



UNITED NATIONS  
TRUSTEESHIP  
COUNCIL



LIBRARY

MAY 24 1983

Distr.  
GENERAL

T/PV.1548  
23 May 1983

ENGLISH

UN/TS/C.1  
Fiftieth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Thursday, 19 May 1983, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom)

Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 September 1982: Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued)

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

Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1982 (continued)

Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to observe the plebiscite in Palau, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, February 1983 (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 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.

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

EXAMINATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 1982: TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (T/1853; T/L.1235 and Add.1) (continued)

EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS LISTED IN THE ANNEX TO THE AGENDA (see T/1852/Add.1) (continued)

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS, 1982 (T/1850) (continued)

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO OBSERVE THE PLEBISCITE IN PALAU, TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS, FEBRUARY 1983 (T/1851) (continued)

The PRESIDENT: Before we start our work I should like to welcome Mr. Edward Johnston who was High Commissioner of the Trust Territory for many years. I think a great many of us know him and it is a great pleasure to have him with us today.

The Council will now continue the examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

As agreed at our meeting yesterday, we shall now hear Mr. Sylvestre Cruz. I invite him and all those who spoke yesterday to take places at the petitioners' table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sylvestre Cruz, the Reverend Father William Wood, High Chief Ibedul Gibbons, Mr. Nelson Wolfe and Mr. Douglas Faulkner took places at the petitioners' table.

The PRESIDENT: If the Council has no objection, I shall also invite Mr. Stuart Beck, who wishes to read a petition, to join the other petitioners.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Stuart Beck took a place at the petitioners' table.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on Mr. Cruz.

Mr. CRUZ: My name is Silvestre T. Cruz and I am President of the Commonwealth Military Retention Area and Landowners' Association. I live on Tinian Island in the Northern Mariana Islands, which are part of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

I am grateful to have the opportunity of appearing before the Council today in support of resolution No. 2-1983: "A resolution relative to requesting the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations to assist the people of Tinian, Northern Mariana Islands, in obtaining just compensation for the taking of their private property by the United States military". First of all, however, I should like to provide a little background concerning our problems on Tinian.

Prior to the hostilities during the Second World War approximately 60 Chamorro families moved from Saipan to Yap in search of employment. During the period of almost 20 years that the Chamorro lived on Yap, many families acquired land, buildings and other valuable assets. In 1948, when the United States military authorities suddenly announced that all Chamorros would be returned to their home island, some resisted the impending move, partly because of their valuable possessions, such as land, farms, crops, useful trees, homes and the lands that they would leave behind. However, after being assured that the people would be given land on Tinian in exchange for the lands that were being left behind on Yap, the Chamorros no longer opposed the move back to the Marianas.

(Mr. Cruz)

Upon our arrival on Tinian we were allowed to occupy abandoned Quonset huts that had been used by the United States military forces and to farm on any available land. Later, however, when homesteads were being given to the people, some of the elderly people were denied permission to acquire land because they had acquired land previously on Yap. Hence, these people lost their land on Yap and were denied the right to own land on Tinian. Of course, most of those unfortunate people have since died without this grave injustice being corrected.

This scenario illustrates the initial frustration that the people of Tinian experienced in their new homeland. While there have been many other disappointing episodes over the past 30 years, my appearance here today has two purposes: first, to obtain a commitment that the funds paid for the use of lands on Tinian will not be expended prior to a settlement being reached with the private landowners, and, secondly, to ensure that the people of Tinian will be paid just compensation for their lands that have been taken for United States military use.

At the request of the representative of the United States of America, negotiations between the duly authorized representatives of the Northern Mariana Islands and representatives of the United States of America were opened in 1973.

After several months of intensive discussions, an agreement to establish the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands was reached. It provided, among other things, that the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands would make available to the United States of America, at its option, the following lands: first, on Tinian Island, approximately 17,089 acres - 6,916 hectares - of land; secondly, on Saipan Island, approximately 177 acres - 72 hectares - of land at Tanapag Harbour; and, thirdly, on Farallon De Medinnila Island, approximately 206 acres - 83 hectares - of land.

As payment for the 50-year lease on the property described above, the United States made available to the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas the sum of \$33 million, of which some \$26 million has been paid and some \$7 million is held in escrow until all the private properties have been acquired.

Because of the almost total insensitivity and lack of co-operativeness on the part of Government officials regarding use of the private property since the announcement of the moratorium on the granting of homesteads in the northern two thirds of Tinian, the Tinian Association was formed to marshal the necessary

(Mr. Cruz)

resources to ensure the payment of fair, just and equitable compensation to the landowners for the use of their private property. Under provisions of United States Public Law 94-241 the Covenant to Establish the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America - which was approved by the people in 1975, we agreed to provide 17,089 acres to the United States for military purposes. Most of this land had been under United States military retention status since early in 1950, but approximately 2.5 million square metres are owned by individuals on Tinian, who were promised fair and just compensation for their lands. On 6 January 1983 the United States Navy deposited some \$33 million with the Commonwealth Government as payment for an up to 100 years leasehold interest in the 17,089 acres on Tinian.

Officials of the Commonwealth then stated that no payments to private landowners could be made until independent land appraisals were made, which was understood and agreed to by the landowners. However, it appears that the value of the private land had been predetermined when Commonwealth and United States naval officials set aside about 20 per cent in a special account to cover the privately-owned lands. When it asked questions about the motive for this, the Association simply got the runaround, with nonsense answers.

(Mr. Cruz)

The second and final point that we wish to make concerns the persistence of the Marianas Public Land Corporation's attempt to establish the market value of the land on Tinian after the Government artificially depressed land values on Tinian for almost two decades.

As far back as 1951, the United States identified certain lands in the Northern Marianas that were suitable for their military use. These lands, almost without exception, are the most suitable for development, but were not available for commercial or residential development.

In recognition of the economic importance of these lands set aside for possible military use, the United States Congress appropriated \$1,200,000 in 1951, from which the Saipan Land Trust was established. Unfortunately, by the time the hospital was built in 1962 and road improvements were made in Chalan Kanoa in Saipan in 1973, no funds remained in the Saipan Land Trust to benefit the people of Tinian.

