

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

T/PV.1630
14 May 1987

ENGLISH

Fifty-fourth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIXTEEN HUNDRED AND THIRTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 14 May 1987 at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. BIRCH (United Kingdom)

- Examination of the annual report of the administering authority for the year ended 30 September 1986: Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued)
- Organization of work

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 DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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.

87-60393 5562V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

EXAMINATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 1986: TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (continued)

The PRESIDENT: We will now proceed with questioning of the representatives of the Administering Authority.

Mr. GAUSSOT (France) (interpretation from French): The report of the Administering Authority on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is a very analytical, precise and detailed document. I do not wish at this stage to get into specific issues; I would merely ask the following general question.

Several petitioners, yesterday and today, mentioned the serious financial difficulties encountered by the archipelago. What, in the Administering Authority's view, is the current state of the Palauan economy and what are the prospects for its development?

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): Since this is clearly a question concerning the internal administration of Palau, I would respectfully request, Mr. President, that you ask the Special Adviser from Palau to answer the question raised by the representative of France.

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Uherbelau, Special Adviser to the Administering Authority, who proposes to answer the question.

Mr. UHERBELAU (Special Adviser): In his opening statement, President Salii said:

"... the private sector stagnates. Foreign investors avoid making commitments to a place that is itself uncommitted." (T/PV.1625, pp. 54-55)

President Salii made his remark in connection with the insufficient funding of Palau. He said that at the moment, under the Trusteeship, our annual budget for

(Mr. Uherbelau, Special Adviser)

1987 is \$10 million, and that it is virtually the same for 1988, while the higher level of funding under the Compact remain untapped. The economy of Palau will continue to depend upon grant assistance from the Administering Authority.

While foreign investors are reluctant to invest in Palau, the Republic, in the period under review, has seen the following developments in the private sector: the new power plant in Aimeliik has been finally put on line. Unfortunately, beginning 1 April of this year, the population centre of Koror was put on power rationing due to insufficient funds to run the government.

Road and water projects have been under way in four or five states, in Babeldaob. In the states of Melekeok and Ngiwal, the roads have been paved. In the states of Ngeremlengui and Ngerchelong, the road projects have just begun.

The Van Camp fish storage facility, which has been closed for the past three or four years, we are happy to report to the Council, has been taken over by a private joint venture fishing company with investors from Singapore, and certain Palauan citizens. They will have a total of 40 ships employing a number of foreign fishermen to take over the operation.

There have been talks with certain officials of the airline industry in Japan and there are plans that, beginning in August of this year, there will be charter flights between Palau and Tokyo to bring in more Japanese tourists to the Republic.

The Republic has also been approached by the same Japanese businessmen for the possible construction of additional hotels.

This is rather a general answer, and if the representative of France would like more specific answers, we will be glad to provide them during this session of the Trusteeship Council.

Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom): I was interested to hear the remarks of the Special Adviser from Palau, particularly concerning the development of private investment in the Territory. As members of the Council may know, my delegation, in the past, has attached considerable importance to the development of private sector commercial activity and private investment in the Trust Territory. I wonder if a representative of the Administering Authority could perhaps comment on any other developments or on progress made in this field during the period covered by the annual report.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): I believe that the High Commissioner, Mrs. Janet McCoy, is best equipped to address the question of private-sector development.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): I think there has been a great deal of progress made since the last time we appeared here in this Chamber. I wish to begin by speaking again on the subject of Palau as regards economic development; I think this is a most important question and a most interesting one.

There are two different facets here, and I am not sure which the representative of France had in mind when he put his question earlier. We have the somewhat discouraging financial status of Palau, but we also have the very encouraging status of Palau, reflected in some of the things that are happening. Working on the theory that we would rather be encouraging than discouraging - and although I am perfectly willing to discuss either side - I should like to talk about some of the things that have been going on in Palau. Then, in response to the question of the representative of the United Kingdom, I shall address some of the other things that have been going on in the rest of the Territory.

I guess the reason I enjoy answering this question is that it has been a good year - not a vintage year, maybe, but a good year in Micronesia. It provides further background for the fact that these Governments are making tremendous strides in handling their own future and their own economy.

In Palau, we have some very fine foreign fishing agreements. Fish is one of our big resources down there. Our fishing grounds are some of the last unfished waters in the world, and thus we are the "new kids on the block", so to speak. Fishing is a new, uncharted magnificent resource as far as the economy goes. I hesitate to try to convert yen into dollar figures, but let me just say that the Japanese have a good fishing agreement with Palau until 30 June 1987 offering a

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

maximum of 290 vessels to fish in Palau waters for a lump-sum fee of 70 million yen - I have neither a calculator nor a computer with me, but that sounds like a fine amount of money - plus \$10 million worth of goods and in-kind services.

