

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

T/PV.1526
21 May 1982

ENGLISH

Forty-ninth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 19 May 1982, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. POUDADE (France)

Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 September 1981: Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued)

Examination of petitions listed in the annex to the agenda (continued)

UN LIBRARY
MAY 24 1982
UN/SA COLLECTION

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent, within one week of the date of this document, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

82-60553

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

EXAMINATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 1981: TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (T/L.1228 and Add.1-3) (continued)

EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS LISTED IN THE ANNEX TO THE AGENDA (T/1836/Add.1) (continued)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): First I would refer to document T/PET.10/193, containing a letter in which Mr. David Anderson seeks permission to present a petition on behalf of the inhabitants of Enewetak. We have now received a letter dated 19 May 1982 in which Mr. Anderson asks that Mr. Ismael John be heard on behalf of the inhabitants of Enewetak. He is accompanied by Mr. David O'Neal, the Head of the Council of Enewetak.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to Mr. Anderson's request.

It was so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Y.M. Gibbons, Mr. Moses Uludong, Mr. Ismael John, Mr. David O'Neal, Mr. David Anderson, Mr. Douglas Faulkner, Mr. Pedro Guerrero, Mr. Douglas Cushnie and Mr. Roman Tmetuchl took places at the petitioners' table.

Mr. GIBBONS : It is indeed a privilege and an honour to address this body of the United Nations today. I wish to introduce Mr. Alan Seid, my special assistant, and Mr. Patrick Smith, my legal counsel, who may assist me in responding to any questions the members of the Council may have.

I come before you as a product of the United Nations Trusteeship System. I was born a year before the end of the Second World War, at a time when Palau was occupied by the Japanese. The city of Koror was a thriving metropolis which accommodated the needs of 30,000 people. Many referred to it as "little Tokyo". Granted, we did not enjoy our freedom, but we did enjoy an infrastructure far superior to anything we have known since. We had a beautiful tree-lined paved road system with paved sidewalks throughout Koror, we had a water system capable of meeting the needs of the people, and we had an electrical system capable of providing a dependable source of power for the inhabitants. There was a thriving economy because of a balance of trade between Japan and Micronesia. In fact, between 1924 and 1936, the value of Micronesian exports exceeded the value of imports in each and every year. Palau enjoyed a diversified economy, obtaining revenues from phosphate mining, bauxite mining, pineapple plantations and canning plants, coconut plantations and copra mills, the manufacturing of beverages, perfume and charcoal, commercial fishing and canning, the raising of cattle and Berkshire pigs, trochus and cultured pearls and the production of many local handicrafts. Shortly after the end of the Second World War the United States chose to destroy the infrastructure of Palau - presumably because its military leaders wanted no reminders of the Japanese influence in this isolated area of the world. Thus, at a time when the United States was committing vast sums of money to rebuild Japan and make it once again an independent, self-sufficient Power in the world economy, and at a time when the United States embarked upon one of the most ambitious projects in the history of mankind - the implementation of the Marshall Plan, designed to rebuild completely the devastated remains of Europe - the United States did not merely choose to ignore our area of the world but chose instead to destroy physically that which had been developed by the Japanese. In pursuit of that policy the United States,

(Mr. Gibbons)

through its military leaders, chose to dynamite, bulldoze and destroy the entire paved road system and 95 per cent of the substantial buildings that existed in Koror.

In contrast, today we have only 8 miles of paved roads, all of which were paved only in the past year. We have an insufficient water system, with many of the 8,000 residents of Koror having running water only from 6 a.m. to 8 a.m. We have a power system which is unreliable - it being not at all unusual to have power outages of an hour or so several times a day. In place of the substantial reinforced concrete buildings we once knew, we have a new architectural style known as "tin shack construction". Simply put, we do not have an infrastructure which would enable our tiny island nation to become economically self-sufficient.

On 2 April 1947, when I was three years old, this body of the United Nations designated the United States as the trustee and Administering Authority of what was to become known as the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

I come before you today with a heavy heart. While I love, admire and respect what the United States has done for many of the downtrodden peoples of the world, I ask you whether the United States has met its obligations as trustee and Administering Authority of Palau. I do not ask this question lightly - because I am generally a strong supporter of this world Power. In fact, by my own choice, I served in the United States Army for a period of six years. But, in my representative capacity as the traditional leader of Palau, I feel compelled to put aside my own feelings towards the United States and objectively ask whether it has met its obligations.

To answer that question, we must first determine what were and are the obligations of the United States as trustee. The Charter of the United Nations gives us the answer. Chapter XI, Article 73, provides in part:

"Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and

(Mr. Gibbons)

accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost ... the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories, and, to this end:

"a. to ensure ... their political, economic, social and educational advancement their just treatment, and their protection against abuses"

...

"d. to promote constructive measures of development to encourage research and to co-operate with one another and, when and where appropriate, with specialized international bodies with a view to the practical achievement of the social, economic and scientific purposes set forth in this Article".

(Mr. Gibbons)

Turning from the Charter of the United Nations to the actual Trusteeship Agreement for the former Japanese mandated islands, we see under article 4 that the United States was and is to

"apply the objectives of the International Trusteeship System, as set forth in Article 76 of the Charter, to the people of the Trust Territory."

In other words, the United States was charged with the responsibility of promoting the economic advancement of the inhabitants. Article 6 specifically provides in part:

"In discharging its obligations under Article 76 b of the Charter, the Administering Authority shall:

1. Foster the development of such political institutions as are suited to the Trust Territory and shall promote the development of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of the Trust Territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned; and to this end shall give to the inhabitants of the Trust Territory a progressively increasing share in the administrative services in the Territory; shall develop their participation in government: shall give due recognition to the customs of the inhabitants in providing a system of law for the Territory".

Has the United States responsibly and appropriately discharged its obligations under article 6 (1) of the Trusteeship Agreement? Palau is a nation of 14,000 people with over one half, or approximately 8,000 people, living in its principal city - Koror. Thus, as a nation, we are no larger than many of the small towns of America. Yet we inherited from the Administering Authority - the Trust Territory Government - a governmental structure and a bureaucracy, and a governmental mentality, which not only are far costlier than our meagre resources will permit, but are inefficient and too complex to meet the needs of our people. What the Trust Territory Government did in allegedly preparing us for independence was to create a welfare State in the name of self-government. For example, our national public works office has two boats which are sometimes operable, yet we have 18 boat drivers on the

(Mr. Gibbons)

payroll of the public works division. Our national land survey office has 12 full-time surveyors. Yet they sit in the office, drawing their full salary, and do nothing, because no funds were budgeted for operating field expenses.

You may ask me "Why should such waste be considered the failure of the United States rather than the failure of your own Government?" The reason it is the failure of the United States is quite simple. At some stage during the past 35 years of this Trusteeship the United States concluded that it was far easier, and presumably less expensive, to create a false economy based upon governmental employment of the masses than to develop the infrastructure necessary to support an economy based upon private enterprise. In other words, if you give everyone a governmental job which provides a subsistence standard of living, it is not necessary to face up to the far more difficult task of developing an infrastructure capable of allowing a small island nation to become self-sufficient.

The United States adopted this short-term solution to the problems of Palau. In doing so it, first, created a false sense of economic prosperity and security on the part of Palau's inhabitants. Secondly, it created a governmental welfare State. Thirdly, it failed and neglected to promote the economic advancement and self-sufficiency of the inhabitants. Fourthly, it has left Palau, at a time when the Trusteeship Agreement is nearing termination, with an inadequate infrastructure, which is incapable of permitting us to become self-sufficient. Fifthly, it undermines Palau's negotiating leverage in the Compact of Free Association negotiations.

Therefore, I submit to you that under the guise of creating democratic institutions to promote "self-government or independence" as required by article 6 (1) of the Trusteeship Agreement, the United States undertook a course of conduct which resulted in an absolute breach of its obligations under article 6 (2) of the Trusteeship Agreement, which provides that the Administering Authority shall:

"Promote the economic advancement and self-sufficiency of the inhabitants, and to this end shall regulate the use of natural resources; encourage the development of fisheries, agriculture, and industries; protect the inhabitants against the loss of their lands and resources; and improve the means of transportation and communication".