Over the past ten years, there have been several businessmen who expressed an interest in establishing businesses on Tinian, such as oil refineries, copra processing plants, rock crushing plants, hotels, radio antennae, farming, cattle production and so on. But permission was denied them because of their incompatibility with the potential military use of the lands.

The economic loss to the people of Tinian is immeasurable. In case some of you might believe otherwise, let me state clearly for the record that the people of Tinian do not oppose the United States military presence on Tinian.

The United States of America is our mother country by the expressed wishes of our people. We love America but deplore the short-sightedness of some United States and Commonwealth officials who think that the end justifies the means.

(Mr. Cruz)

In conclusion, let me again state that we are not angry at anyone. We do not oppose the military presence on Tinian. We are willing to give up our lands on Tinian for United States military purposes, but we want to be treated fairly and to be fully compensated for our private property that has been taken for military purposes.

On behalf of the members of our Association, I wish to express my sincere thanks to the members of the Trusteeship Council for giving me the opportunity to express our views on this important matter that so concerns the people of Tinian.

I hope that it will not be necessary to return here again next year. Thank you, and I will be very happy to answer questions from any member of the Council.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Mr. Cruz. I call on Mr. Stuart Beck to make his statement.

Mr. BECK: On 15 May, I received a communication from Mr. Joshua Koshiba, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Senate of the first Olbil Era Kelulau of the Republic of Palau. That communication contained a letter of transmittal and a petition to this Council, representing the position of the Senate, to be delivered by Senator Koshiba. I was asked by Senator Koshiba to read out his petition as well as a pertinent portion of his letter of transmittal.

First, the letter of transmittal: "As you know, the United Nations Trusteeship Council should be meeting within a few days and the question of the Compact of Free Association should be considered at this time. Several delegations from Palau are already in the United States to attend the United States Congressional budget hearings in Washington D.C. and will be going from there to the United Nations for the Trusteeship Council proceedings. Most of the delegations paid for by the Government of Palau, however, are in support of the Compact, based on the recently concluded plebiscite in Palau. As Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign

(Mr. Beck)

Affairs, I was told that there was no money available to send me to the United Nations, despite the fact that fifteen or more were sent at the expense of the Government of Palau. I think I can smell a rat here and believe that I have been specifically barred from joining the delegation because they know very well that I will speak against the position taken by the Government of Palau."

Now I will read out the petition that Senator Koshiha would have read out had he been able to be with us today.

"It is an honour for me to appear here today on behalf of the Senate of the first Olbiil Era Kelulau, the National Congress of the Republic of Palau. For the record, I am Joshua Koshiha, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs. I testify today as the official representative of the Senate to make clear to you the position of the Senate regarding the effect of the recent plebiscite on the Compact of Free Association.

"Under the Constitution of the Republic of Palau, the Compact of Free Association required approval of two thirds of the members of each house of the Olbiil Era Kelulau and the people in a nation-wide referendum. In addition, because certain sections of the Compact and a subsidiary agreement would have lifted in part the Constitution's ban on certain hazardous substances, a separate question requiring approval of three quarters of those voting in the plebiscite was required to enable the Compact to take effect. This approval mechanism was known by both the United States and Palau for years prior to the plebiscite.



(Mr. Beck)

"To clear the way for the plebiscite, both Houses of the Olbiil Era Kelulau adopted House joint resolution No. 1-0099-8. This resolution approved the Compact contingent upon its approval by the voters in the plebiscite. At the same time, however, the Senate adopted Senate resolution No. 82 expressing its strong dissatisfaction with various portions of the Compact and various subsidiary agreements. The clearly expressed desire of the Senate was that these items be renegotiated prior to the plebiscite. Unfortunately, this did not occur.

"The results of the plebiscite are now public knowledge. The concept of free association as set forth in the Compact of Free Association has been adopted. However, the provisions on hazardous substances failed to garner the necessary 75 per cent vote needed to override the constitutional ban on nuclear substances. Therefore, under Palau's Constitution the Compact of Free Association has been disapproved, as it cannot take effect in the form in which it was submitted to the people in the plebiscite. Additionally, as the contingency referred to in House joint resolution No. 1-0099-8 failed to occur, the Compact was never approved by the Olbiil Era Kelulau as required by the Constitution of Palau.

"Recently, statements have been made by high-ranking officials in Palau that the United States will be willing to implement the Compact without section 314 on hazardous substances and the agreement subsidiary to that section. We have been told in the Senate that this information has come directly from United States officials. While pro-Compact forces in Palau are obviously pleased with this news, the position of the Senate is that such an implementation of the Compact may not take place absent approval of the proposed compromise of the Olbiil Era Kelulau and the People of Palau.

"From the beginning it has been clear that the Compact was a single and indivisible package. The United States has adhered to this viewpoint by stating repeatedly before the plebiscite that, if the separate question on section 314 was not approved, the Compact could not take

(Mr. Beck)

effect. The Government of Palau adopted this same position in its political education programme on the Compact.

"Now that the plebiscite has been held and the separate question disapproved, the United States apparently wishes to change its stance. This is totally immoral and contrary to Palau's Constitution. The Compact, by its own terms, has been disapproved. If the United States wishes to amend it, they may seek further negotiations. Any amended Compact will, however, be subject to approval in a new plebiscite and by the Olbiil Era Kelulau.

"Certain people have agreed that the results of the plebiscite show a disapproval of only the hazardous substance provisions of the Compact. The Senate does not believe this to be the case. We believe that many votes against the hazardous substance sections were cast to require renegotiations on other provisions of the Compact, such as the agreement on jurisdiction and sovereignty, status of forces, construction projects and financial assistance. Because the United States had stated that disapproval of the question on hazardous substances would mean the Compact would not take effect, we believe that many people voted in favour of free association but against the question on hazardous substances in an effort to force renegotiation on other provisions of the Compact. For the United States now to state that it will attempt to effectuate the Compact without the hazardous substance provisions thus subverts the intent of the plebiscite process and defeats the right of all Palauans to self-determination.

