



UNITED NATIONS  
TRUSTEESHIP  
COUNCIL

JUN 12 1986



Distr.  
GENERAL

T/PV.1618  
9 June 1986

ENGLISH

UN/52-100-1000

Fifty-third Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIXTEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTEENTH MEETING

Held at United Nations Headquarters, New York,  
on Friday, 30 May 1986, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. RAPIN (France)

- Organization of work
- Examination of petitions listed in the annex to the agenda (continued)
- Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Trust Territories: Report of the Secretary-General
- Dissemination of information on the United Nations and the international Trusteeship system in Trust Territories: Report of the Secretary-General (Trusteeship Council resolution 36 (III) and General Assembly resolution 754 (VIII) (continued))

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.

The meeting was called to order at 11.15 a.m.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to apologize to the members of the Council for the delay in starting this meeting due to the extension of the consultations I mentioned at our last meeting and which I have held with all delegations in order to decide on a rough timetable as regards the conclusion of our work. I shall submit it to the Council after further consultations with delegations.

This morning the Council will continue its consideration of agenda item 5, on the examination of petitions, and agenda items 8 and 9, relating to study and training facilities and the dissemination of information.

On Monday afternoon we shall consider the last written petitions and also agenda items 10 and 11. On Wednesday morning we shall deal with agenda items 12 and 13, and I hope we will be in a position to deal with what we traditionally call "recommendations and conclusions" drawn up by the Drafting Committee. Delegations that wish to make statements will then be able to do so. Following that, I shall adjourn the meeting and the Council will meet again at the earliest date possible; I have given 26 June as an indicative date. At that time we shall express our views on the complete report of the Trusteeship Council, which will have two parts, one containing the conclusions and recommendations I have just mentioned and the other a summary of our debate.

EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS LISTED IN THE ANNEX TO THE AGENDA (T/1887/Add.1)  
(continued)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I shall now list the documents with which we will deal this morning so that members can have them ready for reference.

The communication on which we still have to express our views is in document T/COM.10/L.364/Add.1; I would remind members that we have already expressed our views on T/COM.10/L.364. An addendum to that document has been published and we must take a decision on it. That is the only remaining communication.

The other documents remaining are those in T/PET.10/346 and 347, which was not available to delegations at our last meeting, relating to the examination of petitions. As members will recall, we had reached document T/PET.10/383 at our last meeting devoted to the examination of petitions. Thus we still have to consider the petitions in documents T/PET.10/384 to 392, 395 to 404, 406, 410 and 411.

Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, before we move on to discussing the petitions that you read out, the Soviet delegation has a question. It would like to have a clarification from you, or perhaps from the Secretariat. As you will recall, at our last meeting the Soviet delegation referred to a letter sent to the President of the Trusteeship Council containing very important information on the consideration by the Supreme Court of Palau of a case against Salii. We requested that that letter be distributed as a document of our Council so that we could consider it during this session.

Secondly, we also drew your attention, Sir, to a request from a group of petitioners that the Trusteeship Council consider the possibility of hearing them on this particular question. In addition another document was submitted relating

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

to this case which, as I understand it, has just been received, namely on 27 May 1986. Would it be possible for you to inform us how matters stand as regards satisfying the Soviet delegation's request?

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to point out that I have circulated copies of the letter he mentioned. As for the other aspect of his question, I can only draw the attention of members to article 81 of the rules of procedure, which I shall now read out:

"Normally, petitions shall be considered inadmissible if they are directed against judgements of competent courts of the Administering Authority or if they lay before the Council a dispute with which the courts have competence to deal. This rule shall not be interpreted so as to prevent consideration by the Trusteeship Council of petitions against legislation on the grounds of its incompatibility with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations or of the Trusteeship Agreement, irrespective of whether decisions on cases arising under such legislation have previously been given by the courts of the Administering Authority."

Does any delegation wish to comment on this?

Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With you, Mr. President, we have looked closely at rule 81. We are grateful to you for having drawn our attention to it. But it deals with matters unrelated to the request made by the petitioners this week. It is not a question of the competence of the courts. On the contrary, the question is whether we can use the services of a supreme court to consider a very important case. In this connection we are not talking about the courts of the Administering Authority or the judgements of competent courts of the Administering Authority. Rather we are talking about the Supreme Court of Palau. It considered a very important case

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

relating to actions which in the view of the petitioners violate the Constitution of Palau. It would appear that rule 81 does not apply to the particular petition to which we have referred.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): May I know the views of other delegations on the interpretation of rule 81?

Mr. ROCHER (France) (interpretation from French): For my delegation, rule 81 does apply to this petition. It seems to us that we cannot consider this document as a United Nations document, a document of the Council, and consequently we cannot study the matter.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I agree with my French colleague, and am grateful to you, Sir, for having drawn our attention to rule 81, which seems to be perfectly clear. Presumably, the way that rule was drawn up is a reflection of the fact that it is not for the Trusteeship Council to consider matters that are sub judice. I would not imagine that any of us would disagree that this matter is sub judice, is indeed before the Palau Supreme Court, and is therefore not an issue on which members of the Trusteeship Council should comment. We should not attempt to second-guess or influence the Courts judgement in this case. I can quite understand why rule 81 was drawn up in this way, and fully agree that it should apply in the case of this petition, which should therefore not be circulated as a United Nations document.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): As views continue to be divergent, I shall, if I may, continue consultations with delegations on this point, and we shall return to this question later.