(Mr. Gibbons)

After 35 years as Administering Authority, what has the United States done to meet its obligations under article 6 (2)? Has true economic advancement taken place enabling the inhabitants to become self-sufficient, either individually or as a nation? Has the United States responsibly regulated the use of natural resources and encouraged the development of fisheries, agriculture and industries? Has the United States protected the inhabitants against the loss of their land and resources and substantially improved the means of transportation and communication? I suggest to the Council that, upon close scrutiny, the United States has utterly failed in meeting its obligations and responsibilities as specified in article 6 (2) of the Trusteeship Agreement.

Palau is blessed with the natural resources which, had the United States chosen a different course of action as Administering Authority, would have enabled the United States to meet its obligations under article 6 (2). Mother nature has been good to Palau. She has provided us with natural beauty in the rock islands, which are unusually breathtaking and which could serve as a natural international tourist attraction. In reality, however, Palau has only one small hotel, with 50 rooms, capable of meeting the needs of international tourists. Why has not the tourist industry been more fully developed? First of all, it takes a developed infrastructure to support it. International tourists will not flock to an area that is served by only one airline three times a week, that does not have a reliable communication system with the outside world, that cannot ensure a consistent source of safe drinking water and that cannot provide a reliable source of energy. Our catch-22 situation is that large amounts of private capital, investors and private enterprise will not flock to a place with our characteristics unless there are assurances that our infrastructure will be developed to offer a chance of a successful, profitable operation. In recent years we have seen examples of Government and private enterprise mutually recognizing large-scale tourist potential. We have seen the implementation of a plan utilizing Government funds for the development of an infrastructure and private capital for the actual development of tourist facilities. Specifically, I refer the Council to Cancun, Mexico, as a prime example of potential being recognized and exploited

(Mr. Gibbons)

by the mutual commitment and co-operation of Government and private enterprise. It is not many years ago that Cancun, Mexico, was a sleepy native village. Today, through the mutual efforts of the Mexican Government and private enterprise, it is one of the major international tourist attractions of the world. Even world leaders convene meetings in Cancun, Mexico. Why has not the United States as Administering Authority and trustee embarked some time in the last 35 years upon a course of action similar to that of the Mexican Government in Cancun, Mexico? I suggest to the Council that it was far easier and less expensive in the short run to forgo imaginative programmes and simply create a governmental welfare State. Thus, had the Administering Authority committed competent, creative and imaginative people with adequate financial resources and professional expertise, an infrastructure would have been developed which would have enabled Palau to take a giant step towards self-sufficiency by reliance upon an active, well-developed international tourist industry.

In addition to the natural scenic beauty of Palau, mother nature has blessed us also with a rich and abundant marine life capable not only of being a major world-wide tourist attraction for the diver, photographer and sports fisherman but also of supporting a major commercial fishing fleet.

Has the United States done anything to promote and encourage the development of a viable commercial fishing industry? Skipjack and bonito tuna in large-scale commercial quantities readily available in the waters of Palau; yet Palau has had no aid in developing a modern fishing fleet, no aid in developing canneries to process the fish and no aid in developing the skills necessary to exploit this natural resource. Instead, for meagre sums we license Japanese, Taiwanese and Koreans to fish our waters. The United States has not even seen fit to offer Palau the potential of enforcing its fishing zone. Thus, where our only revenues from fishing derive from licensing foreigners, we cannot even stop the vast amount of illegal foreign fishing that takes place in the waters of Palau. We do not have adequate aircraft or boats to patrol our waters, apprehend offenders and enforce the law. Does the licensing of foreigners to fish discharge the obligation of the United States to promote economic development, encourage the development of fisheries and protect the inhabitants against the loss of their resources? I suggest to the Council that it does not and that, in fact, there has been an utter and complete failure

(Mr. Gibbons)

on the part of the United States with respect to its duties in the fishing area.

I will not speak at length with respect to the agricultural and industrial development of Palau, since none exists. Suffice it to say that, while an agricultural potential exists in Palau, the United States has done virtually nothing to assist in its development. During their occupation of Palau the Japanese at least developed the coconut, pineapple, cattle and pig industries.

(Mr. Gibbons)

For the past 35 years we have seen no significant development in these areas. Accordingly, Palau is in the economically unhealthy position of importing virtually everything it needs, while it exports virtually nothing. We do not enjoy any sort of responsible balance with respect to foreign trade.

The United States and the Republic of Palau have been negotiating for a Compact of Free Association for 12 years, with the aim of terminating the Trusteeship Agreement soon. In reviewing the over-all history of the United States as Administering Authority of Palau, one must believe that the United States has deliberately and intentionally failed to develop Micronesia and Palau in order to gain negotiating leverage and thus attain its military purposes proposed under the Compact. Under the Compact, the United States now proposes to build an infrastructure for Palau. However, that responsibility without question existed under the Trusteeship Agreement. One must assume that the United States' intentions in Palau are only for the self-interest of United States military goals rather than for the paramount interests of the peoples of Palau.

I have attempted to describe to the Council today, in as accurate a manner as possible, the severe problems which face Palau with respect to the future. Time limitations prevent me from completely outlining our case that the United States has breached its duties as trustee and Administering Authority. I may be asked, "What is the point? What has happened in the past is history". The point is that this great international body is committed to principles of international justice. I do not come before the Council today with a basket in hand, asking it to fill the coffers with monetary aid. I do not come before it today asking that it exert pressure on the United States to increase our annual budget or to commit several hundred million dollars to redress their wrongs.

I do not come before it today to ask it to chastise the United States for having failed in its sacred trust as Administering Authority of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Instead, I come before the Council today, at a time when Palau is emerging as a sovereign nation, with a simple request that this great body has the power and authority to meet. I say to the Council not to take my words at face value as to whether the United States has breached its

(Mr. Gibbons)

obligations. Proof of that assertion requires much more than can be delivered in an address of this nature. I simply ask that Palau be given an opportunity in an appropriate forum to prove its case that the sacred trust has been breached and neglected. The appropriate forum for such a case is an organ of the United Nations. The appropriate forum is the International Court of Justice at the Hague. I simply ask that this great body make it actually possible for Palau to present its best case to the International Court of Justice. In a matter as important as the survival and future of an emerging nation, where we firmly believe there has been a wrong on the part of the United States in discharging its sacred trust, this Council should provide a remedy for that wrong. I ask that this Council adopt a resolution and cause the General Assembly to adopt a resolution which would confer jurisdiction on the International Court of Justice to try the case of the Republic of Palau versus the United States of America. Finally, I ask that Palau be given a realistic opportunity to present its case. A realistic opportunity requires funds with which to prosecute a case of this magnitude. This case will involve proof concerning the actions of the United States, or its lack of action, throughout 35 years of acting as Administering Authority. Since Palau will have the burden of proving that a sacred trust existed, that the trust was breached and neglected, that Palau has been severely and irreparably damaged as a result of that breach of trust, and the amount of money that would be an appropriate reparation for having breached its sacred trust, we will need a minimum grant of \$2 million realistically to be given an opportunity to have our day in court. Upon obtaining a favourable judgment from the International Court of Justice, Palau would reimburse the funds provided by this body of the United Nations.

In closing, the Council should realize that the Republic of Palau is at its most significant crossroads. For 200 years, our peoples have been under foreign influence or domination, first the Spaniards, followed by the English, the Germans, the Japanese and then the Americans. As a result of foreign influences, our native population declined from 80,000 in 1780 to a mere 4,500 shortly after

(Mr. Gibbons)

the Second World War. This decline was caused by diseases and war not of our choice. At last we are on the verge of emerging as a free nation. While we only have 14,000 people, we are committed as a nation to maintaining our traditional and cultural values. We ask only that this body give us the opportunity to seek justice among the nations of the world. Given that opportunity, the Republic of Palau will then be able to take its rightful place among the world community of nations to promote international justice and peace for all people.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I now call on Mr. Moses Uludong to make his statement.