"After the plebiscite, for the reasons I have stated in this address, the Senate adopted Senate resolution No. 87. That resolution states that it is the opinion of the Senate that the Compact of Free Association was defeated. The Senate's contingent approval is thus meaningless. We maintain this view to this day, and will not cease in our resolve to ensure that our people are given the opportunity they deserve to determine their future destiny. Let me point out that it is not the intent of the Senate

(Mr. Beck)

to antagonize the United States, the most powerful nation on earth. As a matter of fact, we place great importance on our association with the United States and consider it in the same position as that of a sacred father-son relationship. But the United States has violated this trust by creating a document so complicated that 99 per cent of the people of Palau find it impossible to understand. We would not hesitate to enter into a lasting relationship with the United States, but such relationship must first be based upon a mutual exchange of fairness, justice and trust. If our islands must be sacrificed for United States defence to maintain world peace, we will gladly and willingly give up our lands for this. But our people must be made to understand this in clear, simple language so that the result of any plebiscite conducted would reflect the true wishes of our people. We have waited many years to exercise our inherent right to set our own course for the future and we will not squander our opportunity as others would desire. Is it too much for the smallest, struggling island-nation to ask for fairness and honesty from the great United States of America?

"Thank you for this opportunity to speak before this honourable body."

The PRESIDENT: That completes the statements of petitioners called for today.

Does any member wish to put questions to any of the petitioners who have made statements both yesterday and today?

Mr. POUDADE (France)(interpretation from French): My first question is addressed to Senator Balos. He spoke of article 176 of the Compact of Free Association which concerns the Bikinians. Can he give us his interpretation of article 177 of the Compact of Free Association.

The PRESIDENT: Am I correct in thinking that Mr. Balos is no longer with us? Is Mr. Weisgall here?

(The President)

I am not sure how we proceed in these circumstances. Perhaps the representative of France might indicate what he would like the Chair to do.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): When I return to questioning the Administering Authority I shall ask the question of its representative. I simply wanted to clarify things for the Council.

I shall now go on to my next question. Several speakers among the petitioners - particularly Father Wood, Ibedul Gibbons and the representative of Senator Koshiha - have told us that the Compact of Free Association has been rejected. As Chairman of the Visiting Mission, I think I reflect the opinion of those who drafted the Mission's report on the plebiscite. The Compact of Free Association, which was submitted as Proposition One (A), received a 62 per cent majority of the votes democratically cast. It is true, though, that Proposition One (B) on section 31<sup>4</sup> was rejected. There is something that I do not understand and would like the petitioners to explain to me: How is it that 62 per cent represents a rejection?

The PRESIDENT: Your question was addressed to Father Wood, is that right?

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): Father Wood, Ibedul Gibbons and the representative of Senator Koshiha.

Ibedul Gibbons said that the Compact was not approved; the representative of Senator Koshiha said that the Compact was rejected. I wonder, therefore, why the President of Palau has certified the result. I would recall that the result was 62 per cent in favour. On the other hand, it is true, as noted in our report, that question One (B) on Section 314 was rejected, because it did not receive 75 per cent of the votes cast.

Can someone explain to me why 62 per cent of the voters represents a rejection, and why the President of Palau certified the result in those circumstances.

The PRESIDENT: I call on Father William Wood to answer first.

Father William WOOD: I think that the High Chief would like to respond.

Mr. GIBBONS: The question that has been asked is a legal question and I will ask my legal counsel to respond to it.

Mr. SMITH: I am happy that Mr. Poudade has asked that question. I believe that at the outset there should be a clear understanding that, as was made clear in Senator Koshiha's statement, section 314 of the Compact of Free Association is an integral part of the entire Compact.

Furthermore, it must be understood that the Constitution of the Republic of Palau provides that, when a compact of free association contains a provision in violation of the nuclear ban provisions of the Constitution of the Republic of Palau, such compact must be approved by two thirds of both houses of the National Congress of Palau and three fourths of the voters. In addition, there is a second constitutional provision that provides that the nuclear provisions of a compact must be approved by three fourths of those voting on that specific question.

(Mr. Smith)

The upshot is that one cannot segregate and separate section 314 from the Compact. The United States representatives made this abundantly clear throughout the course of political education. In view of the fact that neither section 314 nor the Compact as a whole - which is an integrated document - received the requisite three fourths approval, it is the position of the Senate of the Republic of Palau and High Chief Ibedul and the traditional leaders of the Republic of Palau that the Compact has not at this time been approved.

It would be a travesty to suggest that after a vote has been taken the result of which does not meet the three fourths' majority requirement, we can drop provisions from that Compact and implement an agreement which is different from that upon which the people voted.

I hope that answers Mr. Poudade's question.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to say that Mr. Smith's answer does not satisfy me at all. I will tell the Council why.

We were sent on a Visiting Mission to observe the electoral process. I would be curious to know who voted on Public Law No. 1-43 on the balloting in the plebiscite. That law says:

"Proposition One (A): Do you approve of free association as set forth in the compact of free association?" Voters were asked to vote "Yes" or "No".

"Proposition One (B): Do you approve of the agreement concerning radioactive chemical and biological materials concluded pursuant to section 314 of the compact of free association?" (T/1851, p. 14)

Who voted on that law? Could one of the petitioners respond to this for me?

The PRESIDENT: I call on the High Chief, Mr. Ibedul Gibbons.

Mr. GIBBONS: Again, I should like to refer the question to Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH: As I understand it, Mr. Poudade asked who voted on Republic of Palau Public Law 1-43.

(Mr. Smith)

The answer to that, of course, is that both Houses of the National Congress voted on that particular law. However, I must point out that a law enacted by the National Congress cannot supersede or take the place of the Constitution of the Republic of Palau. I believe that that will become abundantly clear once the Supreme Court of Palau hears a trial on the merits of the case.

