

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



UN LIBRARY

MAY 24 1984

Distr.
GENERAL
T/PV.1567
18 May 1984

ENGLISH

Fifty-first session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 17 May 1984, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. RAPIN (France)

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

Hearing of petitioners (continued)

Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 September 1983: Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (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.

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.

84-60775 4945V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m

EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS LISTED IN THE ANNEX TO THE AGENDA (continued)
(see T/1864/Add.1)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): May I first of all inform the Council that we have received a telegram from Mr. Walden Bello, Washington representative of the United States Nuclear Free Pacific, requesting that Mr. Glenn Alcalay, Scientific Adviser to their Organization, testify before the Trusteeship Council at the Council's current session.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the request for a hearing is granted.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The telegram will be distributed as an official document of the Trusteeship Council. I should like to point out that Mr. Alcalay is prepared to speak this afternoon.

Furthermore, we have received a letter dated 14 May 1984 from Ms. Susanne Roff, Executive Director of the New York Office of the Minority Rights Group (New York), Inc., in which she requests to be heard by the Council at its current session. She also indicates in her letter that her Organization would like to introduce as part of its statement a film entitled Strategic Trust lasting 20 minutes.

Rule 78 of the Council's rules of procedure states:

"Petitions may be presented in writing in accordance with rules 79 to 86, or orally in accordance with rules 86 to 90."

In connection with oral petitions, rule 80 (1) of the Council's rules states:

"The Trusteeship Council may hear oral presentations in support or elaboration of a previously submitted written petition. Oral presentations shall be confined to the subject-matter of the petition as stated in writing by the petitioners. The Trusteeship Council, in exceptional cases, may also hear orally petitions which have not been previously submitted in writing, provided that the Trusteeship Council and the Administering Authority concerned, have been previously informed with regard to their subject-matter."

(The President)

The Council's rules of procedure thus provide for oral petitions contained in oral statements, which means that a person who has made a request in writing is authorized to appear before the Council and speak. The request to present a film, or any other request which does not correspond strictly to the presentation of an oral statement, is not therefore covered by the Council's rules of procedure.

In exceptional cases such requests may be granted, but this must be the explicit decision of the Council or its President, who exercises his authority in keeping with the wishes of the members of the Council. It is necessary, therefore, that such requests be brought to the attention of the President and the other officers of the Council through the secretariat of the Council before the meeting of the Council at which the petitioner is invited to speak. I feel that the President has a duty, before taking such a decision within the powers entrusted to him under his mandate and on his own responsibility, to determine the feeling of members of the Council, if he considers this necessary.

It seems to me that in taking this decision two considerations must be borne in mind. The first is the desire not to rule out any information which could be useful to the Council in carrying out its task, taking into account, as was the case yesterday, the cultural environment of the petitioner. The second is the equally important concern to act in accordance with the customs and practices of the United Nations, so that our discussions and deliberations may appear to observers of every cultural background to have the proper significance and maintain the necessary high standard.

I have requested the Secretary of the Council to inform petitioners that any request to make statements other than through oral presentations which have not been brought to the attention of the officers of the Committee will be the subject of a procedural decision at a meeting before the President takes a decision at a subsequent meeting. I shall apply this rule during my presidency.

As regards the request made by Ms. Roff, therefore, I propose not to take a decision until I have consulted the Department of Public Information.

Generally speaking, I shall accede to such requests only in exceptional circumstances.

HEARING OF PETITIONERS (continued)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): We shall now hear a petitioner whose request for a hearing, contained in document T/PET.10/321, was granted earlier.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Edward Temengil took a place at the petitioners' table.

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

Mr. TEMENGIL: In January 1981, several Micronesians - among them me - after many years of addressing petition after petition to the Administering Authority without success, decided to file a lawsuit in the United States District Court in the Northern Marianas. In that lawsuit we seek only justice and fair treatment by the United States Government in paying its employees.

Ever since the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands came into being, the United States Government has had as an official policy wage discrimination against its Micronesian employees. For many years, when Micronesians were not educated, we accepted wage discrimination because we were told that we did not have the required educational qualifications.