Mr. ULUDONG: As a member of the Senate of Palau's National Congress and on behalf of my constituents in Koror State, I extend to the Council my warm greetings and my thanks for honouring me with the opportunity to address this session of the Trusteeship Council. I have been honoured with similar opportunities in the past when I addressed the Council concerning the proposed oil transshipment superport project for Palau and political status issues.

Today I will discuss four grave issues of the utmost importance for the people of the Republic of Palau: first, the failure of the United States and Japan to satisfy claims for compensation for injuries, death and damages suffered by Palauans during the Second World War; secondly, the intent of the United States to ratify the proposed Compact of Free Association as a United States public law rather than as an international treaty entered into between sovereigns; thirdly, the incompatibility of the proposed Compact of Free Association with the Constitution of the Republic of Palau; and, fourthly, the colonialistic and paternalistic attitude of the United States, as Administering Authority, towards the people and the Government of the Republic of Palau.

As for war claims, the just claims of the people of Palau against the Governments of Japan and the United States have yet to be fully satisfied some 35 years after the end of the war. That war was fought by those foreign Powers on our soil against our wishes and without our consent. Despite previous pleas made before this Council, the United States has failed to release its share of the payments under title 1 claims and states in its law that the Japanese Government must release its share first. Thus, just as during the war the Palauan people were caught in the midst of an armed conflict between the two Governments, today we are caught between their mutual obstinacy.

(Mr. Uludong)

The Palauan claimants, most of whom are old, are dying off without seeing the full satisfaction of the claims. We suffer today as we suffered then because of forces beyond our control and events in which we have no part or power.

While I have castigated the Government of Japan somewhat, I must also thank and commend it for its foresight in recently making available to the Republic of Palau \$1.3 million for the development of small-scale fishing enterprises. This aid from the Japanese Government in effect repays Palau for some of the damage done during the war and the people of Palau appreciate this. To the United States I must say that this gesture by the Japanese calls for a reciprocal effort by the United States. Can the United States not treat the \$1.3 million Japanese grant as partial satisfaction of the Japanese war claim debt and thereby release an equal amount of the United States funds allocated to pay war claims? This is the only just route for the United States to take in order to remedy this long-standing injustice. How long must the people of Palau wait for what is rightfully theirs? Our cries for compensation for the loss of life and property are apparently of no concern to our guardian Administering Authority.

As this Council is aware, in November 1980 representatives from the United States and the President of the Republic of Palau initialled a draft Compact of Free Association. Leaving aside for the moment the numerous practical and moral defects of the Compact, it was with dismay and disgust that the people of Palau recently learned that the United States Government intended to treat the Compact not as an international treaty subject to ratification by its Senate, but as a public law enacted by the whole United States Congress.

The United States cannot understand our objections to this arrangement. Why should a mere matter of form, they say, be objectionable? It is objectionable because the Republic of Palau is not and does not wish to be treated as the domestic property of the United States to be governed by its laws.

(Mr. Uludong)

While technically we are considered by the world to this date as a Trusteeship Territory, we consider ourselves to be a sovereign people charged with preserving our own proud heritage and determining our own destiny as stated in our Constitution. We regard and respect the United States as a sovereign nation and we deserve and demand the same from it in return. Any failure of the United States in this regard would be unconscionable and intolerable to our sense of dignity. We can no longer be treated as wards of a colonial Power. We demand equal treatment as a sovereign and demand that the Compact, if approved by our people, be in the form of an international treaty entered into by equals. The Palau National Congress officially adopted this position in Senate Joint Resolution No. 103.

Moreover, this matter is one of substance as well as form. As a public law, the Compact would be subject to change at the whim of the United States Government without the stigma and international opprobrium which attaches to the breach of treaty obligations. The people of Palau desire and deserve the protection of an international treaty. Past experience under the Trusteeship Agreement clearly shows that in the absence of a solemn arrangement such as a treaty there is every reason to believe that the United States will fail to live up to its obligations.

Not only the form of the Compact but also its content are objectionable to the Palauan people. Indeed, I am personally convinced from many, many discussions with the Palauan electorate in village after village that the Compact will be rejected overwhelmingly in a plebiscite unless certain changes are made.

Our Constitution, twice ratified over the objections of the United States, prohibits the presence in Palau's territory of nuclear, chemical or biological substances intended for use in warfare. This provision was made a part of our Constitution by deliberate design. We are all too aware of the suffering and devastation brought upon us by war. The Second World War, a conflict in which we had no interest and in which we did not desire to participate, ravaged our country and resulted in the deaths of a significant number of our people. We do not wish again to become a pawn in the military games of super-Powers.

(Mr. Uludong)

The United States, however, refuses to accept or respect this conscious decision by our people. It insists upon a Compact which allows it to transship or store nuclear, chemical and biological weapons on our soil. And, while it purports to be negotiating the Compact in good faith, the United States dangles over our heads the Damoclean swords of the termination or reduction of its annual grants to us and the use of its veto power in the Security Council.

A second objectionable portion of the Compact deals with land use rights of the United States military in Palau. Land in our society is a sacred and valuable trust, yet the United States refuses to treat it as such. The compensation for land use and impact fees contained in the Compact are inadequate to the point of insult. Our land is a vital resource for subsistence for the vast majority of our people, yet the United States wishes us to give up over one third of our total land area for a relative pittance. We will not and we cannot do so. Both of these objections were adopted as the official policy of the Palau National Congress in Senate Joint Resolution No. 91.

(Mr. Uludong)

As other speakers have stated before me, the performance of the United States in its 35 years as Administering Authority under the Trusteeship Agreement has been seriously deficient, and there is no guarantee, despite the pressure of world opinion, that it will not follow the same course of conduct under the Compact of Free Association. This has led many Palauans, including myself, to conclude that our most viable option may be to reject the Compact and declare ourselves a fully independent nation at the earliest possible date.

I do not make this statement lightly. Independence is a heavy responsibility. It will mean many years of sacrifice for our people, who will have to shoulder the responsibility of creating an economically self-sufficient nation - something the United States has not attempted to do over the past 35 years. But such a step is now required.

I ask the Council to review my country's progress over the past years and the actions of the Administering Authority. First, the United States created a welfare State and false economic prosperity by creating Government jobs where no work existed. When partial internal government was granted us last year, the first action of the United States was to cut our budget and tell us that over-employment in the Government was our problem and that we could expect no assistance from it. Nevertheless, its High Commissioner retains and exercises the right to suspend laws dealing with our internal problems because they are inconsistent with United States public laws and orders issued by the Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior. In other words, the United States relinquishes the obligation to support but retains the authority to command the governance of the people of Palau. This schizophrenic attitude of giving with one hand and then taking away with the other on the part of the Administering Authority has led to chaos and unrest in our country. Yet the problem is ours, they say, not theirs.

(Mr. Uludong)

A further example of this administrative schizophrenia can be seen in the imperious summons to Washington last month by the Department of the Interior of our highest ranking leaders, including our President. After giving our Government employees a raise to just over half of the minimum wage in the United States, those leaders were immediately cabled to come to Washington to justify their actions and to be told again that our present economic plight is our problem. In reality, we have inherited this plight from 35 years of do-nothing economics. We must have appropriate assistance if we are to reverse this dismal economic situation and improve the morale of our people.

The difference between the treatment received by my friends and brothers in the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands and that received by our Republic clearly illustrates the goals of the United States. When the Commonwealth faces an anticipated \$6 million deficit the United States barely blinks an eye. When Palau faces a \$2 million deficit we are visited by the High Commissioner and told to lay off employees. When the Commonwealth enacts a minimum wage of \$2.15 per hour there are no repercussions. Yet, when Palau enacts a \$1.90 minimum wage our leaders are called to Washington and given lectures on fiscal responsibility. I mean no disrespect towards the inhabitants of the Northern Marianas Islands. In the exercise of self-determination they chose to have close ties with the United States. That is their inherent and undeniable right.