Moving into the agricultural sector, a lot has been happening in Palau. For instance, they have gone back very heavily into livestock. We have cattle, we have piggeries, we have many ongoing projects in that area. There is a feed mill there that began several years ago; this last year it produced and sold 133 tons of hog feed and 33 tons of chicken feed to the local livestock people. It must be remembered that, when you get into economic development, it is not only outside development, but the internal development that is so important. When one industry progresses, it ricochets out through the rest of the population, so that everyone benefits.

They have a lot going on in forestry down in Palau. They have been doing a lot by way of forestry extension programmes. There is a rebirth of that industry too, and eventually we will probably be able to do a little exporting.

Mariculture is tremendously important in Palau. One of the things they have been doing for some time is re-stocking the giant clam. Palau used to have the leading industry in that; it went by the boards for a while, but the mariculture centre has been going, and soon the giant clam will be a big export to other parts of Micronesia and perhaps other parts of the world.

Those are some of the things that have been going on, just in Palau. As far as the rest of the Territory is concerned, that too has been interesting.

In the Marshall Islands, for instance, we have a new milk plant. It is a private concern and is doing very, very well reconstituting milk. In Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia, Pohnpei pepper is one of the "gourmet" products. With the President's permission, perhaps tomorrow I shall bring samples of Pohnpei pepper; it is exceptionally good. There are new marketing plans.

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

The fancy pearl buttons on men's shirts come from trochus shells; these come from Pohnpei.

Kosrai is turning to furniture production. There is an odd one-two-three arrangement concerning furniture and wood products. As it stands now, the plan is that American Indians in Oregon, who have tremendous forest products, would send their forest products to Kosrai, Federated States of Micronesia. There local people would work on them, turn them into furniture or lumber and send them to China. Now, that is a pretty far-reaching, splendid idea, and it is going to work: there is no doubt about it.

We have a lot of garment factories in Saipan. They are doing tremendously well. I will not be taking orders for any sweaters, but I can assure members that they are very beautiful.

On Ebeye, the little island right across from Kwajalein in the Marshall Islands, there is a big warehouse, and the whole thing is a private industry.

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

So, when we talk about the economic development of Micronesia and of the Trust Territory, I feel very proud. I think they are doing very well, and I think that, although it is going to be hard - nothing is easy - they will do well.

Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom): I wonder if I could just ask one short follow-up question. There is obviously a great deal going on in the Territory in terms of economic development and investment, and I wonder if we could have a breakdown of where that investment is mainly coming from?

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): I would again ask that the High Commissioner respond.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): It is with a little chagrin, if that is the word, with at any rate a lot of unhappiness, that I have to say that the majority of investment is not coming from the United States. I wish it were. A lot of my job is going around talking to groups in the United States, businessmen's groups, and invariably my theme is that the Trust Territory of Micronesia is the sleeper of the Pacific. I believe that strongly.

I will not launch into my speech, although it is, believe me, a real temptation, but there is much more foreign investment than there is United States investment. I think we will see a decided change in that, primarily because, as you know, the Pacific is rapidly becoming the most interesting and the most dynamic and the forward-leading part of the world. The Age of the Pacific is upon us, and I think that all along this fact is going to sink in more and more. And, as it does, and as America looks for other fields to invest in as it runs out of markets on its own, I think it is going to be looking more and more to the Pacific.

After all, look where we are - and when I say "we," I mean the Trust Territory: we sit out there right in the middle of all of this wonderful rim of countries, all of them, with some of the biggest markets in the world. And we are pretty close to them. I am 10,000 miles from home right now, but there is a lot of

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

big markets over there that I am a lot closer to. Among the foreign investors that certainly realize that and are looking at them we have Japan, Denmark, Germany, Australia, New Zealand, Holland, Kosrai, Hong Kong - name it - and we have a lot of people coming out there and putting their money where their mouths are, so to speak. Hopefully, we will see a lot more Americans.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I would like to ask the Administering Authority some questions, and I should like to begin at the very beginning. At the very beginning of the Administering Authority's annual report to the Trusteeship Council on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, actually on the inside of the cover of the 39th annual report, we read:

"this is the final report of the United States of America to the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations"

with respect to the three Territories. Does that mean that in the future the Administering Authority will not be issuing annual reports for the whole of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, according to the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the obligations of the United States under the Trusteeship Agreement?

