



UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL
T/PV.1394
30 May 1972
ENGLISH

Thirty-ninth session
PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTEEN HUNDRED AND
NINETY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 30 May 1972, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. BENNETT (United States of America)

- Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories, for the year ended 30 June 1971: (continued)
 - (a) Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages (English or French), preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. Corrections should be sent in duplicate within three working days to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, Room LX-2332. Corrections received will be issued as corrigendum.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED ON 31 MAY 1972, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 5 JUNE 1972.

The co-operation of delegations in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

EXAMINATION OF ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITIES ON THE
ADMINISTRATION OF TRUST TERRITORIES, FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 JUNE 1971:

(a) TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (T/1735; T/L.1170) (continued)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Edward E. Johnston, High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the Special Representative of the Administering Authority, and the Special Advisers, Senator Andon Amaraich and Representative Polycarp Basilius, took places at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now continue the general debate concerning the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Mr. WEIR (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom delegation has listened carefully to the comprehensive and illuminating statements of the representative of the United States, the Special Representative and the two Special Advisers. We are very grateful to them for the wealth of detail that they have given us in their original interventions and in reply to questions put to them by members of the Council. My delegation has also noted with interest the statements made by the petitioners from the Trust Territory.

I see that in preparing its report on the Territory for 1971 the administering Power has included its observations on the recommendations made by this Council at its last session. This is in accordance with the suggestion made by my delegation at an earlier meeting and we are gratified that it has been done this year.

I should like to begin by commenting on some of the economic and domestic developments that have been discussed at our meeting.

My delegation was much impressed by some of the examples which the Special Representative gave to the Council in his statement of 24 May of the progress made in the Trust Territory during the past year. My delegation was especially pleased to learn that the United States Congress has appropriated \$5 million as the United States share of the joint United States-Japan ex-gratia payment to Micronesia for damage inflicted during the Second World War. That development, which is certainly long overdue, is in accordance with previous recommendations of this Council and my delegation hopes that the Claims Commission will be appointed soon so that it can start its operations without further delay.

(Mr. Weir, United Kingdom)

My delegation is also pleased to note that the rehabilitation of Bikini Atoll is proceeding on schedule and that its inhabitants are soon to return to their former home. We hope that similar progress will be made with regard to the rehabilitation of Eniwetok Atoll and that the resettlement of other displaced communities will continue to be treated as a matter of priority by the administering Power.

The Special Representative has also drawn the Council's attention to what he described as the "greatest areas for development" (1389th meeting, p. 22), that is to say, agriculture, tourism and marine resources. On the first of those areas the Special Representative described the success of the pilot programme for poultry raising and this certainly appears to have lived-up to the expectations which he expressed last year. On the other aspects of the agricultural potential of the Territory, it is disappointing to note that food imports into Micronesia showed another marked increase in 1970-1971 and that the export of copra, the Territory's largest revenue earner, fell from over 15,000 short tons valued at \$2.6 million in 1969-1970 to 10,500 short tons earning only \$1.6 million in 1970-1971. Indeed, mainly owing to the short fall in copra exports the value of the Territory's exports as a whole fell in the same period by over \$1 million or something rather over 25 per cent.

(Mr. Weir, United Kingdom)

In this connexion there is no doubt that one barrier to the expansion of Micronesian exports is the United States tariff legislation. Members of the Council will recall that in past sessions the Special Representative has described the tariff regulations as a long-standing bar to the economic progress of the Trust Territory. My delegation was therefore disappointed to learn that the bill, one of whose purposes was to grant Micronesian products duty-free entry into the United States, was not approved in this form by the United States Congress. I understand however that this is one of the issues which is being discussed in the negotiations between the United States Government and the Joint Committee on Future Status of the Congress of Micronesia. As this issue is obviously of great importance to the future economic welfare of the Trust Territory my delegation hopes that it will be positively resolved in the near future.

In the area of marine resources my delegation welcomes the formation of the Pacific Islands Development Commission with the purpose of promoting the joint economic welfare of Hawaii, Guam and American Samoa, as well as of the Trust Territory. The priority programme which the Special Representative noted, to secure United States federal funding for research on the development of skipjack tuna fishing, will obviously be of benefit, though perhaps more in the long term than the short, to the exploitation of the Territory's rich marine resources. The Administration's report also outlines some other encouraging developments in the fisheries, but my delegation cannot help feeling that judged strictly by results progress has been somewhat disappointing in the past year. The quantity and value of fish caught in the area has actually decreased. In view of this my delegation has some sympathy with the comment made by Congressman Basilius that with regard to the exploitation of marine resources, which are of such great potential value to the economy of the Territory, a reorientation of budgetary priorities may be required. We are glad to note, therefore, that in replying to a question the Special Representative assured the Council that an increase in fish production would be a matter of high priority for the Administration in the coming year. My delegation hopes that some progress towards realizing the undoubtedly great potential of this asset will be reflected in the Administration's report for 1972.

(Mr. Weir, United Kingdom)

In this area the Council, I am sure, will not quarrel with the remark made by Senator Amaraich that

"If our security is in the land, our wealth and our sustenance, and our economic future, are in the sea." (1389th meeting, p. 33-35)

It goes without saying, therefore, that the International Law of the Sea Conference and the decisions adopted by that body will be of vital interest to the leaders and the people of Micronesia. In this connexion my delegation shares the hopes expressed by both the representative of Australia and, in reply to a question which he put, by Senator Amaraich that there will be the fullest possible consultation between the Congress of Micronesia and the United States Government on how the United States delegation to the Law of the Sea Conference will be able to safeguard the interests of Micronesia. One possibility, although this is of course for the representative of the United States to consider, is that it might be useful for a representative or representatives of the Congress of Micronesia to take part in the International Law of the Sea Conference as Special Advisers attached to the United States delegation.

Coming now to the question of localization, my delegation, as I mentioned at an earlier meeting, welcomes the appointment of several more Micronesians to positions of responsibility previously occupied by expatriates. Senator Amaraich has expressed the view that this process is not going forward fast enough. Although my delegation has sympathy with his natural desire to have Micronesians in all the important posts in the Administration of their own country there are, as he himself recognized, serious practical difficulties to be overcome -- above all, the shortage of suitably qualified personnel. Senator Amaraich himself pointed out in reply to a question that localization should not mean that a Micronesian is entitled to fill a particular post simply because he is a Micronesian. In the Trust Territory, as is shown by the experience of other developing countries, it will certainly be necessary for a considerable period -- even after the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement -- to retain the services of experienced and skilled expatriate staff.

At the same time my delegation welcomes the assurance given by the Special Representative in his statement that his efforts would continue to be directed towards realizing the aim that Micronesians should as quickly as possible assume

(Mr. Weir, United Kingdom)

the direct management of their own affairs. My delegation is satisfied, judging from the record, that the Administration is living up to its policy of promoting localization as rapidly as is compatible with the maintenance of a high standard of administration and of a satisfactory degree of professional competence. The Advise and Consent Bill, now approved by the Administration, is an excellent example of this.

In the context of localization an important question is that of a single salary scale as part of the merit plan for all employees of the Micronesian administration. At its 38th session the Council reiterated the hope, previously expressed, that a bill would be passed containing, among other things, a single salary scale for all employees -- Micronesian or expatriate. The Special Representative has explained to us why this did not happen and the Special Advisers have pointed out that the Congress accepted a revised merit plan which, as it did not contain a single salary scale, fell short of their original expectations.