Nevertheless, the lesson to be learned from the different treatment received by the Commonwealth and by Palau is that dependence and close ties with the United States will be rewarded; attempts at independence and a failure to submit will not be tolerated.

Not only are our attempts at self-government frustrated at every turn, but we are deliberately insulted because of them. When our leaders were called to Washington last month our President and other ranking leaders requested

(Mr. Uludong)

a meeting with the President of the United States. We were told not only that we could not see the President, but that the Vice-President and the Secretary of the Interior also would not meet with us. Yet, while our request was denied, the request by 24 businessmen from Guam to meet with the Vice-President was granted. This insult and others are not forgotten, and their significance is not lost on us.

Far from achieving its goal, the concerted attempts of the United States to drive my country into a dependent political relationship have only convinced me and other Palauans that the only way we can achieve our full potential and realize our destiny is to obtain full independence as soon as possible. I and others like me would rather be free and poor than be rich beggars who are dependent on the whims of a colonial master and must march to Washington to plead for money year after year.

At one point in time Americans felt the same way towards their former colonial masters, who treated them in a manner similar to that in which they now treat us. Over time, however, their Government has forgotten the need for people to have dignity, self-respect and the opportunity to dream and to aspire to the goals of freedom and independence. But we have not forgotten. Our determination will not be suffocated. And it will be with great pride that the people of the Republic of Palau once and for all reject and throw off the chains of our paternalistic overseers and enter the world community as the proud, independent and sovereign people we once were.

I thank the Council for allowing me this opportunity to speak and request the Council's sympathetic and fraternal support in the future struggles of my people. We respect this Organization and the goals for which it stands. We regret only that its intent in creating the Trusteeship System has in the case of the Republic of Palau been frustrated by the self-interest of one of the trustees. We hope this problem will be resolved and the integrity of this institution salvaged.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I call on Mr. Ismael John, who will make a statement on behalf of the Council and people of Enewetak.

Mr. JOHN: Mr. President, thank you for giving me this opportunity to present this statement on behalf of the Council and the people of Enewetak to the United Nations Trusteeship Council.

My name is Ismael John. I represent Enewetak in the Marshall Islands Senate and I have the honour of presenting this petition.

In 1947, as the people of Enewetak were still recovering from the ravages of war on the islands which had been our whole world from time immemorial, we were summarily uprooted and transported to a rocky, desolate island far over the horizon. We could not object. We suffered but we did survive.

Our tragedy enabled the United States to emerge as an undisputed and pre-eminent world Power. In recent years we forged a unique partnership with the United States, which resulted in a substantial clean-up and rehabilitation of many of our islands. We have now resettled some of our islands.

The legacy of destruction and contamination was not, however, fully resolved and reversed, nor could it be. Some of our islands were vapourized, and now the Pacific Ocean is a little larger. Another island on our atoll is uninhabitable for ever. Our forced removal to Ujulang, an alien environment where we often went hungry, denied us the opportunity to obtain adequate education and deprived us of the means to follow our self-sufficient way of life.

(Mr. John)

The United States Government has claimed the right to use our islands for its nation's purposes. It must also assume the obligation to alleviate and correct the problems which are attributable to its nuclear testing programme.

The United States announced that it would negotiate and settle these claims by means of a subsidiary agreement to the Compact of Free Association between itself and the Republic of the Marshall Islands. Meetings were held for this purpose in Majuro last month. At the invitation of the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and at the cost of substantial effort, time and expense, Enewetak sent representatives to those talks.

As it turned out, the talks in Majuro were not productive and we broke off negotiations. We left Majuro with the intention of coming here to ask the Trusteeship Council to exert its best efforts to obtain a commitment from the United States that it would negotiate seriously the agreement called for by section 177 of the Compact.

Instead I am able to report today that the United States and the Republic of the Marshall Islands, working with Enewetak and Bikini, seem to be close to agreement on the substance of a plan to settle the nuclear claims. Under its basic terms with respect to Enewetak, the United States will withdraw its various ongoing programmes of support, replacing them with funds to be administered locally. In addition, a separate amount of money has been offered to meet the claims for the use and destruction of the atoll by the United States for its nuclear testing programme.

The offer leaves much to be desired, because for one thing no fund is provided for the resettlement of Engebi, despite the commitment made by the United States less than two years ago to establish a fund of \$6 million to \$10 million for that purpose. Nevertheless, the offer has provided a basis on which to settle the property claims and avoid litigation and on which ratification of the Compact may be secured.

Those of us here from Enewetak are going back to Enewetak after the meetings here and in Washington next week to explain the offer to the Council and the people. We will inform the Council of their decision. For now, I simply want to report on the status of the negotiations and Enewetak's role in them.

(Mr. John)

I also want to make a brief comment on the status of the petition we presented to this Council last year. At that session, the Council of Enewetak sought the establishment of a special trusteeship pursuant to which the United States would continue to administer Enewetak subject to oversight by this body. The Council of Enewetak continues to believe that this course would best ensure that its needs arising out of the nuclear testing programme will be met. If that view is shared by this body or the United States however, neither has made an effort to communicate that support to the Council. For this reason and others, including our decision to give all concerned an opportunity to conclude the section 177 agreement and to ratify the Compact of Free Association, we have decided to ask you to hold our petition for a separate trusteeship in abeyance until the outcome of the Compact is known. Should the Compact not be ratified, or if Enewetak's claims arising out of the nuclear testing programme are not satisfactorily discharged, we will return to this Council with a renewed request that separate trusteeship be established.

At this point, I would like to introduce David O'Neal, the chief councilman of Enewetak; David Anderson, the legal representative of the Council, and Mac Kaminaga, our translator. If members have any questions we shall be glad to answer them.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): As announced this morning, I shall now call on those Council members who wish to put questions to any of the petitioners present in the chamber who have spoken today.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I wish to thank the petitioners who have spoken here today on behalf of the Micronesian people and made a most important contribution to the work of the present session of the Trusteeship Council. In this connexion I wish to ask the Secretariat, through you, Mr. President, to do everything possible to expedite the distribution of those statements, since they are very important and require detailed study and consideration by members of the Council.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

I have a question relating to the statement made today by Mr. Uludong. He referred to a number of resolutions which had been adopted in the Senate of Palau, if I understood correctly. I have a question to put to the Secretariat of the Council through you, Mr. President, and if the answer is in the negative then I shall have a question to ask Mr. Uludong. The question is, does the Trusteeship Council have available to it those resolutions to which he referred? We feel that they are very important. They reflect the views of the Micronesian people: they reflect and express the views of the people of Palau in this particular case. If they are not available to the Council, could I request Mr. Uludong to provide us with those resolutions and other resolutions which, as I understand it, might help us in the work of this session.

I should like to reserve my right to ask questions of the petitioners. Once again I would stress they have made very important statements today, which require a responsible attitude and very careful consideration by the members of the Council. We should therefore like to have some time to study the statements.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The representative of the Soviet Union has asked several questions, and before asking the Secretariat to reply I shall reply to his first question, in connexion with the statements made today by petitioners. The Secretariat informs me that those statements will be fully reflected in the verbatim record.

Before calling upon the Secretary of the Council, I would say in reply to his third question that it goes without saying that all members of the Council may ask questions whenever they wish of the petitioners or the representatives of the Administering Authority, but I would ask the representative of the Soviet Union, if he wishes to ask questions of certain individual petitioners, to let the Secretariat know, because petitioners who spoke this morning have been good enough to come back this afternoon in case they should be asked questions. But as you know, some of them have to return to the Territory, and it would therefore be useful to have some kind of time-table for the questions you wish to ask them, so that they can know approximately when they will have to answer them. It would have to be fairly soon.

I will ask Mr. Abebe to reply to the question on the resolutions of the Senate in Palau.