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): The reference in question described by the representative of the Soviet Union was included because events unfolding throughout the preceding year, including the adoption by the Trusteeship Council of resolution 2183 (LIII) in May 1986, had progressed to a point where, under United States law, the Office of the High Commissioner no longer exercised the authority it once did over the Governments of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(Miss Byrne, United States)

The United States will continue to provide the Council annual reports on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): So we should understand it in the following manner: the Administering Authority will be submitting reports about the situation in the whole of the Trust Territory to the Trusteeship Council, and the reference on the inside front cover of the 39th annual report is fallacious. It is difficult to make what we read there tally with the statement of the representative of the Administering Authority that annual reports will be submitted. We would like a clarification.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): I really do not think that the explanation I gave to the first question of the representative of the Soviet Union would warrant the use of the word "fallacious." As I said earlier, and I repeat: the United States will provide a report, an annual report, on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Here in the Trusteeship Council many petitioners have made the point that the United States, as the Administering Authority, is now engaged in actions regarding three parts of the Trust Territory that will lead to termination of the Trusteeship Agreement.

In a previous statement the representative of the Administering Authority stated that, in accordance with its domestic laws, the United States is in fact, for practical purposes, no longer implementing those functions it was formerly carrying out as the Administering Authority. Moreover reference was again made to the resolution the Trusteeship Council adopted last year.

Given this situation, two questions arise.

The first concerns this understanding of the relationship between internal legislation and international obligations undertaken by the United States. Under its international obligations, until such time as the Security Council has decided to terminate trusteeship over the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the United States is obliged to carry out its functions as the Administering Authority and to report thereon to the United Nations.

The second question is this: What is the Administering Authority's understanding of the resolution adopted by the Trusteeship Council last year? Does it, or does it not, consider that that resolution makes it possible for the United States to terminate its trusteeship over the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands?

The Soviet Union's position on that resolution is well known to you, Mr. President, and to the representative of the Administering Authority. The Trusteeship Council does not have the right to adopt any resolutions whatsoever dealing with the termination of trusteeship or with changes in the status of the entire Territory or its individual parts.

We should like to get clarification from the representative of the Administering Authority on these important and indeed fundamental questions.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): The representative of the Soviet Union said he had two questions, though I understood only one of them to be a question. He seeks clarification on very comprehensive matters. I must say I do not see what has led him to interpret my rather brief reply to his first question in such a way as to cause him to ask his question and, in particular, to comment as he has.

He has interpreted my remarks as meaning that the United States is no longer fulfilling its responsibilities as Administering Authority. I am, of course, going by the interpretation from Russian into English, but, as I understand it, that is what he said.

What I did say in response to his first question was only that the Office of the High Commissioner no longer exercised the authority it once did over the Governments of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

As we all know, over a period of 17 years the United States and what have become the four entities of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands engaged in negotiations leading to self-government. I believe it is not in doubt that the four entities do exercise self-government. There have been plebiscites everywhere, and they have been observed by the United Nations; I think they have always been deemed valid acts of self-determination. Therefore, it seems quite clear that the United States exercises certainly different authority, and in most cases less authority, than it once did when those Governments had not achieved self-government.

He asked about the meaning of resolution 2183 (LIII) of May 1986 and how the United States interprets it. The United States interprets the resolution to mean what it says. I do not need to go beyond that. The resolution is quite clear in

(Miss Byrne, United States)

its language. It was adopted by a vote of three to one. We do know that the Soviet Union opposed it, but nevertheless it was adopted. We interpret that resolution to mean what it says.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I regret that my question was not fully understood by the representative of the Administering Authority. I would like, with respect to the latest statement, to say that internal developments in the Trust Territory are of importance to the Trusteeship Council. How is it developing? What about the political, economic and social development of that Territory? It is all important. However, it is not the local authority but the Administering Authority that bears responsibility for the situation in the Territory. Indeed it bears that responsibility to the United Nations, the Trusteeship Council and the whole world. Understandably, the Administering Authority is trying to shift responsibility, claiming that it now has significantly less of a responsibility or duty and that our functions with respect to that Territory have changed. The fact remains, however, that responsibility for what is happening there must be borne by the Administering Authority, which has to report and be accountable to the United Nations.

My colleagues in the Trusteeship Council, the representatives of France and the United Kingdom, have asked questions about the economic situation in the Trust Territory. I do not know if they are satisfied with the answers received from the Administering Authority, but if I had asked those questions I would not be satisfied at all by those answers, because the answers referred only to Palau, one part of the Territory, the part of the Territory from which there is a Special Adviser in the United States delegation. But as regards the other parts of the Trusteeship Territory, nothing has been said about them.

Indeed, despite the copious statistics contained in its voluminous report, the Administering Authority, has presented, at best, a vague picture of developments

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

in the Trust Territory. The report itself, in several places, says that as of now three parts of the Trust Territory do not fall under the purview of the Trusteeship Agreement.