My delegation feels bound to express its own disappointment at this outcome. As we pointed out at the 38th session, my delegation is in favour of equalized pay scales which should be fixed so as to avoid distorting the rest of the economy but should also satisfy the consideration, in equity, that the basic pay of an expatriate should be the same as that of an indigenous civil servant who is performing the same job. Such a system is an important factor in averting hard feelings and in holding out to qualified local civil servants the prospects of promotion in accordance with merit. My delegation fully appreciates the practical difficulties involved in introducing such a scheme. However, the United Kingdom Government has faced similar difficulties in our own overseas territories, and in most cases has found that they could be successfully overcome. In our experience the need to provide salaries at a level which will attract overseas experts can be reconciled with the application of the basic principle of equal pay scales by such devices as providing expatriates with additional but separate allowances for purposes such as travel, housing and inducement.

The Special Representative has mentioned the Federal tax paid by expatriates but not by locally engaged employees. This difficulty too, in the view of my delegation, ought not to prove insurmountable. If British experience is relevant, it should, for example, be possible to negotiate an agreement between Micronesia and the metropolitan Power whereby expatriates serving in the Trust Territory would be liable only to local tax and not to Federal tax during the period of their service in Micronesia. My delegation has made the suggestion before and the Special Representative and the Special Advisers may wish to bear these thoughts in mind should the question of a single pay structure be reopened and once again debated in the Congress of Micronesia.

Turning briefly to the local administration's say in financial matters, my delegation has noted from the statement of the Special Representative that the hopes expressed by the Council at its last two sessions concerning an increase in the financial responsibilities of the Congress of Micronesia with regard to the appropriation of the United States financial subsidies have not yet been realized.

The Special Representative has described to the Council how the most recent budget proposals, again drawn up by the Territorial Administration, following the widest participation in their preparation by the district legislators, as well as by the Congress of Micronesia, were amended only in minor detail when presented to the United States legislature for final approval. My delegation shares the view expressed this morning by the representative of Australia that this very fact strengthens the case for a formal act entrusting to the Congress of Micronesia the fullest possible financial control over their revenues regardless of source. My delegation hopes that the United States Congress may come to reconsider this matter with a view to recognizing the legitimate concern felt about it by the Micronesian Congress.

Turning now to the political scene, my delegation has been impressed by the progress which has been made, since last year's session, in the talks on the future status of the Territory between the representatives of the United States and of the Congress of Micronesia's Joint Committee on the Future Status.

Before looking at the results of these negotiations as a whole, my delegation would like to address itself for a moment to the particular situation of the Mariana Islands, which does seem to confront the members of this Council with a dilemma.

As far as my delegation is concerned, we accept, on the basis of the statements made by the petitioners from the Mariana Islands, this year and in previous years, and on the basis of the stream of resolutions and petitions which have been adopted and forwarded from the district legislature to the United Nations and to the United States authorities, and also on the basis of the results of the referenda that have been conducted in the area, that there is a very strong if not overwhelming sentiment in these islands for a close and permanent association with, or even incorporation into, the United States. It is also clear from the records of the recent status negotiations that this course is one which the representatives of the other five districts of the Trust Territory have rejected for themselves.

As my delegation noted last year, there are good ethnic and historical reasons why the Mariana peoples do not feel at one with the rest of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory. For instance, the Chamorro majority of the Mariana Islanders, if not the Carolinian minority, possess ethnic, linguistic and family connexions with the inhabitants of Guam. It is a historical fact, too, that for 300 years up to the end of the nineteenth century, Guam and the Islands now comprising the Mariana Islands district were administered as one unit. It is also true that until the past decade the most important of the Mariana Islands had not -- except for a brief period under Japanese rule -- been administered as part of an entity comprising the other two archipelagos of the Trust Territory.

There are other factors which have been mentioned by the various petitioners from the district in statements to this Council, and these considerations were all set out in the report of the Future Political Status Commission of the Congress of Micronesia in 1969.

As to the attitude of my own delegation, it is our inclination in the United Kingdom, consistent with our policy towards our own overseas territory, to prefer that a Trust Territory or any dependent Territory should attain self-government or independence as an entity. Against this we can hardly fail to be aware that in practical terms the continued unity of Micronesia, following the act of self-determination, will depend on the feelings of its various peoples and that there are obvious advantages in having this very difficult problem fully discussed by all concerned and, if possible, settled in accordance with the interests of the Territory as a whole before the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement.

As the Council knows, Article 76 of the Charter refers to "the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples" -- "peoples" in the plural. There is thus no obligation laid on administering Powers by the Charter to bring the Territory to self-government or independence as the same entity which that Territory constituted when it was first entrusted to the care of the Power concerned. The Council will also be aware that in the termination of two of the Trusteeship Agreements under the supervision of the Council, the Territories concerned were in fact divided into two parts in accordance with the wishes of its different peoples. On the other hand, it must be said that it has been the general practice since the inception of the United Nations, in accordance with the prevailing views of the membership, for Territories to be administered by the metropolitan Power as single units and to evolve to self-government or independence in that form.

When discussing this question at our last session, the representative of the United Kingdom said: "On this difficult question, my delegation can only look for guidance among the people of Micronesia themselves" (1375th meeting, p. 51).

This in a nut-shell, remains the present attitude of my delegation. It is quite evident that the people of the Marianas have made up their minds on the issue. As the Council has been informed, they are now preparing to negotiate their own future status directly and separately with the United States, a course of action which has received the approval of the administering Power.

(Mr. Weir, United Kingdom)

What is not so clear, however, is the extent to which the Marianas' desire for separate treatment has the consent of the representatives of the other five districts. The Future Political Status Commission of the Congress of Micronesia had the following to say in its analysis of the Marianas problem, an analysis which is recorded in its 1969 report and which was endorsed by this Council at its last session:

"... a solution must be found which represents the interests of Micronesia at large, the interests of the Mariana Islands District and the interests of the minorities within the District." (S/10237, para. 313)

The Trusteeship Council, for its part, said:

"The Council endorses this view of the Commission, and notes the statement by the Commission that it would not oppose a political union involving the Mariana Islands District if it reflected the freely expressed desires of the majority of the people of the District. The Council shares the hope expressed by the Commission that the course of separation would not be considered until all possibilities for partnership have been explored, and urges all the people of the Mariana Islands District to co-operate with the Congress of Micronesia and with the Administering Authority in the search for a mutually acceptable solution." (Ibid.)

(Mr. Weir, United Kingdom)

We are well aware from what has been said by the representatives of the Marianas and by the representatives of the Administering Power of the considerable efforts which have been made to find a framework within which the Marianas and the rest of the Territory could agree to share a common destiny -- unfortunately, efforts which have been made to no avail. The Administering Power, for its part, has stressed that it is only with the very greatest reluctance that after years of striving to persuade the people of the Marianas to give every chance to the Territory as a whole to work together, it has consented to engage in separate status talks with representatives of the Marianas.

It has been demonstrated that the members of the Joint Committee on Future Status have, for some time, thoroughly understood the position of the Mariana representatives. As recently as April this year, the representatives of these five districts approved the transmission of the Marianas' request for separate talks to the United States delegation. But, as has been pointed out at this session of the Council, that approval appears to have been limited to the transmission of the document in question, and should not necessarily be regarded as an endorsement of its contents. As Senator Amaraich has said -- and as has been admitted readily by the representatives of the Marianas -- the mandate of the Joint Committee on Future Status is limited to negotiating the political future of the Territory as a whole. This is perhaps self-evident, as separate negotiations on behalf of the Marianas were not envisaged when the terms of reference of the Joint Committee on Future Status were drawn up.