Mr. ABEBE (Secretary of the Council): We have received in the Secretariat three communications from the Palau Legislature, which have been published in documents T/COM.10/L.306, L.308 and L.309. They were made available to the members of the Council immediately on receipt. I will check further with Senator Moses Uludong regarding other communications and then inform the Council accordingly.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Is that reply satisfactory to the representative of the Soviet Union?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Apart from my question, Mr. President, you asked me a question, which I feel I should answer. You asked me when we would be ready to put questions to the petitioners or the Administering Authority. I take it that those questions would be answered not only by the petitioners but also by the Administering Authority. We have a series of questions to both, and we shall be ready in the very near future to ask those questions of the Administering Authority and possibly of the petitioners. I repeat, the statements made today are very important, and in order to give them due consideration we would need some time.

Regarding your statement, Mr. President, that petitioners' statements made today will be duly and sufficiently reflected in the records of the meeting of the Council, we are aware of this system and in this particular respect I said that we would like to have the records of this meeting as soon as possible. That was my first question.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Secretariat assures me that it will do everything in its power to get the records out as speedily as possible.

Does any other delegation wish to put questions to the petitioners who have spoken either this morning or earlier this afternoon?

Mr. BARELLI (France) (interpretation from French): At this stage in our work, my delegation would simply take note of the statements, in many cases important statements, made by the petitioners, which have helped to clarify a certain number of issues for the participants in this meeting.

My delegation notes that the statements will be reproduced in the verbatim record and intends to study the record carefully before putting specific questions to petitioners or representatives of the Administering Authority.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I have been informed that Mr. Moses Uludong will very shortly have new documents, which will, of course, be submitted to the Trusteeship Council secretariat and, as in the case of documents T/COM.10/L.306, L.308 and L.309, those documents will shortly be distributed to members of the Trusteeship Council.

Mr. HUMFREY (United Kingdom): I should like at this stage simply to thank the petitioners for the very careful, serious way in which they have presented their particular concerns today. We have listened attentively, and we shall look forward to studying the various points they have made with a view to seeing whether there are any questions we can usefully put to them at a later stage.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I see that delegations would prefer to wait until they have the documents, which I am sure will be distributed in the languages of the Council, before they put questions to the petitioners. If I hear no comments I shall take it that we may move on to the second stage of our work, which is the putting of questions to the representatives of the Administering Authority. Does any member wish to speak in this connexion?

Mr. HUMFREY (United Kingdom): I should like first to thank the representatives of the Administering Authority for the very clear and helpful statements they have made to us. I would also thank the representatives of the four Administrations for their interesting and useful accounts of the work they are now engaged in.

I should like to begin by putting questions relating to the four individual Administrations, and then ask general questions affecting the Trust Territory as a whole. In these questions I shall be addressing myself to the Administering Authority.

May I begin by saying that we were delighted to hear in the statement of the Honourable Asterio Takesy of the considerable progress which is being made by the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia in managing its own affairs. The growth in Federated States' contacts with regional and international organizations will, we are sure, prove of considerable value. At the same time we have taken careful note of that Government's concern about the need to ensure international respect for its jurisdiction over its marine resources, in particular as regards the fishing of its waters by unlicensed boats. I should be grateful therefore to know what steps the Administering Authority has been able to take to uphold the rights of the Federated States of Micronesia in this area.

(Mr. Humfrey, United Kingdom)

I have a second question relating to the Federated States. We note that the Government there sees a critical need for a comprehensive maintenance programme, and in particular a need for considerable technical and training assistance for local personnel. We should be grateful to know what steps the Administering Authority is taking to assist in this area and what consideration has been given to possible assistance from United Nations organizations.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): With respect to the United States position concerning the marine resources of Micronesia, I shall make a brief statement and then ask my colleague High Commissioner McCoy to speak further to this matter as well as to the point on technical training for a maintenance programme.

Basically, the United States recognizes that the peoples of Micronesia should be the beneficiaries of the resources of the surrounding ocean, and we have been working with them to ensure that this will be the case. We have co-operated with the legislatures of Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia as they have developed legislation creating fisheries management zones. We are pleased that they have enacted such legislation and we are doing our best to assist in the implementation of this legislation.

I would ask my colleague the representative of the Federated States of Micronesia, Mr. Takesy, if he would like to comment following Mrs. McCoy's response.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): In connexion with the question on training in the Federated States of Micronesia - not only in the Federated States of Micronesia, although particularly in connexion with them - we have a trade school going, which is called MTAP. It is a programme that is carried out in connexion with the Navy - the Micronesia Training Apprentice Programme. It is now in its fourth year, and this year our first group will graduate. This programme is purely for the training of young people and of people from the various Governments in maintenance work - for instance, at the moment in connexion with the year-long project of upgrading and overhauling all the generation of power within the whole Trust Territory. At the moment

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

we have six of the students from that school, the MTAP, working on Truk in the overhauling programme, so they are really getting what we call a "hands-on" type of training. Those six are working on the overhauling of that particular power generator; they will be able to go back and graduate with the class and then fan out through Micronesia. There are people in MTAP from all four Governments of the Federated States of Micronesia. We have also worked closely with them in the training of people on high-voltage-type equipment. As power is one of the biggest problems, we think this is an extremely important activity.

We are grateful to the many United Nations committees that have helped in very solid maintenance-type training. We are stepping it up: we do know that it is one of the most important activities, and we are doing the best job we can.

Mr. TAKESY (Special Representative): I should like to supplement the answer given by the Administering Authority, first on the point about the management of our marine resources.

We are grateful to the Administering Authority for helping us arrive at legislation that has given us management and protection of our extended marine resources law. As we pointed out in our earlier statement, we are experiencing some difficulty in the surveillance area, and we hope that this body and the Administering Authority will take that under consideration and give us the assistance we need. In this connexion we should like to emphasize our request to this body for our signatory right regarding the Law of the Sea Treaty. As we have pointed out, only thus can we hope to achieve a measurable degree of self-government and economic self-sufficiency.

With regard to the question of technical training and maintenance for our Government, we have on our own done something to alleviate the problem. We have invited various organs of the United Nations and other international organizations, particularly in the South Pacific, in the technical areas. However, we also want to point out that, as Mrs. McCoy has said, the Administering Authority is fostering some training on Guam; but that will not do everything needed to establish a maintenance programme that would be able to take care of the major portion of our capital improvement projects in the future. Through the United States Congress we are requesting the establishment of a financial management programme for us and a maintenance programme for the Capital Improvement Programme (CIP). Our own funds have been dedicated to providing scholarships and partial grants to our students who are now in various schools in the United States, in the South Pacific and in South East Asia, in the various fields of marine resources, mechanics, computer programming, construction and related fields, so that we should be able to put them to use in our maintenance programme.

Mr. HUMFREY (United Kingdom): If it is convenient to the Council, I will continue with my questions relating to the other administrations. Let me begin by thanking Ambassador Sherman, Mrs. McCoy and Mr. Takesy for those replies. We look forward to continued co-operation between the Administering Authority and the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia in these two areas of concern to the Federated States.

I should like now to turn to a question concerning the Republic of Palau, which again I should like to address to the Administering Authority. I would begin by saying that my delegation listened with interest and pleasure to the statement by Mr. Oiterong, the Vice-President of the Republic of Palau. We welcome the efforts his Government is making to manage Palau's affairs, including that of developing its relations with its Asian and Pacific neighbours. We are also glad to hear of the advances that are being made in such important areas as power generation and telecommunications. We are sorry, however, to learn of the problems it is facing over the financing of its newly acquired governmental responsibilities. We should like, in this context, to ask the Administering Authority what it can do to help the people and Government of Palau overcome these financial problems and whether there is scope for improving the relevant budgetary procedures.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): With regard to the problem of Palau, I should start by saying that one of the charges of the Trust Territory Government is to turn over as much as we can to the Government, and of course fiscal management certainly is one of the leading parts of that. This we have done. We have tried to encourage fiscal responsibility and good management in all the Governments. At the start of this year we all went on a cash quarterly basis. We are on a fixed budget. The whole Department is, the whole Territory is, and each of the Governments is. We went on a cash quarterly basis with the idea that this would be the best possible way for everyone to get a really good hold on the budgets and the budget problems. It became apparent that with this type of foresight and foreplanning one could begin to see if one was headed in the right direction. At that point each of the Governments had to set its own priorities as to what it was going to spend its money on while still staying within the quarterly cash basis. This is an option entirely up to the Governments. If they put in a pay raise or something that runs them over their budget, it is the choice of that Government concerned to so reconstruct its budget and the use of its funds to take care of that. I believe the current figures show that something like 83 per cent of Palau's budget is in personnel, and I think that is one of the problems. We stand ready to try to help in every way we can. We are, as I say, on a strictly fixed budget. If we can help with technical assistance, if we may be of any help in any other way, we are ready and able, if requested, to do so.