We shall now resume consideration of the petitions and communications before us.

Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, in connection with your clarification and the comments of the representatives of France and the United Kingdom, we have a question about another group of petitioners, who were discussed early in our session but about whose fate we have had no answer as yet. I refer to petitioners who were submitting a report on the Mission. These petitioners were directly chosen in the region for the Mission. To date, these documents have not been distributed. Is there a reason for this, or has there been a technical problem? In any event, we should like to have those petitions issued as documents. Among them was a document

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

of some 100 pages; we should not insist upon that one being translated into Russian. But I do not think there should be any objection to the distribution of the other documents to delegations, including that of the United Kingdom.

As we come to the end of our discussion of petitions, we should like to have the full picture with regard to the petitions before us today and those we shall discuss at subsequent meetings. We cannot allow any discrimination concerning the petitions. We cannot understand why some of the petitions which have been referred to by the Soviet delegation have not been published.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): When the delegation of the Soviet Union last asked about the petitions annexed to the report of the Visiting Mission, I stated that the Russian versions of those petitions would be available either yesterday or today. I was assured by the Secretariat yesterday that the Russian texts of the petitions would be made available during the day.

As to the consideration of the petitions before us, I would note that out of a concern for the conduct of our work I have never invoked rule 86 of our rules of procedure, paragraph 1 of which reads:

"Written petitions will normally be placed on the agenda of a regular session provided that they shall have been received by the Administering Authority concerned either directly or through the Secretary-General at least two months before the date of the next following regular session."

Hitherto I have endeavoured to make it possible for all viewpoints to be expressed, which is important, and have not invoked rule 86 (1), since no delegation had asked me to do so.

I propose that we consider the documents to which I referred earlier, many of which reached the Administering Authority beyond the deadline of two months prior to our session specified in rule 86 (1). Indeed, I suggested this morning, in

(The President)

the proposed timetable for the conclusion of our work, that on Monday we consider petitions that have reached the Administering Authority in recent days and will be issued on Monday after having been translated into the three languages we use in this Council. I proposed a Monday afternoon meeting precisely so that delegations would have Monday morning to study these documents. In the light of rule 86 (1), I think I acted in a very flexible way towards the petitioners. When we have considered these final petitions on Monday afternoon, we shall have completed our consideration of the petitions before us.

Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): You said, Sir, that no delegation had made reference to rule 86 (1). Am I to take it that a delegation has now drawn your attention to that rule?

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): To my recollection, no delegation has ever in the course of our meetings drawn the President's attention to rule 86 (1). None the less, that rule exists. In the spirit I have just described, I have not attempted to comply with that rule, but, as in all things, I am at the service of delegations in this regard.

I should make it clear too that, in connection with the questions I was asked by the Soviet delegation, I indicated when the Russian text of the petitions annexed to the report of the Visiting Mission would be available.



(The President)

I should like to draw attention to the fact that those petitions are not of the same nature as the ones we are now considering. The petitions to be translated were petitions addressed to the Visiting Mission, not to the Secretary-General. The latter are automatically translated into the official languages, circulated and considered by the Council as we are doing this morning.

I would therefore propose that without further delay we resume that consideration. I draw to members' attention T/COM.10/L.364/Add.1. We have already taken a decision on the main document (T/COM.10/L.364); this is an annex to it. May I take it, therefore, that the Council takes note of document T/COM.10/L.364/Add.1, as it did with regard to the main communication.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Council will now return to its consideration of the petitions contained in documents T/PET.10/346, 347, 384 to 392, 395 to 404, 406, 410 and 411.

I turn first to T/PET.10/346, 347, 384 and 385. Are there any comments on those petitions?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation is of the view that petition T/PET.10/385 is very important. It is important because it gives quite a detailed description of the situation of the population of Palau both before the holding of the so-called plebiscite on the Compact of Free Association of Palau with the United States and during that plebiscite. It also gives a description of some of the provisions of that Compact, and that description is significantly different from the one the representatives of the Administering Authority have tried and are still trying to give.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

First, the petition deals with how questions were put during the plebiscite. The problem is of knowing just what was being voted on by the inhabitants of Palau and the extent to which the plebiscite truly constitutes an exercise of free expression of the will of the people of Palau, as the Administering Authority maintains. This petition reveals that the people of Palau were not given a choice in determining their political future, but that there was only one path open to them, namely, to vote in favour of the so-called Compact of Free Association and its related agreement. The formulation of the ballot language did not provide for Palauans to choose an alternate political status.

The petition also notes that before the plebiscite was held the people of Palau were confused. On 4 February the representative of the Administering Authority stated that the political education campaign would include information on status options in addition to free association, including independence. In fact, that was not the case. The petition also brings out the fact that the ballot language is insufficient to comply with Palau's non-nuclear constitution.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

In fact, the general language proposed to the population of Palau hid the fact that the United States would have the right of transit and the right to bring nuclear weapons into the territory of Palau on board ships and aircraft. Many other provisions of the Compact are missing, too, provisions that put Palau into a subordinate position and show that it will depend entirely on the will of the United States.

Particular attention is drawn to the fact that in the Council itself the Administering Authority and its delegation of special advisers from Micronesia tried to give the impression that Palau had the right to conduct foreign affairs. In fact, that provision is reduced to naught by other sections of the Compact that show that any action by the Palau authorities will be considered by the United States from the point of view of its security needs, not to mention foreign policy matters that require consultations by the Palau authorities.