In this slightly confusing situation, it seems to my delegation desirable that an issue of such fundamental importance to the future of the Territory should be fully debated in the legislature of Micronesia by the representatives of all the peoples of the Territory. It is not just the interests of the people of the Marianas which are affected, but those of the entire Trust Territory, for the loss of part of the Territory would obviously have far-reaching implications for the whole. If it is established as a result of such a debate that the position of the Marianas enjoys the support as well as the sympathy and understanding of the Congress of Micronesia, then there should be no future obstacles to the Mariana Islands District taking the path it so clearly desires. Perhaps this is a point which the Special Representative could discuss in his closing statement.

(Mr. Weir, United Kingdom)

Having dwelt at some length on the question of the Marianas, I come finally to what I think has struck us all as the very impressive degree of progress achieved in the future status talks during the past year. I imagine that the United States delegation would be the first to agree that at this time last year the prospects that the differences between the two sides could be narrowed to the extent that has now been achieved seemed somewhat remote. The fact that this has been achieved reflects great credit on the flexibility and the willingness to compromise which has been the mark of both the United States delegation under the leadership of Ambassador Williams and that of the Micronesia representatives led by Senator Silk. My delegation would like to extend its congratulations to all concerned.

The communiqué issued at the conclusion of the Palau round of negotiations which sets out the position reached, although it is informative enough, appears to my delegation perhaps not to tell the whole story, as is inevitably the way with communiqués. My delegation was encouraged, however, by the comments made by Senator Salli, to which the representative of the United States referred in his statement, in which the Senator expressed the view that the talks represented a breakthrough in that the Micronesia delegation's four points had finally been recognized.

On the other hand, neither the United States representatives nor, more especially, Special Adviser Senator Amaraich, who himself was a member of the delegation to the talks, has attempted to conceal that there are problems which will have to be solved before the terms of a Compact Association can be successfully drafted. As my delegation understands the situation, the areas of potential disagreement are mainly financial, but they also relate to the manner in which the relationship between Micronesia and the United States could be terminated, as well as to the exact scope and nature of the authority to be exercised by the United States on behalf of Micronesia in the spheres of foreign relations and defence. Other outstanding problems appear to include the method by which any final act of self-determination will be carried out, that is to say in what manner the people of Micronesia as well as their Congress will signify their consent to the eventual Compact of free association.

(Mr. Weir, United Kingdom)

These are obviously not minor matters which can be resolved overnight. Nevertheless, my delegation would like to think that provided what may perhaps come to be called the "spirit of Palau" continues to prevail at the succeeding rounds of talks, it will not be long before the Administering Power is able to report to this Council that over-all agreement has been reached. In the meantime, my delegation prefers to reserve comment on the advantages and disadvantages of any particular type of status that the Micronesians in consultation with the Administering Power might eventually choose in exercise of their inalienable right of self-determination. We shall, rather, await the final attainment of agreement between the Administering Authority and the Micronesian delegation entrusted with the carrying out of these negotiations. Only then will my delegation be in a position to express a definite view as to whether the agreed status -- subject always to its endorsement by the peoples of Micronesia -- represents a full discharge of the obligations imposed by Article 76 of the Charter.

For the present it remains only to express to all members of the United States delegation and to the Special Representatives and Special Advisers my delegation's appreciation of the way they have acquitted themselves at this session and to look forward to their closing statements.

Finally, my delegation would like to offer its best wishes to the participants in the next round of status talks and to express the hope that after these last few years of considerable effort their labours will be crowned with success.

Mr. BLANC (France) (Interpretation from French): "La guerre est finie" announced recently the sceptical title of a film which was shown with great success. In the Pacific Territories, 27 years after the cessation of hostilities, the war, this time, is over -- or almost over.

My delegation, which has long expressed, like successive visiting missions, a wish that this should happen, welcomes these developments: the United States Congress, as we have been told, has voted appropriations for the compensation of victims of war or post-war damage; the Chairman of the Claims Commission has been appointed and his representatives are making the necessary arrangements on the spot for the commencement of work.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

It is admittedly regrettable that, three years after the signing on 18 April 1969 of the agreement between the United States and Japan on a settlement so long-awaited by the Micronesians, one is still at the preparatory stage. It is also true that the specific commitments on the part of Japan are still wreathed in a film of mist. Finally, there is admittedly a risk that the psychological impact of the operation will be attenuated if the recipients of the compensation are the sons or even the grandsons of the victims.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

But the end is in sight today, and our colleagues who go to the Territory next year will for the first time probably no longer have to devote a chapter of their report to this irritating problem.

And while scrupulous preparations are being made to dress old wounds, the other aftermath of the hostilities is also disappearing: the moment is close when the statistics will no longer mention the export of scrap iron which, as the Territory's second largest export, has for a long time made the Territory a kind of curiosity in international trade.

These rusty relics of old battles, these odd reminders of the islands' misery, will soon have departed for the blast furnaces, and the Micronesian beaches, cleared at last of the bristling sheet-metal, will regain their placid appearance.

To be sure, several tons of ships' hulls and masts will continue to be part of the statistics of the Territory in the years to come, since Japan has been authorized by the 1969 Agreement to salvage them; but one would hope that the operation will this time be reported under the heading of the anti-pollution struggle.

As for the displaced populations of Bikini and Eniwetok, since 1968 they have known that living on the atolls of their birth no longer poses any danger, and they are rightly impatient at having to wait two more years in the first case and several more years in the second; at least, they are now sure that they will return to their lands.

A page is thus being turned. The Micronesians can now concentrate on their future.

Since 5 August 1967 -- the date on which the young Congress of Micronesia established the Joint Future Status Commission -- the elected representatives of the Territory had seemed to have acquired an increasingly clear picture of what they wanted for their Territory. The people, whom the last Visiting Mission of the Council at the beginning of 1970 had found relatively unconcerned about the questions of future status, had gradually become interested in them.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

The Administering Authority, for its part, had kept members of the Council regularly informed of the results of the four rounds of bipartite talks which took place in Washington, Saipan, Hana and Koror, during which the views of the two parties had gradually come closer together and an agreement had been reached on such important points as the conclusion of a compact of association, the over-all distribution of authority, the adoption of a Micronesian Constitution, and the settlement of the delicate land question. One could already see the dawning of the day when the partners would together work out the time-table for the drawing up of the compact of association.

Today all this may be placed in jeopardy: the statements we have heard since the beginning of this session have, we confess, confused us.

This is not the first time that the Council has heard the claims of the inhabitants of the Marianas; all the visiting missions to the Territory have reported on such claims. Our colleagues who travelled through Micronesia only two years ago noted, like their predecessors, that many Chamorros in the Marianas desired to be united with their brothers in the neighbouring island. They even analysed the results of an unofficial poll which had been conducted in November 1969, according to which 1,900 of the 3,200 voters (if one may use this term) had declared themselves in favour of some link, as against 1,100 in favour of the formula of associated statehood. They had concluded that the Marianas should not be separated from the rest of the Territory as long as the Trusteeship Agreement remained in force.

Last year the Council, which had received from legislators from the Marianas and the other districts contradictory petitions on the future of the archipelago, had noted the conciliatory conclusions of the Status Commission of the Congress of Micronesia according to which the Commission was not opposed to a political union which would include the Marianas District, if that solution really reflected the wishes of the majority.