We welcome the statement of the representative of the Administering Authority that she intends in future to report on all four parts of the Trust Territory, but, as I say, so far we have not received a clear picture of the situation there. We can and will draw conclusions from the report; we will be asking questions on each of the chapters. In point of fact, we have quite a few questions to put to the Administering Authority. Frankly, we had expected, that, as in the past, there would be some sort of introduction covering specific developments during the period since the last session.

Now, with reference to the Administering Authority's portrayal of events as reflected in the report and in other documents submitted by the United States - to the effect that there has been a change in the political status of three parts of the Trust Territory - I ask the following question: What is the Administering Authority's position? Do the changes that have occurred in the Trust Territory relate directly to Article 83 of the Charter, or do they not?

Miss BYRNE (United States): In response to the latest comments of the representative of the Soviet Union, I wish to state that the United States will never fail to fulfil its responsibilities: under the Trusteeship Agreement, under Article 83 of the Charter, and under the Charter as a whole. I repeat: the United States will never shirk its responsibilities.

(Miss Byrne, United States)

At the beginning of his remarks the representative of the Soviet Union seemed to indicate that my comments on the advent of self-government to the Trust Territory were somehow a bad thing. It seems to me that our goals - the goal of the Trusteeship Agreement, the goal of the Trusteeship Council, the goal of resolutions and declarations of the General Assembly - have since 1945 always been to promote self-government around the globe. We certainly have done so and regard that as a very favourable development.

Because the local authorities in the Trust Territory exercise self-government, that does not mean that the United States is not the Administering Authority. As I said earlier, it certainly means that what the Administering Authority does there is different: roles have changed, powers in areas mutually agreed has passed from the Administering Authority to the local authorities. Again, we regard that as a favourable development.

Interspersed with his comments on that was the statement that he himself was not satisfied with the answers that the representatives of the Administering Authority have given concerning political, economic and social developments in the Territory. He said specifically that the answers have concerned only Palau. As I recall, the question by the representative of France concerned Palau. The question about economic development and private-sector enterprise posed by the representative of the United Kingdom was meant to be general - I did ask for clarification.

In the first instance, the answer concerned only Palau, that is, the answer concerned the content of the question. In response to the second question, the High Commissioner answered to the general question with examples from each of the four entities and including such tiny parts of one entity as Ebeye. Therefore, I really do not see the validity or the basis of that particular criticism by the

(Miss Byrne, United States)

representative of the Soviet Union. We are here to answer questions, and I believe those two were answered as they should have been.

I also noted that the representative of the Soviet Union said he would have many questions on the various chapters of the voluminous report; he mentioned political, economic and social development. I assume he meant that he would have many questions in those areas of the report. It is a voluminous report and I would like to say now that we would welcome those questions. The basic agenda item is the report of the Administering Authority on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for the fiscal year 1986. We would be very happy to hear his questions and to answer them.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Perhaps I did not listen very carefully, but I tried to be very attentive. I did not get an answer to my previous question. I would like to have a clear and definite position from the representative of the Administering Authority as to whether or not the Administering Authority considers that those actions it undertook in the Trust Territory fall under the provisions of Article 83 of the United Nations Charter. What is the understanding of the Administering Authority of those Charter provisions?

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): I do not have the verbatim record of what I said in response to earlier questions, but I have a clear recollection of saying that the United States would always abide by the Charter, and Article 83 is in the Charter.*

*The President returned to the Chair.

The PRESIDENT: Without hurrying members at all, I should be grateful for some indication as to whether there are likely to be further questions this afternoon.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Apparently the representative of the United States is unwilling to answer a direct question. I have asked it twice. The first time, I thought that my question may have been misunderstood or that I had not framed it correctly. The second time, however, I was more careful in my wording, but once again the representative of the United States failed to answer whether the actions undertaken by the United States in the Trust Territory, in the view of the Administering Authority, fall under Article 83 of the United Nations Charter. All I have received are assurances that the United States has always fulfilled and is continuing to fulfil its obligations under the United Nations Charter. Some specific answer!

I asked that question deliberately because I wanted to clarify the Administering Authority's attitude towards its obligations with respect to the Trust Territory of Micronesia; we had seen the report distributed in the United Nations as a Trusteeship Council document - that is, the letter from the Permanent Representative of the United States to the Secretary-General dated 23 October 1986 - reporting that the Compact of Free Association with the Federated States of Micronesia and the Compact of Free Association with the Northern Marianas Islands for 1986 entered into effect on 21 October 1986. That is one statement which, for practical purposes, has a bearing on the political status of the Trust Territory.