Mr. OITERONG (Special Representative): As I mentioned in my statement, this is a real problem for us. The financial problem is really something for which we have to seek a solution. Therefore we turn to the Administration for assistance because the Government of Palau, as I have said, inherited a system whereby the Government itself is a main source for the economy at this time, because the private sector is not developed to the point where everyone is employed. The people look to the Government for employment in order to support their families. When the present unfortunate situation came about,

(Mr. Oiterong, Special
Representative)

as I mentioned also in my statement, we tried our best to discuss the matter with the government employees and we found that it was not possible to deny them, but we asked them to reduce their demands in order to avoid unnecessary problems like destruction of property and suffering among the people of Palau. So, as I said, we turned to the Administration for assistance, and we even made a request to the United States Congress for assistance. If these requests are not met, we shall have to take some action and perhaps reduce the programmes. Even some necessary programmes may have to be reduced in order to balance the budget, or we may have to cut down the working hours of the people, which may not be a very good approach for people in need of salaries to meet their daily needs. This is a real problem we are facing. We still wish to have further discussions with the Administering Authority concerning how it can help in other ways.

Mr. HUMFREY (United Kingdom): I am grateful for those replies, which I think have at least served to clarify the underlying position for my delegation. I am sure the Administering Authority and the Government of Palau will be continuing a dialogue on this important question.

I turn now to the affairs of the Marshall Islands. We listened with great interest to the opening statement by Mr. DeBrum, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Government of the Marshall Islands, and noted with pleasure his acknowledgement of the accomplishments of the Administering Authority in those islands. We do not wish at this stage to address ourselves to the constitutional questions raised in Mr. DeBrum's statement. We should like instead to ask about the question of a long-term health programme for those affected by nuclear testing, a programme which has been under discussion between the Government of the United States and the Marshall Islands. Mr. Ismael John, of Enewetak, referred to this matter in his petition earlier today. What view has the Administering Authority taken of the Trusteeship Council's suggestion last year that a sample survey might be conducted among the people of the Marshall Islands? What points remain to be resolved in the discussions between the two Governments, and what progress has been made so far in those discussions?

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): Again, I shall comment briefly and then ask Mrs. McCoy to supplement what I have said.

On 7 January 1981 the United States Secretary of the Interior presented to the United States Congress a draft preliminary report on a health programme for the Marshall Islands, as called for in section 102 of Public Law 96-205. That report, which presented alternate preliminary draft proposals, noted that the matter required clarification before further preliminary work could be done on developing a specific health plan.

As the Council will be aware, there is considerable dispute among the interested parties as to the islands and atolls covered by the statute. The Department of the Interior accordingly drafted amending legislation and submitted it to the Office of Management and Budget for submission to the Congress. That draft legislation is currently under review in the Executive Branch of the United States Government.

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

The ongoing political status negotiations with the Marshalls also encompass discussions on an adequate and suitable health care programme, as envisaged by section 102 of Public Law 96-205.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): I shall refer to Mr. Teare on the status negotiations.

Mr. TEARE (United States of America): I would simply elaborate the last part of Ambassador Sherman's statement by making clear that the political status negotiations - particularly the negotiations for an agreement subsidiary to section 177 of the Compact of Free Association, which is intended to take care of all residual aspects of the nuclear testing programme in the Northern Marshall Islands - would, if concluded on the terms presently contemplated, encompass a medical care programme substantially larger and more comprehensive than that intended in the legislation to which Ambassador Sherman referred.

Mr. HUMFREY (United Kingdom): I am grateful for that reply.

I should now like to turn to the affairs of the Northern Mariana Islands. We have noted in the statements made by Governor Pedro Tenorio and Senate President Olympio Borja of those islands their Government's continuing serious concern over the question of the possible dumping of nuclear waste in the Pacific Ocean. In this context we should like to know whether the Administering Authority has entered into any dialogue with the Government of Japan on this important matter.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): Some time ago the Japanese Government announced plans to dump on an experimental basis certain low-level radioactive materials at a site about 350 miles north-east of the Ogasawara Islands, which belong to Japan - an area roughly equidistant, 560 miles, between the Northern Marianas and Tokyo - some time in 1982. According to

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

the Japanese, the proposed action would test the effects of the disposal of low-level nuclear wastes on the marine environment and the feasibility of future dumping.

The proposed site is part of the high seas, as defined by international law and by the law of the sea treaty. Japan is a party to the London Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution, concerning the dumping of wastes and other matters, known as the London Dumping Convention, and intends to become a party to the consultations and surveillance mechanism of the Nuclear Energy Agency, which monitors ocean disposal activities in accordance with international standards. So long as Japan abides by those international standards, the United States has no basis on which to oppose the test dumping.

The United States for its part does not intend to dispose of nuclear wastes in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands or in the waters adjacent to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The United States is also a party to the London Dumping Convention and participates in the consultation and surveillance mechanism of the Nuclear Energy Agency. Both the treaty and the mechanism establish international standards that govern the disposal of low-level nuclear wastes in the oceans. The United States position is that those international standards should govern the dumping of all nuclear wastes in the oceans.

Mr. HUMFREY (United Kingdom): I thank Ambassador Sherman for that very clear reply and in particular for his assurances about the United States' own policy in this matter.

I turn now to some more general questions covering the Trust Territory as a whole. In its conclusions and recommendations last year the Trusteeship Council considered that at this crucial stage in the Trust Territory's political and economic development, economic assistance should be maintained at least at its present level to enable the people of the Trust Territory to achieve a certain measure of economic independence. In its report, the Administering Authority has stated that economic assistance is continuing "at a substantial level." Mrs. Janet McCoy, the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory, said in her speech on Monday that

(Mr. Humfrey, United Kingdom)

"During the last several years the United States Government has averaged an annual appropriation of over \$150 million, including federal programmes." (T/PV.1523, p. 26)

We welcome this generous assistance from the Administering Authority. At the same time, we should be grateful to know from them the total of economic assistance from all United States Government sources planned for 1982 and the corresponding figures for 1981 and 1980, if those are available.

Mrs. McCoy (Special Representative): In 1981 our total Trust Territory budget ran to \$94,522,000. I do not have the figure for 1980, but I can obtain it and provide it to the British delegation. In 1982 our budget totalled \$76,157,000. The budget for 1983 is still being negotiated, but it should be very close to that figure.

Mr. HUMFREY (United Kingdom): I am grateful to Mrs. McCoy for her answer setting out figures.

May I ask whether the figures she has just given relate to total contributions from United States Government sources or just to the particular budget as a whole?

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): Those are the total figures. I have them broken down and can give them to the representative of the United Kingdom by government or by line item, if he wishes.

Mr. HUMFREY (United Kingdom): That is fine, thank you.

I should like to put a further general question to the representatives of the Administering Authority. What action has it taken on the recommendation which was made by the Trusteeship Council during its last session that an analysis of the effects of trusteeship should be undertaken to allow the preparation of future programmes in the social and cultural fields? Has the Administering Authority discussed the possible value of such a study with Micronesian representatives?

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): . We are certainly very much in favour of such a study, but in this period of demands on the finances of the Trust Territory we are unable to fund such a specific and possibly very expensive undertaking. On the other hand, if our archives project is successful - and we certainly hope that it will be for it is well under way now - the materials made available covering the full range of subjects and the years of the trusteeship as well as previous administrations will be available to any scholar wishing to make such a study at some time in the future.