The question of Palau's sovereignty is raised separately in the petition. We are talking about a component part of that issue, the situation Palau will be in if the so-called Compact of Free Association is brought into force. Attention is also drawn to other sections, specifically to the military provisions of the Compact and agreements connected with the Compact. In particular, there is the serious matter of the United States Government's right to use any area of Palau for military purposes, in addition to those areas already designated for military use. The petitioners note that the United States Government is not obliged to agree to alternative regions, while the Palau Government has the obligation to make available to it any region within 60 days of its use being requested.

There is an even more important question in the petition: the fact that in the Military Use and Operating Rights Agreement those rights do not clearly terminate in 50 years. Even if the so-called Compact were annulled, the United States military rights would remain in force.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

We have heard speakers at this session say that the Compact is an expression of relations based on equal rights between the partners involved, the United States and Palau. Is that so? The petition shows clearly that it is not, that Palau is completely subjugated by the United States and transformed into a United States colony.

A question is raised with regard to the term "jurisdiction". We have tried to obtain from the representative of the Administering Authority clarification on how to understand the provision of the Compact that allows the United States neither to confirm nor to deny the presence of nuclear weapons on ships and aircraft and allows it to bring those weapons into the territory of Palau. In that context the term "within the jurisdiction of Palau" has been used. Do the exclusive zones where there will be United States military contingents or facilities fall within the jurisdiction of Palau or the United States?

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

At the time, the representative of the United States replied that any zones, including those designated exclusive zones for military purposes, would come under the jurisdiction of Palau. We should like to stress that answer particularly, so that it is not lost somewhere and forgotten. We should like that reply to be set down in capital letters in the records of the Trusteeship Council. Indeed, it would not be a bad idea to issue it as a separate document of the Council's fifty-third session, so that we do not later have to engage in a lengthy search when we want to remind ourselves what it said.

However, what most concerns the Trusteeship Council in this instance is the fact that the authors of the petition from the United Nations Methodist Office for the United Nations, which was dated 12 February 1986 and addressed to the Chairman of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Observe the Plebiscite in Palau, urge the Visiting Mission to take full account of the potential irregularities and obfuscated issues set forth in the petition when in Palau. The authors anticipate that the report of the Visiting Mission will contain statements similar to those in the petition and that it will fully address those and other points of concern for self-determination. We have already had an opportunity to speak about the quality of the report submitted by the Visiting Mission, but we must again note that, not surprisingly, none of those serious and important matters and issues set forth in the petition was taken into account by the Visiting Mission. It certainly ought to have done so.

Mr. ROCHER (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to make a brief comment, since the impartiality of the Visiting Mission to Observe the Plebiscite in Palau in February 1986 appears to be questioned.

I should like to recall the words of the Permanent Representative of France in his statement here last week with regard to our position. He stated that the inhabitants of Palau had, in February of this year,

(Mr. Rocher, France)

"freely chosen the status of free association with the United States in response to a series of questions, each of which gave them the option of independence." (T/PV.1615, p. 3)

As for the Visiting Mission, I can see that it is sometimes very difficult to face reality. The Visiting Mission was in Palau, not to participate in, but to observe the plebiscite. There was no irregularity in the conduct of the plebiscite, and the Visiting Mission noted that in its report. We fully carried out the mandate we were given by the Trusteeship Council.

I can also conceive that it may be difficult to admit that the populations of Palau, after having exercised its right to self-determination in 1983, were able to express themselves freely on their future political status. In other words, no matter how praiseworthy it may be, the petition cannot reproach the Trusteeship Council with having exceeded the norms established by the United Nations, because the right to self-determination had already been exercised in 1983.

Mr. BADER (United States of America): There are some journals that pay authors for their articles by the number of words in the article. Perhaps the representative of the United Kingdom can help me out on this, but I believe The Spectator in London was the first modern journal to operate on that principle. As I listened to the delegation of the Soviet Union discuss this petition, I am reminded of that style of operation. If the Soviet delegation operates on that principle, it must be a wealthy delegation indeed.

We have heard all of these allegations, which have now been raised once again, in repeated statements made throughout the course of the Council's proceedings, not only from the Soviet delegation, of course, but from these very same petitioners. I would call the Council's attention to the fact that this petition comes from Misses Susan Quass and Elizabeth Bounds. Miss Elizabeth Bounds also wrote a petition to the Council on behalf of the National Council of Churches of Christ.

(Mr. Bader, United States)

Reverend Miles Walburn appeared on behalf of that organization, and his petition dealt with precisely the same subject and was answered in some detail. So we are going over the same ground over and over and over.

The second point I should like to make is that this petition, which comes from New York City, was written on 12 February, in advance of the Visiting Mission and prior to its departure. Therefore, its concerns and its suspicions about possible inadequacies or points it is calling to the attention of the Visiting Mission have long since been addressed. The petition is overtaken by events and by the fact that the report of the Visiting Mission has since been issued and has dealt more than adequately with all the concerns raised.

I do not propose at this juncture to subject the Council to yet one more statement of our position on Palau. The Council has heard the eloquent words of President Salii refuting both the points in the petition and in the statement by the representative of the Soviet Union. To pick up on only a few points in the petition, as the representative of France just pointed out, the fact that the ballot language does not provide an alternate status choice is self-evidently due to the fact that that alternate status choice had been made in 1983 in the plebiscite, and also in the referendum in 1984. The results of those plebiscites and referendums are utterly consistent in their expression of the support of Palauans for the choice of free association. There was no need to offer those additional choices once again.