The following statement, of course, is an internal one, not distributed as an official Trusteeship Council document. I refer to the proclamation by the President of the United States that the Trusteeship Agreement no longer applies to three parts of the Trust Territory. Therefore, the question now legitimately

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

arises: where is the Trusteeship Council, on the one hand, and where is the Administering Authority, on the other hand - not to mention the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands? Apparently, somewhere off in another dimension. I should like some clarification from the representative of the Administering Authority.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): The representative of the Soviet Union thinks I do not understand his questions. He has said so. I must say that I think the representative of the Soviet Union does not understand my answers.

Once again I shall say that the United States respects the Charter, respects the Trusteeship Agreement and respects all actions emanating from the Trusteeship Council, including the resolution that he has cited, namely, resolution 2183 (LIII) of 28 May 1986. The actions of the United States are in accord with the Charter, the Trusteeship Agreement and all decisions emanating from this Council.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In fact, I understand very well the situation the representative of the Administering Authority is in. I listened with great attention to the answer of the representative of the Administering Authority just now, and I must say that I did not get an answer to questions I have raised repeatedly, particularly my last question; perhaps there is some delay involved which is why she did not answer my last question, which was very clear. I asked the representative of the Administering Authority to comment on the situation as to how things stand.

We see the statement of the Administering Authority published in the document; it is known to us. We also know about the proclamation that was signed by the President of the United States, and we are asking the representative of the Administering Authority to comment on the situation now with regard to the Trusteeship Council vis-à-vis the Trust Territory, because the Trusteeship Council tells us, on the one hand, that the political status has changed in the Trust Territory, and on the other hand, we hear statements that the Trusteeship Agreement does not apply to three parts of the Trust Territory; and, hence, we would like to know with greater clarity just how this situation is interpreted by the representative of the Administering Authority at the present time.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): I find the line of questioning of the representative of the Soviet Union to be unusual, to say the least. Every year the Administering Authority submits a report to the Trusteeship Council for its consideration at its regular session which takes place in May. This year again we have submitted an annual report to the Council, which is now sitting in the month of May. We have always been here to answer questions or to clarify the political, economic and social developments set forth in the annual report. But we find that this year's report is really quite extensive, and while we are prepared to answer

(Miss Byrne, United States)

questions on it, the idea of interpreting documents is a new one, and I really do not see what the representative of the Soviet Union is seeking. I do not see the necessity of interpreting what is already quite lengthy and clear in the annual report.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In answer to the latest comment of the representative of the United States, I should like, for our part, to emphasize that there is nothing unusual in the line of questioning we are following. It relates directly to the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the report of the Administering Authority regarding the situation in that Territory.

In fact, I started asking questions relating to the cover of the report, where there is an introduction for the reader, as I now see it after the clarification given by the representative of the United States. But this really confuses one; it turns out that the statement on the cover does not mean that the United States will not be submitting reports in the future with regard to the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands where all parts of the Trust Territory would be included, and it was with respect to this statement and to other documents that are also contained in the report that the Soviet delegation asked a question about how the representative of the Administering Authority views the changes mentioned in the report. Does she view these changes as coming under Article 83 of the Charter of the United Nations, or not?

In answer, we have three times had a statement to the effect that the United States respects the United Nations Charter as a whole and its individual Articles. But we have not had a clarification about the question of whether the representative of the Administering Authority believes that the actions undertaken by the Administering Authority in the Trust Territory come under Article 83 at the present time.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

If my question was so complicated as to be difficult to answer, I shall rephrase it.

During the current session, a great number of petitioners have stated the view that, in fulfilment of its obligations under the Charter, the United States should go to the Security Council concerning its actions and the changes taking place in the Trust Territory and that the Security Council consider those changes. It was in that context that I asked my earlier question concerning how in the view of the Administering Authority its current actions fall under the provisions of Article 83 of the Charter of the United Nations - a question to which I received no reply. My delegation would like the representative of the Administering Authority to comment on this.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): Concerning the comments and questions of petitioners, we plan at a later date to make, as we have traditionally done, a composite statement of reply and to comment on the views expressed. We usually do that at a somewhat later date. We shall comment on statements by the petitioners and shall at that time cover all matters we consider appropriate.