Mr. HUMFREY (United Kingdom): My final question this afternoon concerns provisions for the future educational requirements of the peoples of Micronesia, with particular respect to the need for training and higher education courses which are unlikely - at least in the near future - to be available within Micronesia.

(Mr. Humfrey, United Kingdom)

In her very interesting statement, in which she compared the progress which had been made during the period of trusteeship to date, the High Commissioner said that the scholarship programmes had already contributed to the higher education of thousands of Micronesians. It would be interesting, I think, to have some more information on the priorities accorded to scholarships for different types of overseas studies. We should be interested also to know what efforts are being made to encourage recipients of scholarships to return to Micronesia and use their training, skills and knowledge for the benefit of their communities, which, I am sure, we should all like to see.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): I think this question might be addressed in the first instance by the representatives of the various Micronesian entities who are with us today. I regret that the representatives of the Marshalls are not here now, since they are pursuing negotiations in Washington. In any case, if Governor Tenorio, Mr. Oiterong and Mr. Takesy would comment, I think that would be most useful.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Special Representatives may address the question in turn, if they so wish.

Mr. TENORIO (Special Representative): With regard to the Northern Marianas, they have established a scholarship board, which is responsible for foreseeing the requirement and need of our islands. Personally, I would say that our major needs are for doctors, medical and paramedical personnel and teachers and in the areas of business, marketing, farming agriculture and fishery.

We have also made available through our local resources money for students wishing to attend courses outside the Commonwealth.

Those are the areas of our priorities.

Mr. OITERONG (Special Representative): Some years ago in Palau there used to be a so-called Trust Territory scholarship, whose funding was appropriated under the Trust Territory budget. That is not the case today. Our Legislature has for the past several years appropriated a certain amount each year for scholarships. We discovered that, with so many students from Palau in schools abroad, we would need to provide more financial assistance. So, instead of giving a full scholarship to an individual student we devised a system whereby a fixed sum appropriated by the Legislature could accommodate most of the students in schools abroad needing more financial assistance. So we really do not have full-time scholarships at this time. We stress the areas of business and agriculture - more in the field of vocational education. However, finding that some of the students not measuring up even in these areas still needed some assistance, we tried to accommodate some of them. We are facing a small problem at this time with regard to returning students. There will be a time when we shall not be able to accommodate all of them by offering them jobs. So we foresee a situation in which the students coming back will not find a sufficient number of jobs available to them.

Mr. TAKESY (Special Representative): First of all, with respect to technical training, as we stated, we have asked the Administering Authority to continue the programme on Guam.

With regard to our local revenues from the Congress of the Federated States, for the past two years some \$200,000 has been appropriated each year for partial scholarship grants for our students now studying abroad in undergraduate and graduate training. We have given priority to certain areas of development and other professions, consisting of business, agriculture, engineering, computer programming, law, medicine, machinery and mechanics.

(Mr. Takesy, Special Representative)

The various legislatures of the Federated States, Truk, Yap, Ponape and Kosrae, each have their own scholarship programmes. They too have priorities that they assign to the various fields and they award scholarships and grants based on those criteria and on need.

I should like also to point out that at this point our students are benefiting very greatly from United States Federal Assistance, here in the United States and also at the Community College of Micronesia, through the BEOG and the SEOG.

Mrs. McCoy (Special Representative): I should like to add just a few words to express deep thanks to the United Nations for all the splendid help it has given us over the years. So many people throughout the Trust Territory and throughout all the Governments have benefited greatly from the generosity of the United Nations and from its various programmes - on health, on census-taking, and on all kinds of things. It is a practically unlimited source of different courses of which our people can take advantage, and I feel I must express my thanks and the thanks of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for all the help the United Nations has given us.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I am quite sure that Mr. Rifai will not fail to convey to the various members of the Secretariat your words of commendation.

Mr. HUMFREY (United Kingdom): My delegation has no further questions which it wishes to put this evening, but may I just say that I am most grateful for the helpful replies which we have received giving further details about the situation in the Trust Territory. This is, of course, most useful for the work of the Council.

Mr. BARELLI (France) (interpretation from French): I have listened with great interest to the various statements made by the representatives of the Administering Authority and the various entities and by petitioners today. My delegation has also noted the report on the Trusteeship Territory and I can say that, personally, I have learned a lot. I should like to ask several questions to clear up certain points on which I am somewhat in the dark. My first questions concern budgetary matters.

Several representatives of entities reported budgetary constraints imposed this year by the Administering Authority. It was my understanding, based on what they said, that they felt that the situation had deteriorated somewhat in the current financial year. My delegation would appreciate clarification on this score and in particular I should like to know what changes have taken place since last year in connexion with the distribution of income and expenditure between on the one hand the budget of the Trusteeship Territory and on the other the budgets of the various entities and the distribution between the Territory's budget and the budgets of the various entities. It appears, to judge by statements we heard yesterday and the day before, that this distribution is giving rise to certain problems.

In particular, I should like to know what budgetary arrangements have been made as regards the budget of each entity to compensate for new costs stemming from the transfer of responsibilities.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): I should point out to begin with that the programme priorities were determined by each constitutional Government within a total Government spending ceiling. Programme and funding adjustments were made by each Government to accommodate changes in the ceiling. This is in connexion with our turning over more and more responsibility, to them and in fact they handle all their own budgets now.

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

A total of \$7.4 million was provided in 1980-1981 to the constitutional Governments to cover expenses incurred during the transition period. While major reductions and consolidations are being made in the United States federal programmes, the effect on the programmes in which the Trust Territory is participating is relatively small. In fact, the levels of certain key programmes in health and education have continued to increase. The Governments will continue to be consulted in the development of budget formats and procedures, and will be given broad flexibility in designing and implementing their internal budget processes.

It might help to know that, for instance, the federal programme figure in 1981 was \$23,343,000. In 1982 that went up to \$25,551,000. In operations, which includes the headquarters operation, in 1981 the figure was \$55,413,000 and in 1982 it was \$59,692,000, which would help to reflect the increased costs.

If the Council would prefer this broken down even further, I have the figures available here. However, I think that gives a fairly rounded expression of how the budget has kept pace with increased costs. Would you care to have me continue?

Mr. BARELLI (France) (interpretation from French): I thank Mrs. McCoy for the very interesting information which she has just given to my delegation. As she has suggested, I would appreciate receiving later some more specific figures with a budget breakdown for each of the Governments. But the answer that she has given today is an interesting one.

I have a question for the representative of the Palau Islands about the strike of civil servants and events on 8 September 1981. Mr. Oiterong told the Council that the strikers were calling for a 100 per cent increase in their salaries and that they received 50 per cent, if I understood correctly. I should like to know what the annual inflation rate in the Palau Islands is in order to establish a comparison between the increase in salaries and the increase in the cost of living.

Mr. OITERONG (Special Representative): We do not have exact data as to what the inflation rate is, but we are certain that it is much higher than in certain parts of the United States, if we are comparing the island of Palau with the United States.

Mr. BARELLI (France) (interpretation from French): In the absence of precise figures relating to the inflation rate, I would like Mr. Oiterong to give us some information on the social problems arising in the Palau archipelago; in particular I should like him to give us some details about the claims of the strikers in 1981 and about the present situation. In particular, I should like to know whether the salary increases granted were considered satisfactory by those concerned and thus, whether the present situation might be considered as being settled.

Mr. OITERONG (Special Representative): In Palau we really do have social and economic problems. As I mentioned in my statement a few minutes ago, Palauans in government service are regarded as having work which makes them feel secure in supporting their families. We felt, while negotiating with the disgruntled government employees, that their demand for a 100 per cent salary rise was something which was not possible, because of budgetary constraints.