The petition also asserts that the ballot language is probably insufficient to comply with Palau's constitutional requirements. It then cites provisions for the amending of the Constitution. As we have said repeatedly, there was no attempt to amend the Constitution of Palau through this Compact.

(Mr. Bader, United States)

Most of the remaining points in the petition are addressed to the Visiting Mission. The Visiting Mission's report has dealt with them more than adequately. Among the points that the petition raises about the Compact is the following:

"The United States Government is not obligated to support the application of Palau for membership in international organizations." (T/PET.10/385, p. 3)

Of course, the United States cannot be in a position to support the application of Palau for membership in international organizations for which Palau may not be eligible under the terms of reference of that organization.

The description of the Compact says:

"The Government of Palau must absorb any difference between the actual return rate and the projected amount of \$US 15 million from year 16 through 50 of the Compact." (p. 3)

As the petition correctly notes, there is an investment fund being created which will be under the control of the Government of Palau. Funds are being provided to the Government of Palau in the first year. That fund will grow - assuming it is invested wisely - and the funds, which will be available from year 16 through 50 of the Compact, will be more than adequate.

I do not wish to comment on everything in the petition. I would just note one other sentence that leaps out at me in going over the petition. I quote from page 4, where there is the discussion about the "varying legal opinions on the percentage of votes cast needed for approval". It says:

"The Administering Authority has given a rationale for a simple majority voter approval of the Compact." (p. 4)

We not only gave a rationale, but Ambassador Byrne stated clearly in the Council during the special session that this was our clear view and that there could be no question in anyone's mind that this was the view of the United States,



(Mr. Bader, United States)

so that there would not be confusion subsequently over the adequacy of 50 per cent. In any event, the petition then offers an alternative rationale for a 75 per cent voter approval and it says:

"When a document does not have a single, clear interpretation to lawyers, how can it be said to present a clear choice to the general public?" (p. 4)

I find this an astonishing thought that any sentence anywhere provides a single, clear interpretation to lawyers. We have heard in the Council unending disputation among lawyers over the meaning of things which I would have thought were utterly self-evident to a layman who was not a member of the bar. If the political process is to be delayed indefinitely while all the lawyers of the world agree on the single possible interpretation of a piece of paper, then all political activity everywhere will rapidly grind to a halt.

The other point that is raised here in the petition concerns the jurisdiction of Palau. The United States delegation answered that question earlier. It is simply wrong to assert that the language used in reference to the areas which the United States might use for defence purposes within Palau is some sort of a subterfuge to exclude such areas from the term "jurisdiction of Palau". That term is understood as it is normally understood under international law.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to comment on the statement we have just heard. First I should like to say that I am not an English journalist. I do not weigh the words and I do not count words. It seems to me that here we have the same American approach as with all the other problems, that is, through the dollar. This is a question that we have frequently touched upon here to the effect that there are values in the world that do not fall under a dollar evaluation and which cannot be bought with dollars. As for the wealth of our delegation, we are wealthy in our

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

socialist morals - morals which do not permit us to consider questions relating to the future of the population of the Trust Territory through the prism of the dollar.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): Time does move on. On my order paper we are supposed to be considering written petitions. We seem to have made a quantum jump from that to socialist morals. I think perhaps we could get back to the situation in hand and actually consider the petitions that are before us.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I understand that the representative of the United Kingdom really does not like to listen to morals, but since we have also talked about the report of the Visiting Mission to Palau, and since the question here is linked to the future of the Trust Territory, I should like to draw the attention of the Council to the fact that what I am saying now is of full relevance to the petition and to what was just stated by the representative of the United States, who spoke to us about the newspaper The Spectator, as well as other things.

The comments we have heard here from the Administering Authority and the representative of France regarding the petition in no way refute its contents. There are still serious violations which have been permitted by the Administering Authority as regards the people of Palau - violations in the juridical, political and moral spheres. None of this was refuted - nor can it be - in the statements made today by the representative of the Administering Authority and certain other members of the Trusteeship Council.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): We now move on to documents T/PET.10/386 and 387.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Petition T/PET.10/386 concerns the very important matter of the conditions in which the people of the Trust Territory - specifically of Rongelap and Palau - are living. One particularly telling fact is reflected in the description of goods being provided in exchange for the use of land for nuclear testing. The petition states that these people were moved

"onto another barren island where their staple copra does not grow and they have to make an 11-hour boat journey to pick up supplies provided by the American Government". (T/PET.10/386)

The petition is important also because it speaks loudly and clearly of the need to eliminate nuclear weapons.

Mr. BADER (United States of America): I should like to comment briefly on this petition (T/PET.10/386), which comes from Bristol; in the United Kingdom. In its third paragraph, it says that

"The idea that a self-supporting small community should be forced by the Government of a nation much more powerful than it to leave its homeland entirely is ... shocking".

The petition is simply not accurate. The United States did not force the people of Rongelap to leave their atoll; they left voluntarily. The United States urged them to stay. We pointed out that Rongelap atoll was not dangerously radioactive. As we pointed out in our statement earlier, if the 233 people who live on Rongelap island eat only locally grown food - nothing imported from outside - their maximum annual dose rate would be rather less than that of the people who live in mainland United States, in Denver, Colorado.