Concerning the earlier questions put by the representative of the Soviet Union, I will merely repeat again that all actions the United States has taken, is taking and will take with respect to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are and will continue to be consistent and in accord with the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I wish to comment on the last statement by the representative of the United States. In accordance with Article 83 of the Charter of the United Nations, all functions relating to strategic areas, such as the Territory of Micronesia, including approval of the terms of the Trusteeship Agreements and of their

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

alteration or amendment, shall be exercised solely by the Security Council. What is taking place now in the Territory of Micronesia is a change in political status, which has an effect on the Trusteeship Agreement. Therefore, the actions of the United States concerning the change in the political status of individual parts of Micronesia affect the integrity of the Trusteeship Agreement approved by the Security Council.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

We should like the representative of the Administering Authority to comment on this situation and to tell us whether the United States believes that the actions it has undertaken in the Territory represent a change in the Trusteeship Agreement. If it does not think so, let the representative of the Administering Authority tell us that.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): I thought that when the representative of the Soviet Union began his last statement he was going to set forth the Soviet position on the Charter and the Security Council, but, in the end, I take his comment to be only a rephrasing of the question he has already put today. I do not know how many times - I have not kept count. He has put the same question several times, and several times I have given the same answer. I would repeat that answer. I see one slight difference here, if the interpretation is accurate, which I assume it is: in response to that element of his statement, I would say that the Trusteeship Agreement remains in force.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like now to digress briefly from the line of questioning we have been pursuing. On numerous occasions we have heard the representative of the United States express great satisfaction with the level of political development of the Trust Territory and at the fact that democratic institutions have been developed in the Trust Territory. We have noted the degree of trust and confidence the Administering Authority has expressed in local authorities in the Trust Territory.

At one of the Council's past sessions - at the last one, if memory serves - I asked the representative of the Administering Authority a question as to the extent to which it respected the political institutions existing in the Trust Territory. I asked whether the Administering Authority respected the Constitutions of the individual entities in the Trust Territory.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

On that occasion, I received in reply assurances that the Administering Authority fully respects the Constitutions produced by the peoples of the Trust Territory. I should like now to return to that question and ask whether anything has changed in the Administering Authority's approach to the political institutions in the Trust Territory and in its attitude to the Constitutions of the individual regions of the Territory.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): I wish to affirm, in response to the question of the representative of the Soviet Union, that there has been no change in the attitude of the United States towards the Constitutions of the entities of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Those Constitutions were drawn up by the members of those areas themselves, duly approved by the legislatures and the people of the four entities. The United States fully respects them.

I do not understand the basis for the question as to whether there has been any change, but I can say categorically that there has been no change. The United States continues to respect fully the Constitutions of those areas.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Then, on that basis, I would ask another question of the representative of the Administering Authority: given the respect expressed by the Administering Authority for the Constitutions of the individual parts of the Trust Territory, how then are we to deal here with the fact that the population of Palau is for about the eighth time being forced to express itself with regard to the Constitution of Palau? How are we to understand the fact that the population of Palau is literally being forced to review its attitude to its own Constitution?

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Seven times already this was not successful. Now it is being proposed for the eighth time, and the same things have occurred.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): I wish to comment first on a question of fact. The representative of the Soviet Union said, as I understood it through the interpreter, that for the eighth time Palau was literally being forced to take a stand on its own Constitution. I wish to make clear that there are two very important, distinctly different, documents at issue here: There is the Constitution of Palau, on which the people made their voices heard three times. There is the entirely different document called "the Compact of Free Association", a Compact negotiated by the leaders of Palau with representatives of the United States. This is a totally different thing; it concerns Palau's future status, its future relationship with the United States. The people have expressed their views on that document four times.

Apparently, four plus three make eight. But in fact the four times on the Compact and the three times on the Constitution are two totally different events.

The Constitution is their own, drawn up by the people and the legislators - totally their own, having nothing to do with the United States so far as the drawing up is concerned. Obviously, there are provisions in it involving the United States.

The Compact of Free Association, on the other hand, is a document between Palau and the United States. It is definitely an international kind of document. Now, that is fact.

The allegation of "again forced to take a stand" strongly implies, if I may be polite, that the United States Government has entered into this proceeding. I wish to state again, categorically, as I have on other occasions, that the United States

(Miss Byrne, United States)

has nothing to do with Palau's plebiscite on the Compact of Free Association. The Palau Government legislators have set the date and determined whether to have a plebiscite. In each instance, they did it all.

We, like the United Nations Visiting Missions, have looked on, but the United States has not forced the Palauans to do anything.

On Monday, as I recall, President Lazarus Salii of Palau informed the Council that the Legislature wanted to have another plebiscite on the Compact of Free Association and that they had now set the date for 23 June. The United States learned of this development with great interest and we will watch the development in Palau on 23 June with very great interest.

But, again, all those actions are taken by the Palauans themselves. If they wish to have a plebiscite, it is entirely up to them.

May I respectfully ask, Mr. President, that you ask the representative of Palau whether he has anything to add to my remarks. The question does after all concern the Republic of Palau.