To be specific, Public Law 1-43 as it relates to a suggestion that the compact might be approved by a majority vote relating to proposition One (A) is clearly unconstitutional.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): Public Law 1-43, which posed two distinct questions, was indeed voted on by the Palau Parliament - that is, the Senate and the Chamber of Representatives. That is all I wanted to know. And the Supreme Court intervened to modify the wording of Proposition One (B), basing itself on the will of those members of parliament who had voted on Law 1-43.

I have four questions in all. Mr. Faulkner, who knows what a good friend of his I am and in what great esteem I hold him, could perhaps respond briefly to this question.

He felt the Koror road was too beautiful to be of no strategic interest. When we had a public meeting with the members of the Senate last July, Senator Uludong reacted very strongly against my assertion that precisely nothing had been done about roads.

I find that it is more pleasant to go from the airport to the capital by an excellent road than to go by canoe through the channel which separates the airport from the capital, as was the case some years ago.

My question is the following: What does the petitioner base himself on in indicating that the road from the airport to the capital is too beautiful not to have been built for strategic purposes?

Mr. FAULKNER: I did not quite understand the word Mr. Poudade used. Did he mean the road?

Mr. POUDADE (France): I said the road. Because now you can go from the airport to the capital by a road which is extremely beautiful, instead of crossing the channel on a raft or by canoe.

Mr. FAULKNER: Is Mr. Poudade asking me to comment?

Mr. POUDADE (France): No. My question was put as simply as possible: you have said that the roads in Koror  
(spoke in French)  
are too beautiful not to have been built with a strategic interest in mind - military, if you will.

My question is the following: what are the elements or indications that made you think that the roads in Palau in general and that one in particular - were built for a strategic purpose?

Mr. FAULKNER: First of all, I would like to say one thing. Roads were certainly long overdue in the sense that the roads that existed for the better part of the time that I was there and the time that Belau has existed under United States Trusteeship were totally unpaved. There were potholes; they were periodically graded, and as soon as it rained they were back to potholes. They were coral gravel; and this coral very often had to be dredged from the lagoon - of course, to the destruction of that particular reef.

I in no way want to imply that I am downgrading the fact that the roads were finally paved - one main road. In fact part of that road was paved a couple of years prior to the present paving, and it deteriorated quite rapidly over the course of a couple of years. Even while I was there, during the second paving, which I assume still exists, I noticed a great deal of flaking off before the road had even been completed. So my concern at that time as well was that the road was not constructed in the best possible way.

As regards my implication that the road was built more for the military than for the people of Belau, there is the fact that it went unpaved for so long.



(Mr. Faulkner)

I knew that there was a time schedule and that time schedule was built into Palau's coming of age and having some sort of status vis-à-vis the United States, and also the fact that the United States military wished to make use of certain areas of Belau.

It is also based on the fact that we had an \$8-million bridge built 6 or 8 years ago for 14,000 people. It is the only one, to my knowledge, in Micronesia. It is the longest single-span cement bridge - one arc spanning about 750 feet of water - in the world. I too am glad it is there; it is an easier route, and even though it is somewhat ugly from close up, from a distance, from the reef or the water, it has a nice graceful appearance. I am not saying that it is not needed, not convenient. What I am saying is that it is more than likely it is there more for the military than for the Palauans, just as an extension of the runway that was going on when I was there last was more likely to be for military use than for the Palauans. A runway of 6,000 or 7,000 feet can take 727 aircraft; interconnecting flights to the South Pacific, Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, the Philippines and Indonesia can exist quite easily with a runway that would accommodate 727s. It is not necessary to fly in 747s or larger military aircraft or whatever might be used on a runway that might be 8,000 to 10,000 feet long. That runway is part of the package; it is in the military agreement and it was being extended to those specifications until some time last year. I understand that now the runway is only being extended by 1,000 feet.

These may be assumptions on my part and they may be totally unfounded. I leave that for others to decide. The thing I know is that we have a military agreement and we have clauses in the Compact of Free Association, and we see what is happening throughout Micronesia and know what has happened in the past. It is my assumption that when the United States starts making major improvements in an area like Belau, with a population of less than many small towns in the United States, it has a purpose, and that purpose - based on all the pressure that is being put on the people of Belau and the people of Micronesia - could well be for military purposes.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): May I preface my remarks and my questions today by saying how constructive and useful we find the statements of the petitioners. It seems to me that they are essential to the conduct of our deliberations here today.

I have a number of questions. My first is addressed to Father Wood of the Focus on Micronesia Coalition. He spoke yesterday of the wording of the statements circulated as part of the education programme, which he described, if I paraphrase him correctly, as one-sided and omitting significant points. I wonder if he could be more specific about that?

Father William WOOD: The document which was circulated - a people's fact sheet on the Compact of Free Association - by the Office of Political Education, dated 7 January 1983, was, first of all, in our view quite late in being circulated. Secondly, it seems to support to a very great degree a positive vote in regard to the Compact of Free Association and the second issue, the nuclear matter.

A system that would attempt to reach the people of Palau and to educate them to the form and substance of the ballot, and at the same time to a complete understanding of a ballot, would certainly seem to require a far more ample presentation of the issues which were involved in the election itself, so that everyone, no matter how well or how poorly educated, could clearly understand just exactly what he was doing and what he was voting on.

That, it seemed to us, was very much lacking in the educational attempt on the part of the Office of Political Education.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I thank Father Wood for that answer. My second question is likewise addressed to Father Wood. He spoke in his statement of voting irregularities following the plebiscite. I wonder whether he could be a little more explicit about exactly what form these irregularities took.

Father William WOOD: The voting irregularities referred to in our statement concern those ballots which were cast in Guam and the description of the way in which the balloting was done, the failure of the persons supervising the ballot to use wooden boxes and the fact that, when the ballots were sent back to Koror, one of the cardboard boxes was found to have a hole in it. The explanation was given that the pressure of another box had created the hole, but it seemed to be very skimpy as an explanation, and consequently the concern was: was there actually proper supervision, both of the balloting and of the transmission of the ballots from Guam to Koror?