So there was no question of the people of Rongelap being forced to leave. They left, in conjunction with a well-known anti-nuclear group, by their own choice. They are free to return to their atoll, which is regarded by nuclear scientists as safe.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I propose now to suspend our consideration of written petitions, which we shall resume at our next meeting, and to move to agenda item 8.

OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF TRUST TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (T/1890) (General Assembly resolutions 557 (VI) and 753 (VIII))

Mr. GRIGUTIS (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): As in previous years, the report of the Administering Authority and other documents before the Trusteeship Council do not reflect the true state of affairs with regard to the training of highly qualified specialists with a view to self-sufficient development. Certain data is lacking in this regard.

We do not know the number of specialists in the islands with higher or middle-level education. We do not know the number of doctors, engineers, economists, lawyers or other specialists. The only success of which we know is that one Micronesian has received a doctoral degree, but it took nearly 40 years to realize that significant achievement.

Clearly, the situation could be far better. It would be better if all possibilities for assistance to the Micronesians were used to help them acquire knowledge and to take advantage of the experience of other countries.

The report of the Secretary-General tells us that in the past 11 Member States had made scholarships available to Micronesian students. But those opportunities are not seized. Why, for instance, are virtually no Micronesians taking courses in the United States? Is that an accident? We do not think so. It is clear that the Micronesians do not know of the possibilities and conditions for receiving education in other countries which are providing assistance in the training of national personnel in the framework of the United Nations system.

(Mr. Grigutis, USSR)

The Soviet Union and several other socialist countries have offered scholarships to students from the Trust Territory, but unfortunately, although our country has great experience in training specialists for developing countries, we see again that there are no Micronesian students studying in the Soviet Union.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): Contrary to what the representative of the Soviet Union has just said, the people of the Trust Territory continue to receive educational assistance from several Members of the United Nations, in addition to what they receive from the United States. We are grateful especially to Australia, New Zealand and Japan for providing assistance to Micronesian students in specific areas. Our sincere thanks go also to Fiji and Papua New Guinea for acting as hosts to several of these programmes.

I should like also to mention that, in addition to these national bilateral aid projects, there are several training and study projects sponsored by various regional and international agencies, such as the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, the South Pacific Commission, the United Nations Development Programme and others.

I wish now to respond to one of the perennial questions raised by the representative of the USSR. Much to our chagrin, this year we had no offers from the Soviet Union of scholarships of any type. As we have stated in previous years, the Administering Authority imposes no condition or restriction on where Micronesian students may go for their education. We expect that they will continue to accept offers from other places in the world where English is the language of instruction and where the course offerings are relevant to their developmental needs.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I would respond to the representative of the United States by saying that it seems to us that her statement did not address the substance of the matter. We are considering the question of offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Trust Territories. Against that background, we were examining the state of affairs in the Trust Territory.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

The representative of the United States did not in fact indicate how the opportunities provided by the programme set up many years ago by the United Nations are used. The representative of the United States said that the Soviet Union made no offers to the United States to train Micronesians in the Soviet Union. To be frank, the Soviet Union should not have to make such offers. The Soviet Union participates in the relevant United Nations programme, and it is our understanding that that programme is run according to a certain system. The Administering Authority has been told of the opportunities offered it by the United Nations.

Clearly, looking at the report before us, we see that the United States has provided no information to the Secretary-General. I have read that report carefully; the United States, the Administering Authority, is not even mentioned there. We get the impression that the Administering Authority knows - or perhaps wishes to know - nothing about this programme. The question of this programme is considered annually, at every session of the Trusteeship Council.

Paragraph 3 of the report states that, "As stated in previous reports, 11 Member States had in the past made scholarships available under this programme" and proceeds to list them. The report states also that information was received from the Soviet Union in response to the request of the Secretary-General, who inquired whether any students were studying under the scholarships offered by States participating in the programme.

The report states further that the Polish People's Republic had informed the Secretary-General that it had offered two scholarships for students from the Trust Territory. There is a question about whether or not those scholarships were used. That is what we should be discussing.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): I merely wish to reiterate that offers of study and training are examined and accepted when they are proffered. I also mentioned in my earlier statement that advantage has very definitely been taken of offers from such regional and international agencies as the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), a sub-organ of the United Nations, and the United Nations Development Programme, a key specialized agency dealing with development, to mention only the two United Nations organs. I believe also that the four Micronesian States will in the future take even greater advantage of the offers of ESCAP now that they have achieved individual associate membership of that body, which is, as I believe I have already noted, one further recognition of the political status which they have achieved.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Since no other delegation wishes speak on this item, I shall take it that the Trusteeship Council decides to take note of the report of the Secretary-General (T/1890).

It was so decided.



DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE INTERNATIONAL TRUSTEESHIP SYSTEM IN TRUST TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (T/1889) (TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL RESOLUTION 36 (III) AND GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 754 (VIII)) (continued)

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We have some questions in connection with the Secretary-General's report (T/1889) and some ideas to put forward.

Paragraph 5 says:

"The Department of Public Information sent copies of the report of the Visiting Mission as soon as they became available at Headquarters ... through the United Nations Information Centre in Tokyo. The High Commissioner of the Trust Territory, however, indicated that she would have preferred to receive a copy of the document before it was released to the press."

The fact that the High Commissioner expressed a desire to familiarize herself with the report in advance is perhaps not a matter that we need be concerned about, in itself; it is only natural. But why was that mentioned in the report? The Department of Public Information must have had some reason for mentioning it or proposing that the Secretary-General include it in the report.