The PRESIDENT: Would the representative of Palau care to comment now or at a later time?

Mr. UHERBELAU (Special Adviser): I agree wholeheartedly with what the representative of the United States has said and I have nothing to add to that.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not know how we will sort out the arithmetic of this, whether adding three and four or four to four. We do know that we received a letter from the Deputy Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations which says that another plebiscite will be held in Palau. This is the eighth, according to our calculations.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

But it is not really arithmetic that is the point here. The representative of the Administering Authority told us that apparently, according to the Constitution, two plebiscites were held. We will not go into why there was a third plebiscite under the Constitution, and why they did not like this. I think that everybody knows why.

But as regards the other plebiscites, I would not assert that plebiscites on the so-called Compact of Free Association do not affect the main parts of the Constitution of Palau, because if the people of Palau are being forced to vote now in favour of the Compact of Free Association, then they will be voting against their own Constitution. But we are told: "Well, the Constitution is one thing; the Compact of Free Association is an entirely different thing." We are experienced people; we can read what is written on paper: the documents submitted by the Administering Authority, and not only those documents either. Therefore, I think that all this talk about the fact that the people of Palau are not ostensibly being forced to change their own Constitution is unfounded.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Moreover, the representative of the Administering Authority said that the United States has nothing to do with the plebiscites being held in the Trust Territory. Who is paying for them? "He who pays the piper calls the tune." Yet we are being told that that is not the case. The representative of the United States has attempted to illustrate the "impartiality" of the Administering Authority, but I am firmly convinced that that impartiality does not exist in this case. If it did exist, officials from the Administering Authority would not visit Palau and would not state - as they have recently done - that the United States does not intend to conduct negotiations about reviewing the Compact. The statement was made to the people who live on Palau that they have 10 months in which to get their financial house in order - until they adopt the Compact. Therefore, for the Administering Authority to speak about impartiality in this case betrays a lack of seriousness. That is how the Administering Authority respects the Constitution and how that respect is implemented. It is implemented by twisting the arms of the people of the Trust Territory.

Moreover, at previous sessions of the Trusteeship Council when we spoke of withholding plebiscites in the Trust Territory, in answer to the question raised by the Soviet delegation the representative of the Administering Authority said that, if the people of Micronesia rejected the Compact of Free Association, the United States Government would discuss alternatives. How does it discuss those alternatives? So far the Trusteeship Council does not know. We would like to find out whether there are such alternatives. Do the Micronesians really have any alternative? So far we know from the people of Palau that they are being asked to renounce the most important provisions of the Constitution, that this Territory would not allow within its territorial borders either nuclear, chemical or bacteriological weapons or any substances of that kind. We would like the representative of the Administering Authority to comment on that.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): I do not want to play games with the representative of the Soviet Union on methods of counting, but I will say that this is not the eighth time: the Compact of Free Association is a totally different document from the Constitution, and the forthcoming event is a further plebiscite on the Compact of Free Association. In any event, all of those pollings were called at the request of the Government of Palau. I repeat: they were always called at the behest of the Government of Palau.

I also wish to reject the idea that the vote for the Compact is a vote against the Constitution. There are matters that must be resolved. As we have said many times, it is up to the Palauans to resolve them in the way that they wish. But they are two totally different documents. On 23 June the Palauans will be taking a position on the Compact of Free Association, not on the Constitution.

With respect to the question of who is paying for it, the Administering Authority has been responsible since 1947 for the well-being of, and the maintenance of basic services for, the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. It is quite clear that it is the Administering Authority which is charged with paying for the well-being of the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. In that sense, one would say, since the United States does give grants to Palau, that that money ultimately comes from the United States. But would the representative of the Soviet Union wish to deny the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands the opportunity to express their wishes on any number of things at the voting booth? I would think not. The United States grant, in effect, facilitates life, including plebiscites and elections, in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. But those grants are turned over to the Governments of the entities and they then determine how they will spend the money. They have chosen to spend some of it on a plebiscite that is to take place on 23 June.

(Miss Byrne, United States)

There were many charges made in the comments of the representative of the Soviet Union concerning the "impartiality" of the Administering Authority. The United States has scrupulously stayed out of these plebiscites. They are conducted by the Government of Palau. But I see that basically the representative of the Soviet Union is in absolutely no position to talk about partiality or impartiality, since the Soviet Union refuses to participate in the Visiting Missions dispatched as a result of resolutions of the Council to observe these various plebiscites. There is really no way that he would be in a position to judge that element in his statements.