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): That completes the questions to Father Wood. Like my French colleague, I had a question for Mr. Weisgall, the legal counsel of the Bikini islanders, and I regret that he is not with us today. With your permission, Mr. President, I wonder whether I might read my question into the record, so to speak, so that I can place on record our view that we would have liked a slightly fuller explanation of certain points raised in his statement. Would that be in order?

The PRESIDENT: Yes, I think this follows precedent. It would be perfectly in order for your question to be asked and to be transmitted to Mr. Weisgall, and then his answer could be circulated to members. If members agree, I would like to follow that precedent in dealing with this question.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): Perhaps I could explain for the benefit of my colleagues here exactly what I wanted to do. I had a question for Mr. Weisgall, who is the legal counsel of the Bikini islanders. He is not

(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

here to answer it. Therefore I wished for the record, so to speak, to read out my question, in the hope that that question might be transmitted to him and that at some date the Council might be provided with perhaps a written answer to that question.

The PRESIDENT: My suggestion was that we would be following precedent if this were done: the question would be transmitted to Mr. Weisgall and his reply could then be circulated in writing to members of the Council. If that is agreeable, I would suggest that we do that.

Mr. MORTIMER:(United Kingdom): Mr. Weisgall spoke at some length of the dissatisfaction of the Bikini islanders with the existing drafting of section 177 of the Compact of Free Association but he went on in his statement to concede that this article was being renegotiated, although no such agreement had so far been reached. What I would have liked to hear from Mr. Weisgall is more detail about the sort of wording he would have liked to see in section 177 and whether or not he was optimistic or pessimistic about achieving his aims.

The PRESIDENT: I will ask the Secretary to be so kind as to arrange for that question to be placed in the form of a letter to be sent to Mr. Weisgall.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I had one more question to ask of the President of the Oceanic Society, Mr. Christopher Roosevelt, who spoke yesterday. Is Mr. Roosevelt in the chamber?

The PRESIDENT: I understand that Mr. Roosevelt is not here but that Mr. Wolfe is willing to reply to questions on his behalf.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): The question refers to the end of Mr. Roosevelt's statement, where he says:

"As concerned and patriotic Americans, we question:

"A. The fundamental assumption that Palau is of great strategic value and an essential element to contemporary United States defence posture in the Pacific. We believe such assumptions should be re-evaluated."

(T/PV.1547, p. 72)

I wonder whether Mr. Wolfe could give us his opinion on the basis on which those assumptions should be re-evaluated.

Mr. WOLFE: Our suggestion, in that particular question, is based on a history of the Trust Territory that was written by a former Ambassador of the United States to the United Nations, Donald F. McHenry, who wrote in a study funded by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in 1976, raising that same question as part of his conclusions and recommendations, that indeed the times are changing. History has moved on since the 1940s, and indeed conflicts, given present defence capabilities, will not be fought as they were in the west Pacific again.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In the petition presented by Focus on Micronesia reference is made to one of the pamphlets issued in the process of so-called political education in Palau. The pamphlet is called The People's Fact Sheet on the Compact of Free Association. In the petition there is information on how this publication was drawn up. My question is this. Does the Focus on Micronesia Coalition know of any publications that have been distributed in the Territory explaining to this population of the Territory the advantages of acquiring independence?

The PRESIDENT: I take it that that question is addressed to Father Wood, and I call on him.

Father William WOOD: To the best of my knowledge there has been no publication of such a pamphlet detaining or outlining the advantages or disadvantages of independence.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Papua New Guinea.

Mr. KAREPA (Papua New Guinea): My question is directed to Mr. Nelson Wolfe. Yesterday, in his statement, Mr. Roosevelt said that he had some documentary evidence to show that the amount of money that was given for political education was misused to influence people to vote for the Compact. I wonder if Mr. Wolfe is able to tell us more about that evidence.

Mr. WOLFE: I can provide the representative of Papua New Guinea with the documentary evidence within 24 hours. We have those figures. I would also refer him to a civil action suit in the Supreme Court of Palau - No. 67-83 - which details the use of those funds. I can make those materials available for his use and for the record.

The PRESIDENT: Would it be possible to have those documents tomorrow?

Mr. WOLFE: Yes.

The PRESIDENT: We would be grateful if you could give copies to the Secretary so that we can arrange distribution. Would that satisfy the representative of Papua New Guinea?

Mr. KAREPA (Papua New Guinea): Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Since in the petition to which I have referred mention is made of this quite curious document - I am referring to The People's Fact Sheet on the Compact of Free Association - does not the Secretariat of the Trusteeship Council have available a copy of this publication? If so, the Soviet delegation would be interested in familiarizing itself with this example of political education for the population of Palau. We ask that that document be made available to the Soviet delegation if that is possible. Secondly, I should like to recall the request we made yesterday that the petitions be made available to members of the Council even if in mimeographed form. Today quite an important petition has been transmitted to the Council on behalf of Mr. Koshiha, and we should like to have copies of both his letter and the petition.

The PRESIDENT: On the second point, I have here a copy of the petition of Mr. Beck I will ask the Secretary to have this copied at once so that the representative of the Soviet Union can have it within a very few minutes. I think that he will then have a complete set of all the petitions received so far.

On the first point, I do not know if we have The People's Fact Sheet.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I see that we are getting into a debate on a document, and I think that it would be best if I spoke now as Chairman of the Visiting Mission to Palau.

I deeply regret that the publication of this document has taken so long, because quite clearly very few people in this room - perhaps it would be closer to the truth to say virtually none of them - have read this report. If it were possible for us to read the document it would avoid exchanges such as the present one. If members turn to chapter III of our report "Programme of Political Education" it will be seen that a certain number of documents were issued by the committee on the Programme. We listed those documents that were communicated to us as follows:

"In addition, the committee prepared various documents and radio and television programmes. The documents included a brief summary of the 'highlights' of the compact; a small booklet setting out its main provisions; charts showing its financial benefits to Palau; a paper comparing in schematic form free association, the status quo, commonwealth status and independence ..." (T/1851, para. 28)

The document which describes the four systems in summary form does not have to be given us by Father Wood because the Visiting Mission has it and I am sure that Mr. Abebe would be kind enough to give us Xeroxed copies for all the members of the Council that wish to see it.