Secondly, what is the situation here? A United Nations document on the Trust Territory is disseminated, and I suppose it is necessary for the Administering Authority to acquaint itself with the report. But what happens if there is censorship? We know the content of the report, and it contains hardly anything that could give rise to particular concern on the part of the representative of the Administering Authority, the High Commissioner. We have already discussed the report, but this situation concerns and puzzles us. We should appreciate clarification from the representative of the Department of Public Information, our old friend Mr. Masha.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I call upon Mr. Masha.

Mr. MASHA (Department of Public Information): It is a pleasure for me to appear once again before the Council. I wish to respond to the comments made by the representative of the Soviet Union.

The reference in paragraph 5 to the High Commissioner's having indicated that she would have preferred to receive a copy of the document before it was released to the press is perhaps an aspect of our wish to be as open as possible about what we know and how we do our work. As far as we know, there was not the slightest indication in any communication from the High Commissioner that she intended to exercise any censorship.

It should be borne in mind that the DPI's role is to send material to the media and various organizations. We sent the document to the press, and we are simply reflecting the fact that as a courtesy the High Commissioner would have preferred to receive a copy. That is exactly how we took it. It was not our role to do anything other than to distribute it to her office, as we distribute it to any other body. But we acknowledge that as a courtesy it would have been right for her to receive a copy, though not necessarily from our Department.

I repeat that there was not the slightest indication that the High Commissioner wanted to censor our work. Perhaps the representative of the Administering Authority has more comments on that. It is simply a matter that we are acknowledging in the report, without there being anything behind it.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The report contains a list of information material distributed in the Trust Territory. Does that cover everything that was distributed this year? Was anything omitted?

Mr. MASHA (Department of Public Information): As in previous reports - this can be seen from last year's report - we list all the materials we send. The list contains only those items that we know for sure, from our records, have been

(Mr. Masha)

distributed in the area. We cannot be certain that they are the only United Nations materials to reach the area. It will be noted that the report states that, for example, the Visiting Mission distributed some materials in the area. We do not know what material the Administering Authority may distribute. I repeat that the list is of materials that we in the Department are quite certain were distributed in the area. I cannot say that no other materials have gone to the area.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I thank Mr. Masha for his answer. I have one further question in this connection: does the Department of Public Information consider itself obliged to send all United Nations materials on decolonization to the Trust Territory - not materials of a general nature, but specific documents relating directly to the Trust Territory?

Mr. MASHA (Department of Public Information): The job of the Department of Public Information - and this is what we consider to be our primary responsibility - is to send out material that is either produced within the Department or material that is produced in the United Nations system that is of a public-information nature. That is what the Department considers to be its primary responsibility. However, on the basis of past discussions in the Trusteeship Council, and in consultation with the secretariat of the Council, we have in past years sent official documents as part of our work. We have not, therefore, in any way avoided sending any material to the area, whether it was directly of a public-information nature or whether it was in the form of official United Nations documents, which are not necessarily our purview.

I should like to add that there are a number of documents produced by our Information Centre system that are sent to depositary libraries and other such institutions. We also make sure that those documents are sent to the Trust Territory either directly by us or the secretariat of the Council, or through the library system. Therefore, much as our primary responsibility is only for materials relevant to public information, on this subject and in this area, we do send all material that we have that would be of interest to the region.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): One more question: in this instance, does the Department of Public Information use the normal postal channels or does it use some additional or other

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

channels. If, for example, DPI felt that some material needed to be sent to the Trust Territory very speedily, what channels would it use to get it there?

Mr. MASHA (Department of Public Information): The normal way we send our public-information materials, at least the publications and cassettes, is through the pouch system. However, over the years - and there have been prior discussions about this in the Council - there have been indications that some of those materials might better be sent occasionally via direct mail. We have done that on occasion. As I indicated earlier, some of the Visiting Missions took specific documents with them for direct, on-the-spot distribution. Some of our materials, especially in the audio-visual areas, are broadcast from radio and television stations. When we used short-wave they were broadcast to the region. When they are sent to regions, neighbouring stations that can reach that region broadcast them directly. There are various means through which public-information material reaches the area.

I should like to draw the Council's attention to paragraph 13 of the report, which notes that the information officer who visited the region did suggest - and we shall look into it - that perhaps there might have been some delay in some of the material's reaching there or being distributed, and that we should consider that instead of sending the material the usual way, in bulk shipments, we might use some mailing by air.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): On the basis of those general questions, I should now like to ask several specific questions. In order to ask them, I needed to have a clear picture, which I think I have now almost achieved from the answers given by the representative of the Department of Public Information.

My first specific question is: on the list of United Nations publications, I do not see any reference to the report of the Trusteeship Council on the Council's

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

last session, which DPI should have distributed in the Territory. Nor do I see any reference in that list to the report of the Committee on the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. There is no reference to any of the materials issued by the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly at its last session, and I do not see any reference to document T/1884 of 21 February 1986, which is a document setting forth the position of the Soviet Union on the question of Micronesia.

Mr. MASHA (Department of Public Information): Paragraph 4 of the report states as follows:

"The Mission, which took place from 16 July to 3 August, was accompanied by members of the Secretariat, who provided to each entity of the Trust Territory a complete set of Official Records of the Trusteeship Council."