We negotiated further to the point where the Government employees agreed on what was known as a cost-of-living allowance. That was the agreement which we finally made, not to accept the claim for an increase of 100 per cent, but to concede a cost-of-living allowance, because we felt that otherwise we would not have been able to maintain peace and order in the community. We felt that this was a matter between Government employees and the Government which we could work out and settle by reaching agreement.

(Mr. Oiterong, Special Representative)

As I said, we have lacked security since we became a constitutional Government. We are only a little over one year old. We were not equipped to deal with a security breakdown and we were very much concerned over further possibilities of pointless destruction of property. That is why we finally conceded a half-way agreement together with the cost-of-living allowance. We will have to reach the \$1.95 minimum rate.

With your indulgence, Mr. President, we should like to prepare a further detailed statement to the Council, if you wish us to do so.

Mr. BARELLI (France) (interpretation from French): First of all I should like to thank Mr. Oiterong for the information which he has given us.

My next question relates to the problem of communications, which has been mentioned by several speakers today. I should like to know what programmes are now in use and what are the major projects relating to maritime transport, particularly as regards the question raised concerning the Micronesia Inter-Ocean Line. I should also like to know about the building of airports and roads. This question is, I believe, addressed chiefly to the representative of the Administering Authority, but possibly also to the representatives of the various Governments and entities.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): The Administering Authority intends to upgrade portions of the existing telecommunications system, that is, local telephone and outer-island radio to the operating standards for which it was designed. In this regard, all outer-island radios will be replaced with solid-state modular radios operating from solar-powered batteries.

Concerning worldwide communications, Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia have signed agreements with the Communications Satellite Corporation (COMSAT) for installation of satellite-earth stations. It is anticipated that construction of these satellite-earth stations will be initiated during the calendar year 1982. The Palau station should be operational by October 1982 and the remaining stations should become operational during the calendar year 1983. Mrs. McCoy may have more to say on this subject as well as on airports and roads.

Mrs. McCoy (United States of America): As far as the communication programme is concerned, we are one of the first to admit that it has not yet reached the standard we should like. It is very much in the budget, it is very much in the works and we have had several meetings on this and are making a special request in connexion with it in our budget hearings.

The agreements have been signed with COMSAT and that has now gone through the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), which has approved them. We expect that the station in Palau will be operational some time this year and that it will then be followed by the installations in the Marshalls and the Federated States of Micronesia.

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

We are making strides in this. We are slow. We are hoping that it will all be in place shortly. We are well aware of what a tremendously important part this plays in all of the Trust Territory Governments.

As far as the rest of the capital improvement programme is concerned, as I said in my opening statement, we now have the airports in pretty good shape. That of Kosrae is coming along nicely, and the Marshalls are to be highly commended for the fact that they have now got so many air strips on their atolls. I had the pleasure of going down to Kili on the occasion of the dedication of that strip, which has become so very important to the people of Bikini who are settled there. The airport in Yap is coming along nicely. The road in Ponape is now complete all the way through the city. The roads in Kosrae, again, are coming along nicely. Many of the hospitals are being renovated. Architectural and engineering design studies are under way for the relocation of the capital and for the College of Micronesia. I could perhaps give the Council more details on the capital improvement programme later in this session, if that would be satisfactory.

Mr. BARELLI (France) (interpretation from French): As regards this question of communications and infrastructure programmes, I have an additional question, without asking the representative of the Administering Authority to go into details. I would just like to know whether there are any medium- or long-term investment plans or programmes as regards the construction of airports, ports and so on. If so, I should like to know how financing was arranged for this work, which could be costly.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): I am not altogether sure that I can come up with the correct answer to the question posed by the representative of the French delegation.

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

I can say that the Trust Territory Administration, in co-operation with the officer in charge of construction and other agencies, has been working on the infrastructure programme. Because it is a multi-year project, some adjustments are inevitable. We anticipate, however, that it will be completed in the near future.

Today, 70 per cent of the projects contemplated a few years ago have been completed, at an approximate value of \$25 million. This includes 18 projects. The remaining projects are in various stages of development or are being rescoped to meet changing local priorities. But all of them should be well under way by the end of 1982, if not sooner.

If that is not a satisfactory answer, I shall try to provide more information.

Mr. BARELLI (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to ask one last question this evening. It is a question relating to the local culture of the populations of the Trust Territory. Several speakers, several petitioners, have expressed their fears concerning the protection of the traditional way of life, of the environment and of the culture of the peoples of the Trust Territory. My delegation would like to know what actions have been taken by the Administering Authority and the various Governments as regards the protection of the authenticity and specific nature of local cultures. We should particularly like specific information concerning the teaching of local languages and cultures in the various entities, and especially what is the position of local languages in education as compared to English.

My delegation would also like to know what action has been taken in the area of public or private financial aid to promote the production of newspapers, books

(Mr. Barelli, France)

or other publications or radio and television broadcasts in the local languages, and, generally, what action has been taken to protect and promote indigenous artistic, literary and cultural works and values.

Mrs. McCoy (Special Representative): With your permission, Mr. President, I would like to refer some of those questions to the Governments, since they have their own radio stations and could give the representative of France more background information on what is being done to protect their own local cultures.

Perhaps I could add a word after they have spoken.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Very well, I will call on those Special Representatives who wish to reply.

Mr. TAKESY (Special Representative): Taking the questions put to us by the French delegation in order, let me say that on the question of the promotion of arts I am happy to report that, for our part, we have attempted to broaden our outlook by participating in such regional exercises as art festivals in the South Pacific, including the one held in Papua New Guinea last year.

Internally, we teach local crafts in our trade schools and in some of our elementary schools in the outlying islands. We have junior high schools that teach local crafts and local methods of doing things.

In the public schools, English is taught along with a local language. That is a requirement. Just last month our Board of Education met in Ponape and received instructions in upgrading curricula and changing them the better to suit the needs in the Federated States.

The Community College of Micronesia is undergoing changes to reflect the changes in our political status and also to foster our cultural values in Micronesia.

Mr. OITERONG (Special Representative): We are very conscious of the need to protect our culture. In Palau we have in the social services a departmental agency called the cultural promotion agency which tries to develop programmes to maintain local culture. Recently there were art festivals in Guam, which some of our people attended, and, as has been mentioned, we participated in the art festival in the South Pacific some years ago.

(Mr. Oiterong, Special Representative)

As far as languages are concerned, we have a very intensive bilingual programme in Palau. We are very fortunate in that the United States Federal Government supports that programme with funds for the development of materials in the local languages and for its dissemination to the various elementary schools.

In neither the private sector nor the public sector have we any established printing programme at this time. We are making every effort to obtain a printing press, which will be used to provide more materials for the various schools throughout Palau.

Mr. TENORIO (Special Representative): In the case of the Marianas, we have two languages: Chamorro and Carolinian. I have personnel on my staff in charge of Carolinian affairs and responsible for protecting the interests of the minority.

In the area of education, from the first to the third grades students are taught in Chamorro; then, from the third grade on, they are taught in English. There are also private parochial schools and other missionary schools.

For the preservation of our culture we have an art council that is trying to put together the culture of the Marianas. Also, because of our two different languages, we have bilingual education, which is funded by the Federal government.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): The federal programme is both bilingual and bicultural; it is a federal regional programme particularly designed to establish orthographic spelling and the use of language in literature. This is true of all of the languages throughout Micronesia. That programme is well under way.

(Mrs. McCoy, Special
Representative)

I should point out also that, as indicated in the annual report, four or five curriculum specialists from each of the six districts of the Territory continue to work during the year at the University of Hawaii's Pacific Area Language Materials Development Centre. Materials in 10 different Micronesian languages, including Chamorro and Carolinian for the Northern Mariana Islands, have been produced for various elementary school grade levels.

I should also point out that it has been my personal experience that all the Governments are doing a fine job in keeping their native music and dancing very much in the forefront and training all the children. I have seen children from the tenderest age on doing the traditional cultural dances, and I heartily applaud that.

Mr. BARELLI (France) (interpretation from French): The answers given by the High Commissioner and the representatives of the various entities fully satisfy my curiosity in this field. I have other questions, but I will reserve them for the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.