The Council, however, had shared the hope expressed by the Commission that a course of separation would not be considered until all the possibilities for partnership had been explored.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

Last week's statements, we must admit, seem to indicate that that is not the direction being followed. What we have heard is that the Marianas, despite their hostility in principle to secession, should dissociate themselves completely from the Congress and from its Status Commission, which were trying to loosen the bonds between the Territory and the United States, although, on the contrary, the people of the Marianas wished to maintain those bonds and strengthen them in order to become, according to what was said by one speaker, "a permanent member" of the American political family -- for example, under a Commonwealth system, a system which had been specifically rejected in 1970 by the Status Commission. The only remaining option, we have been told, is a separate political destiny.

We have also heard that separate negotiations were to begin between the United States and representatives of the Marianas.

The Marianas are at present the site of the office of the High Commissioner, of government offices and of head offices of private companies; even if only somewhat more than a tenth of the Micronesian population lives there, the Marianas are ahead of the other archipelagos -- and sometimes far ahead -- as regards cattle-raising, municipal taxes, bank deposits, imports, industrial output and numbers of automobiles, while accounting for three quarters of the tourism, which this year is the main and most promising commercial resource of the Territory.

It is the paradox of Micronesia that the subsidies which it receives and which are by far its main resource have practically doubled in the years 1970-1972 -- that is to say, during the specific period in which discussions have been held as to its future status -- while during a more stable period they had already tripled in 1961, and doubled in 1968. That sudden abundance of resources was reflected in infrastructure projects and in the recruitment of personnel (again this year the increase in personnel, we have been told, is almost one fifth for the indigenous population, and over one tenth for expatriates) more rapidly than in increased production. The phenomenon in itself has been observed everywhere else in similar circumstances, together with increases in prices, which have not occurred in this case; except for salt, the price of which has almost doubled, the prices appearing in the annual reports have varied by only a few cents since 1961. Incidentally,

(Mr. Blanc, France)

this stability is remarkable in a country which seemed predestined for inflation.

Production statistics are disappointing this year. Despite the price support policy applied by the Stabilization Fund after the fall in world prices, and undoubtedly because many planters, as in other parts of the Pacific, are losing interest in their coconut plantations and trying to find jobs in the cities, the production of copra has fallen by 30 per cent in volume, and by somewhat more in value.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

Exports of fish and of handicraft products have decreased by about one tenth; in the latter case the drop is more surprising at a time when tourism is developing.

Exports of meat have also decreased by more than half.

In the case of fish, not counting the production of Van Camp Sea Food, the value of the sales abroad has decreased from \$66,000 to \$48,000.

At the same time, it is true that exports of vegetables have doubled (59,000 and 131,000), and pepper exports have tripled (8,000 and 26,000). These figures have a very important social meaning, to which I shall refer later, but do not yet have an economic meaning because their absolute value remains marginal.

In total, the value of exports, which had fallen by one fourth, rose by \$3,000,000, which is what it was five years previously, in 1966. If one compares this to the figures published 10 years previously, one can see that the difference is roughly equal to the value of the fish sold to Samoan factories by a large international firm.

This purely statistical fact only highlights the importance of the efforts that have been made, according to the annual report, to organize co-operation between Micronesian fishermen and that company.

Moreover, although the comparison of reports is not very revealing on this point, it does show that the indigenous fisheries on the spot have made progress: so many dollars are used for research of all types, which have been enumerated and analysed for us and of which we know the cost, and so many technical meetings have been organized, that the results of these efforts must some day be reflected in the level of production.

For the time being, however, it does not seem that an increase in the extent of the territorial waters would have a decisive effect on the problem of fishing in Micronesia, since the cost of keeping such a vast area under surveillance would be quite out of proportion to the resulting increase in revenue. The question of the territorial waters is thus, for the time being, separate from the problem of production, which does not mean that it does not exist.

While exports are decreasing, purchases from abroad continue to expand at a rapid pace; at the end of the 1950s and towards the beginning of the 1960s, they came close to \$4 million; they doubled in 1966, tripled in 1968, quadrupled last year, and they have increased more than five times this year.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

In itself this increase, which is truly astronomical, is not unhealthy. Indeed, as I have already said, it is evidence that the territory is equipping itself, when the expenditure on fuels, construction material and machinery increases.

But the increase in the consumption of rice, canned fish, and also of beer -- which has doubled -- does not have the same meaning. On the one hand, it aggravates a completely abnormal trade deficit (\$22 million out of \$26 million); on the other hand, it indicates that the urban population and also the rural population are becoming accustomed to relying on foreign countries for their foodstuffs.

If they are to eat canned fish, perhaps it would be better for them to buy it from a Micronesian factory.

But we know that the fish from the islands is canned by a factory several thousand miles away, in another archipelago, because the products of the Territory are not admitted duty free to the United States.

The 1970 Visiting Mission had expressed the wish that this barrier be removed; it welcomed the fact that such a project was being considered. But the text had to be abandoned and the situation, which establishes an imbalance to the detriment of Micronesia, has in fact been maintained.

The continuation of the talks about the future of the Pacific Islands should not prevent a return to the procedure that was abandoned last year, because the first beneficiary would obviously be the fishing industry, that is to say, the industry which, in the opinion of all the experts, constitutes virtually the main resource of the Territory. At the same time a certain amount of protection could be envisaged for canned fish processed on the spot as opposed to canned fish imported from the outside.

In order to hasten industrialization might it not also be necessary to revise the legislation which reserves for American citizens only the right to invest in Micronesia?

This question must be posed. Of course, in this field one must act with caution. The economy of this tiny Territory is so fragile that if a very powerful enterprise -- or even a Government -- were to make massive investments, it might make the entire Micronesian economy dependent on it. Obviously that is not the purpose of the Trusteeship Council's work.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

No matter how careful the District Economic Development Board may be -- and my delegation wishes to praise once again the establishment of these Boards -- such a risk should not be completely excluded. Perhaps it would be better to measure it in a more concrete fashion.

The Trusteeship Agreement does not preclude the opening up of the Territory to foreign capital. As my colleagues will remember, under the League of Nations system, the mandates envisaged in article 22 of paragraph 5 of the Covenant -- that is to say the B mandates -- were subject to the open-door system of economic equality which, on the other hand, did not apply, by virtue of paragraph 6 of the same article, to C mandates, such as the Pacific Islands, South-West Africa, New Guinea and Western Samoa.

After the adoption of the Charter, the Trusteeship Agreements which replaced the former B mandates maintained the system of economic equality, while those which replaced the former C mandates -- such as Western Samoa, and New Guinea -- and those which did not contain any provision on this point -- such as Micronesia -- placed all States except the Administering Authority on an equal footing. To tell the truth, however, nothing obliged the Administering Authority to establish discrimination in its own favour.

At a time when the end of trusteeship does not appear to be far off, we should examine in an entirely new light the matter of the investment system, using the caution which I recommended a few moments ago.

One of the causes of the excessive development of the consumption of goods which could be found in the Territory and which are in fact imported is certainly found in the system that in Africa used to be called trading -- goods trading, of course. The businessmen authorized to buy the copra are also authorized to sell consumer products. As these two operations are practically simultaneous, if I may believe the report of the Visiting Mission, the partner has a natural tendency to spend the product of his sale.

This technique has for a long time been banned in Africa, particularly in the case of buyers of cocoa and coffee in the countryside, because it has been considered that it alienates the freedom of the peasant. It will be necessary for this practice also to disappear in the Territory.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

The general picture of the Micronesian economy is not, thank Heaven, completely dark. First, as I have said, the infrastructure -- whose weakness, as was stressed by the Visiting Mission, prevented any long-term development -- has been improving little by little. The network of airports is being improved and at the same time the lines of Air Micronesia are being extended. The progressive modernization of the merchant fleet and the financial reorganization of Transpac undertaken by the Government should ensure regular maritime services. My delegation is aware that the present High Commissioner correctly has a primary interest in this type of problem: to open the Territory to other countries and to open up the islands to each other.