I would stress again that we cannot spend hours discussing the plebiscite of 10 February if neither the members of the Council nor the petitioners have read this report. I am sorry: This is not the bitterness of an author; but it took us a lot of time and it would be very helpful if it could be distributed in good time.



Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I understand the feelings of the representative of France, who headed the Mission of the Trusteeship Council and presented us with a report quite late, as he himself acknowledged, but I do not understand very well - I would even say that I detected a note of irritation in the statement just made by the representative of France. The question was asked by the Soviet delegation in quite a calm and, I would say, businesslike way. We are listening to the petitioners and we study what they tell us and in so doing we have encountered references to a certain document and the Soviet delegation would merely like to have clarification from the Secretariat of the Trusteeship Council as to whether we may have that document to look at. So far we have not received an answer from the Secretariat.

The PRESIDENT: I understand from the Secretary that he will be able to circulate these documents, which are also referred to in paragraph 28 of the report of the Visiting Mission and I think it could be possible to have them circulated in time for our meeting tomorrow morning.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I should like simply to point to certain adjectives which my dear colleague from the Soviet Union judged fit to use in my regard. For four sessions now he has been taking part in the Trusteeship Council and so have I. For four sessions we have had the most affectionate and friendly relations. As the Council knows, he sometimes speaks with his tongue in his cheek.

The PRESIDENT: I am sure that nothing said this morning would damage the friendly relations between all members of this Council. Now, are there any other questions that members would like to ask of the petitioners?

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I do not have a question and I had not thought it appropriate to raise this matter while the petitioners were being questioned, but I have one point I should like to place on record concerning a statement made yesterday by one of the petitioners. By your leave, may I make it?

The PRESIDENT: I think that, if is not in the form of a question, probably it should be better left until we have an opportunity to hear the statements by the members of the Council later in our meeting.

I am ready to catch the eye of any member who wishes to ask any further questions but, if there are no further questions this morning, I should like, first of all, to say how grateful the Council is to the petitioners for continuing to make themselves available for questioning by members of the Council. It is very helpful to the work of the Council. Although some members of the Council may have completed their questioning of petitioners who have spoken so far, there will nevertheless be further questions addressed tomorrow to the petitioners. I would therefore be grateful if petitioners could continue to be present tomorrow, when I hope it may be possible to complete all the questioning of petitioners.

We have now completed hearing the statements of petitioners for today and we have also completed the questioning so far. It would therefore appear that the best course of action would be to adjourn now and to meet again tomorrow.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, you are making a proposal which usually meets with the approval of delegations, but since we shall have the afternoon free and since the interpreters and all the technical services can go on working for a few minutes more, could I not, if you or any other members of the Council have no objection, since we have settled the question of the petitioners, begin my questions to the Administering Authority? If the Administering Authority could answer certain questions immediately, that would be excellent; if it could not, then it could reply later. But I think it would be shame, in view of the rules proposed by the Secretary-General and the General Assembly, to adjourn now. Perhaps we could go on, if there was no objection from the Council, for perhaps another half hour?

The PRESIDENT: The French representative spoke to me informally this morning and also with the representative of the United States and indicated that, unfortunately, he might not be present tomorrow afternoon, when the Council would be concentrating on questions of the Administering Authority and he suggested that it would be convenient for him, if he could start his questioning of the Administering Authority now. I am sure the Council has no objection. I would like this to proceed.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): My first question to the Administering Authority is the following: Is it possible at this stage for the Administering Authority to bring the Council up to date as regards the situation in Kwajalein since the end of the "sail-in" which, if my memory serves me well, ended last October? That is my first question.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): If I may I shall call on High Commissioner McCoy to make an initial answer to that question by the French representative and subsequently perhaps Mr. Domnick would also be prepared to offer a comment.

Mrs. McCoy (Special Representative): A new Council has been formed between governmental representatives of the Marshall Islands Government and the landowners of Kwajalein. They have been meeting frequently, with very good results; they are making progress. The Council is chaired by Mr. Oscar DeBrum, Head Secretary of the Government. They have been meeting regularly and making strides in ironing out their opinions and their questions with the military.

I think perhaps Mr. Domnick, who is representing the Marshalls here today, may be able to add something to that.

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Domnick.

Mr. DOMNICK (Special Adviser): After the occupation last year, the Marshall Islands Government came to the United States to seek further negotiations with the United States Government regarding military use rights and amendments thereto, in an attempt to accommodate the wishes of the landowners who were then occupying Kwajalein missile range.

As I stated in my opening remarks last Monday, their main concern was the amount of money they were to receive and the length of time the agreement for land-use rights by the military was to remain in force. They were allocated \$6 million -- \$2 million in fiscal year 1984 and \$4 million in fiscal year 1985 - to take care of special needs on Ebeye, for instance, the much needed infrastructures. With regard to the agreement, they sought a reduction of the term from 50 years to 30 years. That was accomplished. After that, the people returned to Ebeye. There are several other concerns of the people of Ebeye which the newly formed Community Relations Council is addressing. There are the banking facilities, which were, in a way, granted to them again, except that they still have restricted rights to the military base. For example, if they came to Kwajalein to do some banking, they were taken from the pier to the bank by bus and stayed in the bus awaiting their turn to go into the bank. They expressed some concern that they were being treated unfairly. Also, the Senator from Kwajalein stated that he was being accompanied by security forces every time he went to Kwajalein to catch the airline, which is the only way to go from Kwajalein or Ebeye to Majuro. He expressed concern about that.

(Mr. Domnick, Special Adviser)

My Government is still talking on a monthly basis with the authorities of Kwajalein missile range and we hope we shall be able to settle some of these problems.

Kwajalein landowners have indicated to me that they would be coming here; but they have not yet shown up and I do not know whether they will come later on. They said they had particular concerns they wanted to bring to the Council's attention but, as I said, I do not know whether they are coming.

On other subjects, my Government has approached the military authorities, and one of the Under-Secretaries of the Army is going to Kwajalein next month. We hope we shall be able to iron out some of the differences between the community on Ebeye and the military authorities on Kwajalein.