(T/1889, para. 4)

(Mr. Masha)

The Council will notice that in the footnote on page 4 we make reference to several other documents which were available. On page 6 there are references to matters pertaining to the Committee of 24 as well as the other documents to which I have made reference. But let me say that if there is any particular document which the representative of the Soviet Union wishes to make sure is delivered, as long as it is an official document of the United Nations and he lets us know what it is, then we will make sure it reaches the Territory. Of course, we would have to identify the kind of interest he may have in the document, which we would then be glad to send. In other words, we have no limitation in terms of sending an official document, and if there is any document that is of particular interest to the representative of the Soviet Union which does not appear in these records - and it should be borne in mind that last year we had considerable discussion as to how we select some of these materials - we will be glad to see if there is interest in that material and will have no difficulty in sending it.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): Mr. Masha's point about identifying interest in documentation is, of course, extremely important and central to any successful information operation. The question of end-user and feedback on information sent to various parts of the world by Information Centres is in itself important and was actually discussed at some length in the Committee on Programme Co-ordination earlier this year and, no doubt, will feature again in the Committee on Information in June. It is basically concerned with how the Department of Public Information (DPI) works out, how its information has been used, what mechanism exists for saying that such-and-such a document is particularly in demand and such-and-such a document is not. I notice, for example, that in the list appended to the Secretary-General's report we have a sort of nice round figure

(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

of 80 documents sent for most of them, and then suddenly we have 53 documents for Development Forum, and no less than 351 copies of General Assembly resolution 39/10, on the International Year of Peace.

I wonder if Mr. Masha could tell us a little more about how the DPI goes about assessing the sort of material that is in demand in the Trust Territory.

Mr. MASHA (Department of Public Information): As we report almost every year, we do send information officers to the area to assess not only the needs for public information materials but also to get an indication of the utilization of those materials in the area and, of course, to touch base with the users in the area.

Last year we reported to the Council that we had not sent any information officers, as we usually did. But, as we say in the present report, last year we did send one, and in the previous years we had sent information officers. We also state in the report that we did send a radio officer to the area.

It is on the basis of the feedback we get from our people in the area, together with the mail we may receive through our department directly from people requesting specific material, that we are able to assess what material is needed - and, let me be candid, we do not send it in every case; there are times when we are guided by previous experience or by assumptions we may have to make. We send materials - depending on their nature - assuming that they may be of use. But, in any case, in a follow-up visit by our information officers we ascertain whether our assumptions were correct or not.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I have listened very carefully to what was said by the representative of



(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

the Department of Public Information (DPI) in answer to our question, and I am still not satisfied with his explanations and the fact that the report is drawn up in this way.

The question arises as to why the selection of the official records of the Organization is just mentioned in passing in the report. The report does not tell us what was involved in the selection of official records, or how many copies of this "complete set" were sent out.

Judging from the text of paragraph 4, we feel we must take it that in each entity of the Trust Territory there is one complete set of the official records of the Trusteeship Council. Is this a lot or just a little? Evidently for the Mission going there it was a lot, since they had to take all these records with them, but from the point of view of the population of the Trust Territory and their ability to obtain a broad range of information, quite clearly it is very, very little.

Furthermore, once again, in a footnote it is stated that the official records of the Trusteeship Council, including the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council and the resolutions of the Council and so forth, were sent to the Territory. But once again it is not clear how many copies were sent and why the basic materials concerning the work of the Trusteeship Council on the question of the Trust Territory are subject to such an unequal treatment vis-à-vis other documentation sent to the Territory by DPI. It seems to me that it is a very serious omission on the part of the Department not to inform the Trusteeship Council of the volume of material to be received in the Trust Territory.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Finally, the last remark made by the representative of the Department of Public Information is one that I cannot agree with. I cannot agree with it simply because he has stated that if any delegation is interested in having information get to the Trust Territory it should go to DPI and ask it to send this information to the Territory. Now, after all, this is a Trusteeship Council document; I am not saying that we should ensure that Security Council and General Assembly documents get there, but DPI certainly should have reacted to this document appropriately and not left it for delegations to have to go to it and say that they would really like this statement to be sent to the Territory.

Finally, is it a regular practice that delegations must go to DPI and request that it give its attention to a Council document and that such document be sent to a Trust Territory? I think that this gives rise to a basic question of principle, and I should like the DPI representative to comment and to reach the appropriate conclusions from our discussions today.

Mr. MASHA (Department of Public Information): In paragraph 3, we said that

"Documents of the Trusteeship Council as well as copies of press releases and the United Nations News Digest were airmailed by the Distribution Section directly from Headquarters [in New York] to the Trust Territory ...". (T/1889, para. 3)

And then in the foot-note on page 4 we stated exactly which documents these were, giving a list of the documents we had sent.

I would have thought that we would consider this as a co-operative effort by both the Secretariat and the relevant intergovernmental bodies. While we believe we send all the materials that are relevant and needed in the area, should a document for any reason be inadvertently missed out we would welcome - in a co-operative spirit of providing information to the Territory - suggestions from

(Mr. Masha)

any source, in particular from delegations which may have noted an omission that we might have made. It was only in that spirit that I suggested that, if the delegation of the Soviet Union felt that there was an official document that might not have been distributed but which it strongly felt should be, it could let us know and we would be glad to distribute it. It was not a suggestion that we receive instructions from any quarter as to what material we should distribute.