This elimination of a mediocre past has been taking place at the same time as a change which will have a great bearing on the future of the Territory; namely the tourism boom, the sudden increase, hoped for, but not really expected, in tourism revenue, which has increased by nearly one third during the past year, constituting the outstanding feature of the Micronesian economic year. Hotels are springing up like mushrooms. We are told that the number of hotel rooms will increase by half in several weeks, and by two thirds in less than a year. The pilgrims of the camera, the collectors of lost civilizations, the exiles from pollution have found by the thousands the road of the atolls and have spent more than \$2 million. This sum is expected to double next year and triple in three years.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

The Administration has very wisely set up local commissions and has let the people express their views on the way in which tourism should be developed in each district.

In this field, therefore, all is well and the situation is expected to improve still further in the near future. That being so, the Administration has, no doubt -- though this is not stated very clearly in the report -- been adopting measures in the field of personnel training to train managers, chief accountants and hotel managers, as well as the head waiters and cooks, whom we are told are attending the Micronesian Occupational Centre.

Everybody knows the saying "What is picturesque is the poverty of others".

Viewed from that angle tourism in the Pacific, as in the rest of the world, is in the final analysis, a luxury export, like jewellery and perfume. If elsewhere it served to open up the population to the outside world, in Micronesia, which has long been practising an open-door policy, it will not play that role, because the Territory is open to all the winds of the Pacific. That means that the tourist trade should be a main source of support, but not a substitute for other productive activities of the Territory. Its development will be even further justified if its side effects have an impact on the more peripheral islands of Micronesia.

At this stage, when the end of the Trusteeship system is rapidly approaching, statistics are less important than a certain availability of Micronesians, which cannot be measured. Seen from this angle the picture for 1971 is much more encouraging than it seemed just now. For although the economy is marking time in some sectors it is at least being "Micronized" -- if you will pardon the expression -- in every sector. In every sphere the Micronesians are beginning to play their part in the sphere of finance, for example, they are doing so in the most indirect and most unpleasant but perhaps the most concrete way. I know that the establishment of an income tax recommended by the Trusteeship Council, then by the Pollock report and finally by the Mission that went to the Territory in 1970, was not received without a certain reluctance even on the part of elected officials, or at least some elected officials. However, no one will deny that it is progress, and in a twofold way. First, it has had the far from

(Mr. Blanc, France)

negligible result of more than doubling the revenues of the Territory itself, which this time have exceeded the resources of the municipalities and districts. Secondly, as in all countries, it has indirectly contributed to the civic education of the inhabitants.

It is true that the tax rates -- which are much lower than those proposed by the Pollock mission -- are not graduated, as fiscal technique recommends. But even in its present form the income tax fills a gap which has been noted so often that one cannot quibble over the form in which the tax was established. And besides, although the Territory is no longer one of those fiscal paradises which were once scattered throughout the Pacific, it is still basically in an advantageous position in comparison with its competitors in the race to attract foreign capital.

Of course, the new financial effort made by the inhabitants of the Territory does not substantially modify the structure of the territorial budget. Subsidies or direct expenditures by the United States continue to represent more than nine tenths of the total, and no one would presume to contemplate a considerable reduction in those levels in the future. Under the circumstances, we must see things as they are. We must prepare to see Micronesia as a self-governing entity, although it will depend almost 100 per cent upon foreign finances. No matter how unusual this prospect may be, it is the correct one. We should therefore review means of reconciling the internal sovereignty of the Territory with lasting budgetary dependence. The method of granting a global subsidy equal to the present subsidy cannot be used when the percentage of aid exceeds a certain level, as is now the case. Maintenance of the present system seems incompatible with the change in constitutional status. We should therefore contemplate a mixed system.

The following could be envisaged. Part of the aid could be allocated for specific purposes in specific amounts and would be negotiated for a specific period -- for example, five years, because it is precisely the five-year period that has been taken into account in the past in budgetary planning. Furthermore, at the same time a balancing budgetary subsidy, without control and without specific assignment could also be provided. It would disappear after a specific date or after a certain level of local revenue had been reached. In short, this

(Mr. Blanc, France)

subsidy would be freely utilized but would eventually disappear, so that the person in charge of local finances would not set into the habit of drawing freely on funds from abroad and would not have the impression that they were permanently dependent upon a foreign country. Other systems can be envisaged, but I suggest that the principles behind that division should be examined.

The financial preparations for self-government would also include a review of civil service salaries and wages, which should be based, not on those paid in Maryland or in New York but on those paid to other civil servants in other Pacific Islands and other small territories, and on the wages earned by Micronesians employed in agriculture, fishing or tourism.

According to the Special Representative's reply to one of my questions the other day, if I remember correctly, the average civil servant already earns approximately four times as much as the Micronesian not working for the Administration. Experience in the rest of the third world shows that such distortions soon jeopardize social balance and economic progress. As for the expatriate problem, that will be dealt with separately, as my colleagues suggested this morning and this afternoon, on the basis of the principle that there exist provisional employees who will sooner or later -- and generally sooner -- be required to return to the mainland.

Indications given in the annual report, and by the High Commissioner here in the Council lead us to accept the premise that every year additional high posts are given to indigenous persons -- we were given the list a few days ago. In the private sector, resources of the Economic Development Fund increase each year. This fact, combined with the forthcoming establishment of the Bank of Micronesia and the multiplication of joint ventures augurs well for the gradual "Micronisation" of the market economy system.

The fact that, following adoption of the "Advise and Consent" Act, the elected officials will be required to approve certain appointments provides a guarantee that the progressive replacement of expatriates by Micronesians at all levels will take place without reducing the quality of service to the public, as the Senator indicated the other day. In that regard, and taking into account the coming political changes, we should attentively review the phenomenon occurring before our eyes. In the present system popular representation is concentrated in

(Mr. Blanc, France)

the legislative branch. Consequently thus far, in order to strengthen democratic control, the Authority has had to increase the powers of that branch and of that branch only. But should that trend continue or increase it could produce imbalances when the executive in turn emanates from the popular will. If, as it seems, Micronesia will have a presidential and not a parliamentary system, the time will come when the Congress will have to be denied the right to approve certain appointments because in future these posts should be filled either through elections or by the sovereign decision of the executive branch. Doubtless, it is not too late to think of dissociating in the Executive the powers of representation of the Administering Authority and those of the Chief of Local Administration.

Because today, Micronisation -- an administrative and technical operation -- and emancipation -- a political process -- tend to overlap and intermingle.

The administration of Micronesia could if one wished, be criticized on every score except that of hiding the facts from the public, and especially from the Trusteeship Council. We have heard here the most contradictory statements about the present and future of the Territory. We have been fortunate enough to get copies of the main resolutions adopted by the elected representatives at the district level as well as the Congressional level. We have read and heard detailed reports on the Hana and Koror talks.

We are very interested in the destiny of the Micronesian people and therefore we have listened with the greatest attention to the distant echoes of the Territory and the closer echoes which we have heard here in this room, we have compared, scrutinized, and analysed.

After these weeks of reading and then of careful listening, a certain image of the Territory appears: these thousands of islands, always scattered, long forgotten are still marking time economically, a set-back in one sector negating progress in another. Enormous sums often disappear in the heavy bureaucratic machine; the hope that one day Micronesia will be able to stand on its own feet financially belongs to the realm of dreams of fiction.