As to whether there are other alternatives to the Compact of Free Association, the answer to that is: Yes, there are other alternatives. For the last few years, the Compact of Free Association has been the mode preferred by the Government of Palau for its relationship with the United States and the focus has been, and continues to be, on the Compact of Free Association.

As we know, great majorities of the people of Palau have voted for the Compact of Free Association, majorities that in the United States would be considered landslides. In Palau, as the Council is aware, there has been a technicality requiring 75 per cent, but the majorities already achieved are quite remarkable. Nevertheless, there are other alternatives. We have said so and Palau has said so. In fact, on Monday, as I recall, President Lazarus Sali mentioned the possibility of looking at other alternatives if "success", as he called it, did not result from this next plebiscite.

So the answer to the representative of the Soviet Union is: Yes, there are other alternatives.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Once again the representative of the United States, the Administering Authority, has in answer asserted that the agreement, or as it is called, the Compact of Free Association, has nothing to do with the Constitution. I cannot agree with that assertion. Incidentally, nor can the population of Palau, with the exception of Mr. Salii, who apparently did agree in this respect with the Administering Authority. But the Supreme Court of Palau does not agree, neither with Mr. Salii nor with the representative of the Administering Authority, in so far as the approval of the Compact means a rejection of the Constitution.

I also do not agree with the assertion that the United States continues to stay out of these plebiscites. I do not agree for the very simple reason that the United States has actively exerted its influence, and continues to do so, both on local authorities and on the population itself to see to it that the Compact is approved.

This is an internal matter for the United States as to reasons why, how and when statements are made by highly placed, responsible persons of the Administering Authority. But if the Council will recall, in the film made in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, representatives of certain States - which, incidentally, were part of the Visiting Mission of the Council - posed in front of the camera, and as I recall, part of the film showed how the campaign and the voting process took place. A few minutes were devoted to a very highly placed official, at a very high level of authority in the United States, who gave a direct message to the population of Palau, in the Trust Territory. This, naturally, was done by way of a video, which was later inserted into the film. At a time before the results of the voting had come in, he greeted them and said that the day had now arrived when finally the Micronesians would become a part of the large and friendly family of the

United States. I am paraphrasing here. I am not quoting in this case. I am simply recalling the film that was shown here at the United Nations, if I am not mistaken, last year.

Further, as to the statement to the effect that apparently the Soviet delegation does not participate in these Visiting Missions and therefore does not have a moral right to comment on whether the decisions being taken by the Micronesians are profoundly democratic and on who participates in preparing such referendums, it seems to me that this is not really serious. The Soviet delegation is a member of the Trusteeship Council. It is its sovereign right to take decisions as to whether or not it will participate in a visiting mission. The fact is that the Soviet delegation - and we have said this already to the representative of the United States, who perhaps has forgotten - once had the opportunity to participate in such a mission.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

But that did not give the Soviet delegation the chance to have its opinion reflected in the report of the Visiting Mission; it was not allowed to do that. As always, the "football score" was 3-1, and the Mission's report contained only a single sentence to the effect that the report had been adopted by the majority of the members of the Mission.

Still on the subject of the assertion that if the Soviet delegation participated in visiting missions it would have more of a right to make judgements and to speak about what took place, I would note that in addition to the official Trusteeship Council Visiting Mission to observe the most recent plebiscite in Palau there was also present an international observers group mission, which came to the appropriate conclusions about what took place and the conditions in which the referendum took place. I have in my hands a copy of the report of that group. My delegation proposed that this report, bearing directly on the situation in the Trust Territory, be published as a Trusteeship Council document so that it might be accessible to readers. What was the decision? A score of 3-1. It was said that we needed to make savings and we could not spend the money to publish the report.

That report is extremely informative, and the Soviet delegation reserves the right in the course of consideration of the report of the Trusteeship Council Visiting Mission to refer to it, and thus to examine a single situation from the standpoint of different observers. I shall not quote from that document now, but I wished merely to mention it in connection with the question of participation in visiting missions and with what is really occurring there.

I can see that a single individual might not be objective in his views and could perhaps be accused of some sort of selfish political or other motives, but this was a whole group of five people, only slightly smaller than the group dispatched by the Trusteeship Council.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

That was in regard to the question of participation in those types of visiting missions.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The PRESIDENT: I think it might be useful for me to remind members of the Council that the purpose of this afternoon's meeting was to ask questions of the Administering Authority. There is a later period in our timetable, when we shall have a general debate on the issues we are addressing.

As I think I heard no question in the course of the last intervention, this might be an appropriate moment to draw this afternoon's proceedings to a close.

I propose that we meet again tomorrow morning at 10.30, when, I hope, we shall continue with questions of the Administering Authority.

If I hear no objection, I shall adjourn the meeting.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.