Once again, if there is a document that any delegation believes we might have missed - we do not think there is, but should there be any - and makes this known to us, we shall assess the need for it and be glad to distribute it.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Perhaps Mr. Masha and I do not understand each other or perhaps we are talking in different terms, but right at the beginning I asked Mr. Masha the question, has document T/1884 been sent to the Trust Territory? He used a different document number: A/41/168-S/17838. I asked: Has this document been sent? If not, why not? Mr. Masha answered twice that if some delegation feels that it is necessary to have this document sent on they can go to the Department of Public Information, but we do not know whether or not DPI has sent it.

We asked the question, has this document been sent on or not? We see from Mr. Masha's last answer that it has so far not been sent.

The question then arises, why was it not sent? Does DPI not follow up as to whether documents that have been issued by the United Nations have been sent? Or perhaps someone decided that that document was not very important and that there was not much point in sending it to the Territory. That is what we are talking about.

Finally, I repeat once again that I do not understand why documents which relate directly to the Trust Territory are in such an unequal situation as regards

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

other documents. We cannot understand from the documents how many of these documents directly relating to the Trust Territory were sent to it. Perhaps a sufficient number was sent there. In that case we need not express dissatisfaction, but the representative of DPI is not giving a clear answer to this. He is referring to a footnote at the end of a page. Would it be a disgrace to answer such an important question? Of course not. It would be difficult, first, to agree with such an approach as regards basic materials on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. If possible we should like to have a list from DPI at the next meeting with the appropriate explanations. If Mr. Masha still does not know what has happened to the document I have mentioned (T/1884), perhaps at the next meeting he could tell us when this document was sent to the Territory and how many copies.

Mr. MASHA (Department of Public Information): The information I have is that documents A/41/168 and S/17838 were issued recently. Document T/1884 was issued on 21 February 1986. This is a communication addressed to the Secretary-General as a document of the Trusteeship Council, and normally this kind of document would be reflected, if sent in this form, in our report next year should there be a session.

We do not automatically send everything we get at the time we get it, but we would be reporting to the Council next year, and at that time the documents issued in the intervening period will be reflected.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It seems to me that the atmosphere is thickening further, after the last statement made by Mr. Masha. If we could only know whether or not the document issued on 21 February was sent. But if we are only to know that it is going to be sent in a year's time, then we would say that this does not reflect favourably on DPI. I am now even more concerned that a written communication to the Secretary-General of the United Nations comes under the category of documents which are not necessarily sent to the Trust Territory, especially since such a document relates directly to the Territory. That is a source of profound concern and gives rise to serious questions as regards the work of DPI. Further, it reflects not only on DPI but also on the distribution of documents within the Trusteeship Council. As we know, initially it was not even distributed in the Trusteeship Council. It has been distributed only at the request of the Soviet Union and was not in the documents room next to this Chamber. Why has that happened?

Mr. MASHA (Department of Public Information): We shall check with our colleagues in Conference Services who are partly responsible for the distribution of some of the documents, of this kind in particular, to see whether it was actually sent. I cannot say for sure that this document has not been sent to the relevant places in the Territory.

However, I want to say that, if it was not sent, this cannot be blamed on DPI, because, as I tried to indicate at the very beginning, the Department of Public Information has responsibility for public-information material and specific documents are not automatically its responsibility. But this is not to absolve the Secretariat as a whole in terms of its work. If it has not been sent - and I am not sure that it has not - blame does not attach to DPI. None the less we shall check with our colleagues in Conference Services.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I take note that an answer will be given later to the questions asked by the representative of the Soviet Union. Apart from that answer - to which we shall return - and if there is no other comment I now suggest that the Council take note of the report of the Secretary-General contained in document \_\_\_\_.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): So what are we doing, Mr. President? You now want to adopt the report even though we have not concluded consideration of this question. We have asked Mr. Masha to give the Trusteeship Council at its next meeting a list that would indicate the number of copies of documents relating directly to the work of the Trusteeship Council which have been distributed.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Secretariat has confirmed that an answer will be given to the questions asked by the representative of the Soviet Union at our meeting on Monday, and I have taken due note of the questions. Nevertheless, I should like us to be perfectly clear. If the representative of the Soviet Union, apart from these two matters, has any other questions I should like them to be asked now because I do not want us to spend too much time Monday morning considering this item. Have I understood the representative of the Soviet Union correctly that, apart from those two questions that have just been mentioned, we shall not reopen discussion on other points on Monday morning?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, I raised this question because, depending on the answer we get from the representative of DPI, we may have further comments. It all depends on what is submitted to us, and with the understanding that we can make those comments we are ready to agree to the procedure you are proposing to us now.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): That is exactly how I understood it with regard to the two specific questions that were asked by the representative of the Soviet Union. There will be answers to them and he can, of course, comment on them. I merely wished to make sure that there would be no other questions being asked that have nothing to do with these two specific questions. I invited him to ask such questions now so that we might have them answered.

In the circumstances, may I take it that the Council can now take note of the report of the Secretary-General contained in document T/1889, it being understood that we shall return to the two questions asked by the representative of the Soviet Union, at which time he can comment on the answers given to them.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): Mr. President, we have a very brief statement to make. I leave it in your hands as to whether you would wish me to make it today or to postpone it until Monday.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In the circumstances, we shall hear the statement of the delegation of the United States next Monday, when I shall ask all delegations to be brief on this item. I shall therefore adjourn the meeting now, without our taking note of the report.

The next meeting will be held on Monday afternoon at 3 o'clock.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.