But setting aside figures, in a way appropriate to our Organization, we see the facts in another light. First of all, we see that there is a certain atmosphere which is difficult to describe when it exists and too easy to recall when it has disappeared -- an atmosphere of freedom, of trust in man, of civic sense, of mutual respect. And then, on the part of the administering Power, there is not only goodwill -- because anyone can have goodwill -- but a generous will to guide this free people -- that has so often been subjected to so many masters -- this peaceful people -- that has suffered through so many wars -- towards self-determination. Finally, one fact: probably to a greater extent than other regions which resemble it -- particularly in the Pacific Ocean -- Micronesia, through its people -- elected officials, high civil servants, heads of companies, workers, members of co-operatives -- is in many respects already guiding its own destinies.

It would be a pity, it would be surprising if that image -- yes, the image which in the final analysis is quite flattering -- were suddenly to be tarnished.

Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The present session of the Trusteeship Council has started to discuss the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands at a time when the Micronesian people has directly confronted the solution of its most urgent problem -- the problem, that is, of the future political status of its country. This is not a problem which has arisen today, but it is precisely now that it is acquiring particular political acuteness in the light of the events which have recently taken place. In recent years the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands has been displaying growing discontent with the policies of the United States which for more than a quarter of a century has been maintaining the Territory in the status of a colony, making all its activities as administering Power subordinate to the implementation of its own military-strategic plans, heedless of the interests of the indigenous population.

For many years now the Micronesian people has been urgently seeking an end to the Trusteeship system and seeking to have its country converted into a self-governing State, a State where the Micronesians would enjoy full power in all areas of the internal life of the country and the inalienable right to enter into treaty relations with any country and also to put an end to those relations if that should prove necessary.

The Micronesians have put forward and valiantly defended the well-known four principles which reflect the true aspirations of the peoples of the islands who aspire to independent national development, that is, complete sovereignty, the right to independence or self-determination, the right to accept and if necessary to change its constitution, and the right to free association with any State or group of States on the basis of a treaty which could be dissolved at any time by one of the parties.

The efforts of the Micronesian people, which have been aimed at putting an end to the de facto colonial domination of the United States, have continually come up against stubborn resistance on the part of the Administering Authority as a result of which the decision on the future status of the Trust Territory is a matter which unfortunately has been put off continuously.

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

As the Trusteeship Council knows, for a number of years now, talks have been going on between the representatives of the Micronesian people and the representatives of the United States on the question of the future political status of Micronesia. Unfortunately, those talks, because the administering Power wished it so, have gone on in an atmosphere of strict secrecy without the participation of the United Nations. Neither the bodies of the United Nations nor public opinion have been informed in time about what was going on in the talks and the demands which were put forward during those talks at various stages by the United States. It should be pointed out that the talks went on in an obviously inequitable situation for the people of the Islands which made it possible for the United States to apply pressure on the Micronesians in order to prompt them to accept the United States conditions which would make it possible for the United States to perpetuate its control over the Trust Territory.

A certain light has been shed on those talks by the report of the delegation on the Political Status of the Congress of Micronesia which we believe contains a very far-reaching and critical analysis of the activities of the administering Power during the Trusteeship period and is by way of being an indictment of the policies of the United States towards the Trust Territory, a policy the basis of which has by no means been the interest of the Micronesian people or the purposes of the Trusteeship system as stated in the United Nations Charter, but the selfish imperialist interests of the United States.

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

The report convincingly reveals the fact that the United States has continued to reject any decision on the future of the Trust Territory which would not give it a complete guarantee that the Territory would remain under its direct control in perpetuity. In violation of its obligations deriving from the Charter of the United Nations and the Trusteeship Agreement, it has continually turned down the just requirements of the Micronesians and stubbornly tried to impose on the Micronesian people first of all the status of a so-called non-incorporated Territory of the United States on the model of Guam or the Virgin Islands, and then the status of a commonwealth on the model of Puerto Rico, which would maintain the domination of the United States for an unlimited period and would leave the populations of the islands in the situation of being deprived of their rights.

We must not be surprised that the Micronesian Congress has rejected outright the American plan for solving the question of the future of the Territory and has pointed out that that plan simply demonstrates the intentions of the Americans to maintain these lands, which they are now using for military purposes, and also the desire of the Government of the United States to have the right to set aside certain lands for so-called public needs and to restrict the constitution of Micronesia and relegate to the Micronesian Government only an auxiliary role, making it completely dependent on the interests of the United States.

The Micronesians obviously completely realize that the position taken by the United States during the talks derives directly from its previous policies and practical activities in the Trust Territory. In the report which I have referred to, it is pointed out that the economic policy of the United States in the Territory during the entire trust period has been aimed at precluding any possibility of independent development of Micronesia and that this policy "has not achieved one of the long-term purposes and objectives." The authors of the report have pointed out that the position of the United States is by no means determined by any concern for the indigenous population but by "constant and inflexible strategic interests".

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

The position of the United States did not undergo any considerable changes in the course of the previous round of talks on Micronesia which was held in October last year, although some reference was made to the positions of both sides coming closer on certain issues. Senator Salii, the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Future Status of the Congress of Micronesia, in summarizing the results of these talks pointed out that the adamant position of the United States towards the fourth principle on the question of the procedure for dissolving the association treaty had obliged the Micronesian delegation to quit the talks. A certain form of association, Senator Salii said, should not be an alternative to independence but rather one of the forms of a voluntary restriction which would be subject to annulment at any time when Micronesia wished to attain full independence.

In the view of the Soviet delegation that is an exhaustive summary of the position of Micronesia, which, we believe, is completely in accord with the conditions prevailing in the Trust Territory and the interests of the indigenous population and the purposes of the trusteeship system.

The Soviet delegation believes that the results of the recent fourth round of bilateral United States-Micronesian talks, which was held in Palau in April this year, should be regarded in the light of the basic demands put forward by the representatives of the Micronesian people, to which I have already referred. In this connexion it should first and foremost be noted that the results of these talks unfortunately do not give us any reason for optimism regarding a speedy and positive resolution of the problem of the future status of the Territory. As can be seen from the joint communiqué on these talks, which was published on the eve of this session of the Trusteeship Council, the United States has once again tried to impose on the Micronesian people fundamentally inequitable conditions of agreement which are in conflict with the four principles put forward by the Congress of Micronesia. Instead of giving genuine sovereignty to the Micronesian State, which could then conclude a treaty governing its relations with the United States, Micronesia from the very outset has had imposed on it such conditions that in place of the Trusteeship Agreement a Compact would come into force which would not only determine questions of relations between the two parties to it but also affect the fundamental rights of the Micronesian people.

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

In the joint communiqué, for example, it is stated:

"Under the Compact the people of Micronesia will vest in the Government of Micronesia authority over their internal affairs while authority over and responsibility for foreign affairs and defence will be vested in the Government of the United States."

That can only be regarded as a restriction on the sovereignty of the Territory -- and an a priori one, even before the actual Compact has come into force.

In paragraph 2 of this communiqué reference is made to the right of the people of Micronesia

"... to write, adopt, and amend their own Constitution...".

But here again the proviso is included that

"... the Constitution of Micronesia, and any amendment to it, could not be in conflict with the Compact."