If there are other questions, I shall be here and willing to answer them, if I can.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not know if this is in order, but I should like to ask one more question, ~~either for clarification or to develop the~~ question put by the representative of France. May I do that, or should I wait until the representative of France concludes his questioning?

The PRESIDENT: Does the representative of France wish to continue his questioning? If so, I think he should do so now, after which I shall be glad to call on the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I thought I had understood that the delegation of the Soviet Union wanted to put its questions later on. That was why I ventured to make use of the half hour remaining to the Council for my delegation.

Mr. President, if you give me the authorization and the representative of the Soviet Union has no objection, I shall continue my questioning now and his delegation can speak in its turn.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of France may proceed.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): Mr. Domnick stated that some of the amounts now negotiated would go towards the restoration of Ebeye. My question is a general one, because I think the situation in Ebeye is one for which, I would say, everybody is responsible, including the Trusteeship Council. When do the United States Government, on the one hand, and the Marshalls authorities, on the other, and the people of Ebeye themselves expect to proceed to this restoration? There is a description of Ebeye in the report.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): Again I would ask Mr. Teare to respond to that question, after which perhaps Mr. Domnick will have additional comments.

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Teare.

Mr. TEARE (Adviser): The arrangements the United States has made with the Republic of the Marshall Islands for the continued use of the Kwajalein missile range since 1 October 1979 are recorded in a series of interim-use agreements. We are now into the fourth of these agreements. Each agreement has provided considerable sums of money to the landowners of Kwajalien Atoll themselves or of those islands which the United States leases and each has provided as well the sum of \$2 million per annum for capital projects destined for the improvement of conditions on Ebeye. A variety of circumstances, including the need to co-ordinate planning for the use of those funds and also the administration of the construction work to be funded with that money, delayed for a time the start of work on several of those projects.

But, as I believe Mr. Domnick can confirm and perhaps amplify, the work provided for in appropriations beginning 1 October 1979 is now indeed in progress in Ebeye. I believe it includes a dock, a cold-storage facility and a number of other projects for which the need has been evident for some time.

Mr. Domnick referred a few moments ago to the special - or, to some extent, continued and augmented - funding provided in the current interim-use agreement - a total of about \$6 million spanning three fiscal years. Those funds too are now, or will be in the appropriate fiscal years, available for

(Mr. Teare, Adviser)

further improvements on the island of Ebeye, and the uses to which they will be put are now being planned primarily by the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the municipal authorities of Ebeye.

I would note also that, for the first time under the terms of this new interim-use agreement, some of the landowners of Ebeye themselves who receive lease payments through these interim-use agreements are going to be making a contribution totalling, I believe, \$1 million in fiscal year 1984 or 1985. In any event, for the first time the landowners of Kwajalein, many of whom live on Ebeye, will themselves be contributing to the improvement of conditions there. We see that - and I think the Republic of the Marshall Islands does as well - as a very significant development.

So if we look at this range of projects - some already begun; others in the planning stage; and still others to follow - and if we consider also the Community Relations Council, which has been meeting regularly for the last several months and to which both the High Commissioner and Mr. Domnick have already referred, I think we can see a very promising and, in many ways, altered situation in Ebeye developing. And I believe the representative of France would, were he to revisit Ebeye today, note a significant improvement both in physical conditions and in atmosphere from the conditions that prevailed at the time he so ably led the Visiting Mission last July.

Mr. DOMNICK: The frustrations that led to the selling on Kwajalein stemmed from a lot of reasons and one was that money had been allocated by the United States Congress, to the tune of \$2 million per annum for projects on Ebeye. The control of that money was vested in the United States Corps of Engineers and they, as the Council is well aware, because these are United States public funds, have too many criteria in seeking bids and so forth prior to construction. It therefore took a long time, and it was not until January 1982 that the Government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands was given the full authority to spend the money for the purposes which the United States Congress had intended. As a result, a considerable speed-up of the projects on Ebeye has taken place. Also, with the concurrence and participation of the landowners the Kwajalein Atoll Development Authority has members from both factions on Ebeye, the Kwajalein Atoll Corporation (KAC) and the other landowners not represented in the KAC. I am therefore very sure that in the next year or so, apart from the projects that have been completed, which I mentioned in my opening remarks, and others that are in progress, the development of the Kwajalein Atoll will take place, not only on Ebeye but on the next island, between which my Government has planned to build a connecting causeway and that will significantly reshape the outlook for Ebeye in its crowded conditions. It will take time, but we have the contractors on hand who are actually doing work that has long been needed by the people of Ebeye.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): Before continuing with my questions I should like to thank Mr. Teare for what he said about the improvements on Ebeye. I think that if a mission to observe the Plebiscite were to take place soon, we would authorize one of the members of the French delegation to go and observe the Plebiscite on Ebeye, and I can assure Mr. Teare that this time the French representative would stay not on Kwajalein but in a hotel on Ebeye, so one might venture to hope that the conditions described by Mr. Teare would be those which that representative would observe.



(Mr. Poudade, France)

I shall continue with my questions.

Why, at Roi-Namur is the Global Associates Company selling merchandise twice a week to the inhabitants of Third Island at very high prices in dollars and refusing to buy in exchange the products that the inhabitants of Third Island could provide: fresh high-protein fish, as well as shells, souvenirs and so on? Why is the trade between Global Associates and the Marshallese only one-way trade?

Mr. DOMNICK: I do not think I can answer that question. I have no idea why Global Associates is doing that. I am sorry.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I thank Mr. Domnick, but indeed this is one of the questions which I think the Marshallese authorities on the one hand and the United States Department of Defense on the other should concern themselves with and deal with, because in our time at Roi-Namur - and the secretariat members who accompanied me will testify to this - I was very surprised at the joy expressed by the representative of Global Associates when he spoke of the size of their weekly sales to the Marshallese, and when I asked him, "But what do you buy from the Marshallese in exchange?" he said, "Absolutely nothing at all." I find that very regrettable, because it could be an additional resource for the people living on Third Island to be able to sell fresh fish, which I am sure would be a source of joy to the scientific personnel living in both Roi-Namur and Kwajalein.