Thus the sovereign rights of the people of Micronesia are considerably restricted in this way as well. That is why the Micronesian delegation was obliged in its statement at the conclusion of the talks to say the following:

"Apart from the question of financing there are certain issues in connexion with the position of the United States regarding the sovereignty of Micronesia which remain outstanding. The United States obviously would recognize the sovereignty of Micronesia only in so far as the framing of this Compact is concerned. The United States refuses to recognize any right to inalienable sovereignty both to the people and to the Government of Micronesia. This reservation on the part of the United States may create further serious problems for the talks."

Nor can we overlook the fact that although the agreement of the United States to unilateral dissolution of the Compact, which was so earnestly sought for many years by the Micronesians, has finally been achieved it is hedged about by such conditions that the people of the Territory cannot use the right to unilateral dissolution because that right is subject to the Compact being in force for a considerable period. We do not even know exactly what period that would be.

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

Furthermore, the United States party has put forward a demand that if the Compact should be terminated the so-called mutual security pact would remain in force, which would maintain military bases and the presence of the United States for an eternity.

In these conditions any dissolution of the basic Compact would be pointless because it would not rid the Micronesians of domination by the United States.

Finally, it should be pointed out that both the pact I have referred to -- the mutual security pact -- and the separate military agreements on the lease of lands for military bases and so on would come into force before the basic Compact was signed. Thus the United States, even at the latest stage in the talks with Micronesia, has not stood aside from its policy of maintaining control over Micronesia.

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

It has simply been a change in tactics, and this is quite obvious. Instead of direct annexation of the Trust Territory, which would undoubtedly cause a very negative reaction on the part of the United Nations and world public opinion, the Administering Authority is trying to impose on the people of Micronesia an inequitable association treaty.

There is one further aspect of the policy of the United States with regard to the Trust Territory which cannot fail to cause alarm and concern to the people of Micronesia, to the members of the Trusteeship Council and to world public opinion as a whole. We are referring to the plan to dismember the Territory by means of the de facto annexation of the Mariana Islands under the guise of a permanent association.

For many years now, the United States, as is known, has been increasingly practising the policy of artificially singling out the Mariana Islands from the remainder of the Territory and has continually been fanning the flames of separatism there. This, of course, can be explained by the fact that this part of the Territory is being widely used for the location of military bases, such as those which have been set up in Saipan, Rota and Tinian. This major district of the Territory, at the present time more than any other time, is in fact living at the expense of the Administering Authority and completely depends on imports from the United States. It is sufficient to refer to the fact that for 1971 the Mariana Islands imported goods to the value of \$8.6 million and exported a total of \$281,000 themselves.

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

It should be pointed out that as recently as a year ago the representatives of the Administering Authority acknowledged that the separatist trends to be observed in the Mariana Islands are simply carried out by a small group of local politicians who are incited from outside. Exactly a year ago, in May of 1971, the High Commissioner stated that the position of the Marianas "can be explained by the agitation of a very small group of five to six people who do not represent the Micronesians".

At the last session of the Trusteeship Council, Mr. Phillips also stated that the United States intended to conduct talks within the framework of the entire Territory and did not intend to start any separate talks with the representatives of the Marianas. However, at that time the High Commissioner could not have been unaware of that fact that the United States had already started those talks some time before, that as early as March 1971 a special Ambassador, David Kennedy, met in Saipan with the leaders of the Marianas separately, and that at that secret meeting he was handed a memorandum which set forth their position; that is, the position of the separatists in the Marianas.

Those consultations were continued in May 1971 while the Congress of the United States was discussing the Japanese-American agreement on paying compensation to the Micronesians for damages caused during the war. Since then, furthermore, the United States press has kept on referring to talks between the United States and the delegation of the Congress of Micronesia and the delegation of the Marianas, separating the delegation of the Marianas.

Finally, at the talks in Koror the delegation of the United States, for all to hear, stated that it

"recognized the right of the people of the Marianas to self-determination and was prepared to start separate talks on political alliance between the Mariana districts and the United States."

This can only be regarded as a gross violation of the prerogatives of the Congress of the Territory. Is it not the Congress of Micronesia which is authorized to represent all the districts of Micronesia at talks with the United States? Has anything changed in the mandate of the delegation of the Congress of Micronesia

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

on this score? It should be pleased to hear a reply to this query from the Administering Authority.

It is quite obvious that, deprived of its most developed and largest district, Micronesia would inevitably be confronted by serious economic and political difficulties. We have only to recall that the development of tourism, about which we have heard so much, affects in practical terms the Mariana Islands exclusively, and primarily Saipan where a hotel is already under construction. The basic airports of the Territory are located in Saipan, Tinian and Kwajalein.

Thus, the already limited sources of income of the Territory would suffer from an even greater loss. The plans for the dismemberment of Micronesia, we believe, are a blatant violation on the part of the United States of its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and the Trusteeship Agreement. They could cause irreparable damage to the vital interests of the Micronesian people, who are vitally concerned in the integrity and vulnerability of their country.

It is suggested that officials of the United States have not concealed the fact that their plans, in the case of this Trust Territory, are subject to military strategic interests of the United States. The members of the Council have undoubtedly had occasion to pay attention to document T/COM.10/L.52, which quotes the following utterance of Admiral Lemos:

"There are essentially three reasons why the Department of Defense" -- that is, of the Pentagon -- "considers the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands important to our national security. The islands are strategically located, they could provide useful bases in support of military operations and they provide valuable facilities for weapons' testing. Our continuing strategic requirements in the Pacific and our need to further develop United States missile capabilities will make the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands increasingly valuable to United States security interests in the area.

"The islands are a natural backup to our forward bases in East Asia."

(T/COM.10/L.52, p. 6)

It seems to me that this utterance on the part of Admiral Lemos speaks for itself.

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

Then, the well known and very well informed American observer, Sulzberger, in an article published in The New York Times on 5 April -- quite recently in fact -- referred to the reduction of American armed forces in South Viet-Nam, the transfer of Okinawa to Japan, and the changed status of Taiwan. Pointing to the changes in the strategy of the United States in the Pacific, which amounted to the reduction of the use of American land forces and more emphasis being placed on the use of American naval and air forces, Sulzberger says:

"One immediate result is enhanced importance of the sparsely inhabited Pacific island area known as Micronesia, conquered from Japan during World War II and, precisely 25 years ago assigned to U.S. Trusteeship by the United Nations Security Council.

"The new Pacific strategy calls for more bases in Micronesia...

"The Pentagon has been in close touch" -- and I should like to draw attention to this -- "with the American negotiators. Washington wishes to assure that no other powers are allowed to move in militarily and that additional U.S. base facilities can be arranged."

This information, from a very sound journalist, is, we believe, worthy of the Council's attention.

What has been said, I think, once more bears out the fact that the basis of United States plans for solving the problem of Micronesia is the open intention of the United States to engulf Micronesia and to turn it into a permanent military strategic bridgehead. The Soviet delegation, of course, cannot support the proposed plan for solving the problem of the future status of the Trust Territory, which is in direct conflict with the letter and the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations and the Trusteeship Agreement, and would doom the Micronesian people to the perpetuation of their present situation of being without their rights and would turn the Trust Territory into a military and strategic appendage of the United States.

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

We should like to stress also that the existing military bases of the United States in the Territory of Micronesia and the plans for their further expansion represent a threat to the peace and security of the peoples of Asia and Oceania, including the peoples of the Trust Territory.

In conclusion, we should like to dwell on certain external aspects of the development of the Trust Territory during the period which has elapsed since the thirty-eighth session of the Trusteeship Council. Judging by the material which has been presented in the present discussion, the situation in the Trust Territory during the year which has just passed has not undergone any substantial changes. Nothing new has happened in the political structure of the Territory. The Congress of Micronesia is, as before, relegated to the role of an auxiliary, and complete authority in the Territory is concentrated in the hands of the High Commissioner. There is also the double veto of the High Commissioner and the United States Secretary of the Interior.

The situation in the economic and social areas remains unsatisfactory. The economy of Micronesia for the period under review has in fact been brought to a catastrophic state. At the present time, the Territory is completely dependent on imports whereas its exports continue to fall. The external trade deficit has reached the unprecedented figure of \$23 million, which has been caused by the considerable increase in imports and an even more considerable decrease in exports. At the same time, with the reduction of arable land for basic crops there has been a reduction in the absolute volume of agricultural production, and a number of products previously exported, such as cocoa, crabs and boats, have simply disappeared from the pages of the report. There has been a considerable drop in earnings from copra, metal working, meat, fish and, in fact, in all the main items of the Territory's earnings.

We have heard a number of encouraging assurances from the representatives of the administering Power regarding the status of the economy of the Territory. However, it is useful also to heed the opinion of the Micronesians themselves on this score, an opinion which is strikingly different from the declarations and the assurances of the Administering Authority. In particular, we should like to refer to the report on the situation in the most densely inhabited district of the Territory, Truk, where one-third of the entire population of Micronesia

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

live. That report was presented to the District Legislative Council at the beginning of 1971 and contains the results of a very careful two-year survey which was carried out by four members of the Council. The Committee visited all 38 islands in the District and its conclusions are extremely significant, as they help us to understand why it is precisely in Truk that the most virulent independence movement has arisen. The report points out in particular:

"The average per capita earnings of the population in Truk are equal to the earnings of the most backward countries in the world. The population lives in houses which are broken down and which are not even fit for human habitation. There is practically no electricity. There is a lack of water during the months of drought. There are very limited possibilities of earnings from copra. Certain very fortunate people are working for the Government teaching English."

The report contains very justified and severe criticism of the actions of the administering Power and partially explains the reasons for the economic backwardness of the District, pointing out that a careful study of the requirements and possibilities of Truk has never been carried out by the Administering Authority, nor have any systematic efforts been made to guarantee the development of its economy.

While we are being assured that the Administering Authority is going on with its policy of decentralization and is vesting responsibility for social development and education in the municipalities, the report also states that the so-called Department of Political Affairs is in fact inactive and the municipalities are deprived of elementary financial support to carry out the functions which have been vested in them.

The report also makes it quite clear that the educational situation in Truk is quite unsatisfactory. There is a shortage of school buildings. The plans of the administration to set up schools in the District not only have come to nothing, but have had deleterious effects for one-third of all the school children in Micronesia, as a result of which the situation is as it was 20 years ago. The report goes on to say that in the two major districts of the Territory, Truk and the Marshall Islands, secondary schools are not in a position to accept all the students who have finished primary school. In Truk

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

During one year only one out of five school children can in fact enter the secondary schools. In the Marshall Islands the ratio is one to four. In addition to this, it should be pointed out that only a small fraction of those who complete secondary school can continue their education further. However, according to the Micronesian specialist on planning:

"The most tragic aspect of this is that those who have completed secondary education frequently are not in a position to find any work. Those who find it come up against a new problem, namely, that during their education they did not receive any vocational training."

That is quoted from the Micronesian Reporter for the first quarter of 1971 at page 29.

The representative of the Palau District at the Congress of the Territory pointed out that outside the Central District the situation in Palau was very similar to that found in Truk. Practically half the population is not getting any assistance from the Government of the Territory. The absence of any well-thought-out programme for the development of the economy, which holds up progress in Truk, is also typical of Palau. The administration refuses to develop and protect the maritime resources of the district, which are the main source of earnings, as a result of which the catch has dropped by 25 per cent in comparison with 1970. The population suffers from a lack of water and food. Very convincing facts show that the people of the Territory do not enjoy rights and are in a very penurious economic position as well as an unsatisfactory educational situation. This also applies to other fields. That situation has also been referred to in meetings of this Council in statements made by Senator Amaraich and Congressman Basilius. That is the true situation in the Territory.

We believe that this analysis of the policies of the administering Power is much more convincing than the voluminous pile of statistics which has been presented to the Council. The opinions which are quoted by the leaders of the indigenous population make it possible for the Council better to understand that the policy of the administering Power has remained what it was, that is, a policy of ignoring the developmental and economic problems of the Territory and also the problem of education of the population.

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

At the present time, the situation in the Trust Territory is characterized by an obvious increase in the movement for complete independence for the country. Among the indigenous population, there is a growing mood in favour of being liberated from the domination of the United States. Based on that, a political party has arisen which is called the Coalition for Independence. It has arisen as an expression of the desire of the Micronesians for independent development. The coalition enjoys considerable support in the Congress of Micronesia, more than a third of which has become members and founders of that party. The independence movement is growing among the Micronesian youth.

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

What does independence mean for the Micronesians? It is difficult to answer this question more eloquently than was done by one of the prominent congressional leaders of that Territory, Congressman Williander. Speaking on 13 May 1971, he declared:

"We interpret independence to mean the possibility for Micronesia to take its fate into its own hands without any intervention on the part of foreign interests. If the invaluable resources of Micronesia are controlled by foreign companies, that is not independence. If the Government and the economy of Micronesia depend on foreign assistance which at any time can be refused, then that is not independence. But, above all, if there are foreign military bases located on our islands, and foreign soldiers and foreign Powers, that once again is not independence."

The Soviet delegation stands solidly behind the people of Micronesia, who are struggling for their freedom and independence, and when it comes to deciding the future political status of the Territory we will come out in support of the just demands of the Micronesian people which would ensure the independent national development of their country. We will speak for this as we have spoken for it previously.

In this connexion, we should like to recall that the question of the final political future of the Territory in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations can be decided only by the Security Council. For the time being it is premature to try to foresee what will be the final conditions for agreement between the Administering Power and the Congress of Micronesia regarding the future political status of the Territory. Therefore, the Soviet delegation would like to reserve its right to express its attitude on this matter at a somewhat later stage. However, we should like to emphasize that whatever agreement is reached on the question of status, the people of Micronesia should have the right to self-determination up to and including complete independence, as laid down in the Charter of the United Nations, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the Trusteeship Agreement.

Mr. SACKSTEDER (United States of America): Mr. President, as the Council concludes the general debate on the report on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands my delegation merely wishes, through you, to thank the members of the Council for the remarks they have directed to us today and for their thorough analysis of the situation in the Territory. They have given us much food for thought, and we wish to assure them all that in the short time that remains to us before we prepare our concluding statements we shall try as best we can to answer all of their questions, and that we have, through their carefully pondered and well-presented statements, been given a good job to try to answer them. We shall certainly look forward to doing so on Friday. Again we should like to thank each and every one of them for their remarks and for the obvious care and attention that they have given to them.

The PRESIDENT: Are there any further comments?

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to raise a technical point. Since it would appear that errors of interpretation occurred while I was making my statement earlier I would suggest that the English text of that statement should not be distributed before being submitted to the translators, who could, with the aid of the French text, establish an exact translation. The same kind of thing happened last year, and a month after the session I was obliged to re-do the English text of my statement in its entirety. It would be well if we could avoid such waste.

The PRESIDENT: The Secretariat will arrange for that to be done in accordance with the wishes of the representative of France.

If there are no other comments or observations, I propose that the Council should adjourn until tomorrow at 10.30 a.m., when we shall begin the examination of conditions in Papua New Guinea.

The meeting rose at 5.05 p.m.