I think it is very important that the company involved in Roi-Namur and Kwajalein take this matter into consideration.

My next question concerns the Federated States of Micronesia. I should like to know how, on the one hand, the political education programme and, on the other hand, the campaign with regard to the plebiscite which is to take place on 21 June are being carried out.

Mr. TAKESY: I am happy to report that the work on political education in the Federated States is proceeding well. For the State of Kosrae and the State of Yap it is nearly complete. It is expected that for Truk and Ponape it will be completed by the end of this month.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): May I interpret to Mr. Takesy the views of the members of the Visiting Mission - a mission that you, Mr. President, may be heading - to the Federated States of Micronesia and express to him the concerns voiced by the representative of the Soviet Union in this connection. It seems to me that this political education programme - which, as could be seen in Palau, was centered on the Compact of Free Association, in keeping with the wishes of the inhabitants - also sets forth in detail the other options to be on the ballot: that is, either independence or other formulas, because people will be entitled to vote on a range of options. I hope that Mr. Takesy will convey this point to President Nakayama.

I come to my next question. The mission had occasion to visit in Ponape what is certainly a unique institution in the Trust Territory, the Micronesian Cultural Centre. Unfortunately it is a private institution, which is being administered by two very remarkable persons without funds other than donations from visitors. The Governor of Ponape promised me that financial assistance would be forthcoming for this Centre and I should like to ask whether that assistance has indeed been given.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States): I shall again ask Mrs. McCoy to answer; Mr. Takesy may also like to comment on the matter.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): I too have been to the Micronesian Cultural Center in Ponape and I feel that it is an excellent place. They are doing fine work in keeping up the old skills, the old dances and so forth. There has been an election of Governors in Ponape State, and I know that the former Governor had talked about trying to find some money for the Cultural Center. I do not believe the new Governor has had time yet to consider this; he was inaugurated only on 1 May. I have been talking to some of the historical preservation groups in Washington to see if perhaps some funds can be acquired from them to carry on this worthwhile project. Mr. Takesy may be able to give the Council more information.

Mr. TAKESY (Special Representative): The organization referred to by the representative of France is a private organization. Its purpose is both to foster our cultural heritage and to earn the money to keep itself going. It has approached the Federated States of Micronesia Development Bank; I regret to say that I do not know the status of its loan application. I should be very happy to look into the question and to provide the information at a later date.

Mr. POUDADE (France)(interpretation from French): I wish to thank Mrs. McCoy for the work she has done in Washington to help the Micronesian Cultural Center. I hope that her work will bear fruit. I believe it will be to the benefit of the entire Micronesian culture and the Micronesian community.

I would point out to Mr. Takesy that what he referred to is not a loan, but rather a grant. I am convinced that the newly-elected Governor, Mr. Resis Moses, will honour the commitments of his predecessor.

I turn now to the next question, which as everyone knows, I take very much to heart. It concerns the Kosrae airport. Funds were made available to the Kosrae authorities to build an airport suitable for a Boeing 727. Preoccupied with size - and rather unwisely, it must be said - the Kosrae authorities decided to use the money that was to have been used to resurface the coral runway in order to extend the runway to accommodate Boeing 747s.

(Mr. Poudade, France)

All members of the Council who have been to Kosrae or who will be going there can be sure that it will be a good long time before Boeing 747s land at Kosrae, which, I would recall, has 5,500 inhabitants.

But the Kosrae authorities felt they had to make this choice. A company has therefore built a coral fill. We spoke to the contractor and he told us that, if this runway is not resurfaced, the coral fill will quickly be damaged by rain. Millions of dollars will have evaporated on Kosrae.

In his statement, Mr. Takesy touched on the question, on what he called the problem of the Kosrae airport. I know that this is a question that the High Commissioner is following closely. Could Mrs. McCoy please tell us what the situation is with regard to the Kosrae airport?

Mrs. McCoy (Special Representative): The status of the Kosrae airport, as a matter of fact, is very much in the news right now. To get Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approval and to turn it into a certified airport, a decision had to be made as to whether we would do that. FAA insisted that, if we were going to ask for certification, a fill should be made up near where the terminal will eventually be for a pull-out apron for the planes. We have been in consultation with people from Kosrae and it has been pretty much the decision that it would be better to do that - to fill that area and have a pull-out parking apron as FAA requires - and then obtain certification from FAA. If you do not have that, no American planes can land there. So that is the present plan: we are short of funds and had to make a selection at the moment about whether to fill and get FAA certification and hold off on the paving until later on, the reason also being that along with certification there will be further grants from FAA to help with lighting, safety measures for the airport and other things. We hope we may even get some funding for the airport to be paved. They will also be getting a new terminal to go with the airport, so the airport is coming along nicely. But the decision was made at hearings in these last few weeks in Washington that, in order to get the certification, we should go ahead and bring in that fill. We needed to do it now because the contractor is getting ready to demobilize. I think we must remember that, when we are so far away from places, half of our expense is in mobilization and demobilization of the contractor, so while the contractor is there we will go ahead with the fill. That is my understanding of the matter.

Mr. POUDADE (France)(interpretation from French): I had said that I should be posing questions for only half an hour. I do have other questions for the Administering Authority and shall ask them later on.

The PRESIDENT: Does the representative of the Soviet Union wish to ask any questions at this stage?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I have noted some questions in the nature of clarifications and of additions to the ones asked by my good friend the representative of France, but taking into account the lateness of the hour I hope to be able to ask those questions tomorrow.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The PRESIDENT: I am happy to say that our Secretary has been successful in arranging for all the remaining petitioners to appear tomorrow. There are, I believe, three. There will this, I hope, be no need to hear petitioners on Monday. I suggest that we use tomorrow to complete the hearing of petitioners and to continue with our questions to petitioners and questions to the Administering Authority. That would leave Monday free for the preparation of statements by members of the Council.

The next meeting will take place at 10.30 a.m. tomorrow.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.