By the 1960s, however, many Micronesians had enough education to hold many positions then held by Americans, and many were indeed promoted to jobs once reserved for Americans. But, sadly, Micronesians were paid and have continued to be paid to this day different, lower, wages and salaries than those paid to their American counterparts.

I come before this world body today to seek support for this just fight for simple justice. All we are asking from the United States, our Administering Authority, is to abolish its racially based wage discrimination against Micronesians and to compensate those who have worked for the Trust Territory in the past under a discriminatory wage scale. We are asking no more and no less - simply what is due to us.

It is the strong belief of the over 400 Micronesians who will be affected by this lawsuit that the United States will refuse to resolve this issue, in the hope that it will just die away after the trusteeship ends. We come to this body as a last resort to resolve the matter. It is not to our advantage nor to that of the

(Mr. Temengil)

Administering Authority to let this case drag on. As the plaintiff in this case, we are prepared to settle the lawsuit out of court, to the mutual satisfaction of the two parties. What we now request of this body is to persuade the United States to sit down and negotiate this matter out of court.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I shall now call on representatives who wish to put questions to the petitioners heard by the Trusteeship Council either yesterday or this morning.

Mrs. COCHEME (France) (interpretation from French): In his statement yesterday Mr. Weisgall told us of the economic difficulties experienced by the Bikinians in the 1950s. My delegation would like to know what the situation is today. Specifically, what is the average per capita income of the inhabitants of Bikini today - that is, their annual income? Of course, I have in mind also the various grants, allowances and subsidies paid by the Administering Authority.

My delegation would also like to know what the situation will be once the Compact of Free Association has entered into force - in other words, the amount that will be paid to each inhabitant of Bikini, and for how long.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Jonathan Weisgall took a place at the petitioners' table.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I call on Mr. Weisgall.

Mr. WEISGALL: The first compensation to the people of Bikini was paid in 1956, when the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory established a trust fund of approximately \$300,000 on behalf of the people of Bikini, in return for their giving up their right to Bikini Atoll and agreeing that any future claims of the Bikini people would be against the Bikinians signing the agreement with the United States, not against the United States or the Trust Territory Government. That trust fund paid, I believe, a per capita income of approximately \$30 annually to the people of Bikini through the 1950s and 1960s and into the 1970s.

In 1975 the United States Congress appropriated the sum of \$3 million in trust as an ex gratia, or charitable, payment to the people of Bikini and in 1978 appropriated an additional \$3 million for that trust fund. The corpus of that trust fund is today approximately \$6 million, and it provides approximately \$38 per month per Bikinian. There are approximately 1,200 Bikinians. The trustee of that trust fund is the Hawaiian Trust Company in Honolulu.

In addition Congress in September 1982 appropriated money for a trust fund for the resettlement and relocation of the Bikini people within the Marshall Islands,

(Mr. Weisgall)

and Congress provided that of the sum appropriated \$3 million would be paid out ex gratia to the people of Bikini over approximately a three-year period. Those payments expire on 1 June 1984. That is not any kind of ongoing payment. The only current ongoing payment is the \$6 million trust fund, which provides a monthly amount, as I have said, of about \$38. That is the situation as it stands today.

With respect to the second part of the question, concerning the payments once the Compact of Free Association becomes effective, the section 177 agreement subsidiary to the Compact will provide payments to the people of Bikini of \$5 million per year for a 15-year period. Of the \$5 million, \$2.4 million is to be distributed to the people, and the remaining \$2.6 million is to go into a trust fund. I am doing the mathematics in my head, but if you divide \$2.4 million by 1,200 Bikinians, I think it works out to \$2,000 per capita per year for the people of Bikini. The purpose of the distribution scheme, that is, distributing a little less than half of that sum and putting more than half into a trust fund, is to take care of the Bikini people beyond the fifteenth year of the Compact of Free Association. I hope that adequately addresses the question.

Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom): I would like to follow that up, because I am interested in some of these details of compensation. I wonder whether Mr. Weisgall would also give details of other compensatory measures which have been taken - for instance, in the field of housing. Would that add significantly to the picture he has painted? Am I right in saying, from his figures, that at the moment there is a total in trust of \$6 million and that in the future there will be an additional trust fund of \$2.6 million, assuming the Compact of Free Association is adopted? That would make a trust fund of \$8.6 million for them. In addition they would have had their distribution of \$2.4 million, and in addition to that there would be that compensatory trust fund of 1956 which pays a certain amount annually. I did not quite gather how much that was. Could he give the total, therefore, of the amounts that would be in trust and the totals that have been distributed or under the present plans would be distributed per capita?

Mr. WEISGALL: The representative of the United Kingdom is correct in saying that there is one trust fund totalling \$6 million, which, as I said, averages a monthly payment of \$38 per person. With respect to the payments under the Compact of Free Association, it is contemplated, under an agreed minute to the section 177 subsidiary agreement, that each year's payment of \$5 million will be divided as follows: part, \$2.4 million, would be distributed directly to the

(Mr. Weisgall)

people, and the remaining part, \$2.6 million, would go into trust. To correct one possible wrong impression, I would point out that \$2.6 million will be added annually to a trust fund for 15 years. I would have to do the mathematics on that, but I think that over a 15-year period the trust fund would add up to upwards of \$25 million.

With respect to housing, the United States Government did construct houses on Kili and Ejit Islands in 1978, at the time of the second removal of the Bikini people. There was of course housing on Kili, and some new houses were added at the time, and some housing was built on Ejit. Those houses were built by a private contractor and their condition after some six years or so varies from house to house, but most are in a general condition of disrepair. I do not exactly see how that would be added to any kind of compensation package as such.

I would answer the last question raised by the representative of the United Kingdom, concerning the 1956 payment, as follows. In the mid-1970s the value of the \$300,000 payment from 1956 had decreased to \$180,000 as a result of the investment scheme of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory, who was the trustee of that fund. I do not know why the value had decreased from \$300,000 to \$180,000. All I know is that in the late 1970s that trust fund, to the best of my knowledge, was terminated and perhaps included in the new trust fund created. My knowledge here, however, is second-hand, and I would suggest that perhaps the High Commissioner's Office may be able to provide more detailed information on that point.

In conclusion, it is difficult to put a total figure on what the compensation will be once the Compact becomes effective. The one point I can make is that the trust fund concept - of taking money, putting it in trust so that there will be a sum in perpetuity to take care of the Bikini people - is in my opinion a good way to deal with the situation and the compensation needs of the Bikini people.

I think one has to differentiate here between compensation that is due to the Bikini people for past damages and loss of lands and islands and for the situation they experienced from 1946 to the present on the one hand, and, on the other, a present and future obligation to clean up Bikini. In that regard, the Council should know that the lawsuit pending in Federal Court in Honolulu calling for a clean-up of Bikini does not seek any dollar damages for the people of Bikini; it seeks only a court order directing the United States Government to clean up Bikini. As a footnote I might add that the people of Bikini, when faced with the

(Mr. Weisgall)

vote on the Compact of Free Association, fully realized that it was going to provide some compensation for them, but nevertheless over 90 per cent voted against the Compact, largely because there was no commitment to clean up their islands.

Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom): I am grateful to Mr. Weisgall for helping me with those figures. Could I just ask him whether he has included this Congressional Resettlement Trust Fund - the \$3 million ex gratia payment which he mentioned earlier and which expired in 1984. Should that therefore be noted as being a payment which had been divided up amongst the Bikinians and which would therefore appear, not as a trust for the future, but as something that had been paid in the past? How much would that amount to per person, in addition to the payments made out of the trust funds?

Mr. WEISGALL: I had included that in my response to the first question from the representative of the United Kingdom but I neglected to include it in the answer I just gave. The answer is yes: the \$3 million was distributed to the people of Bikini. The full amount of \$3 million will have been fully distributed by 1 June 1984, over approximately this two to three-year period. I am again doing my mathematics very quickly here, but I think it results in a payment over that period of time of approximately \$2,800 per capita; and just to make sure that the answer is clear here, for the record, I may say that is compensation paid to the people as opposed to funds for construction or resettlement. That was actual dollar compensation to the Bikini people.

Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom): I am beginning to get the picture now, but I should just like to check my figures. First of all, it appears to me - and I should be grateful if Mr. Weisgall could correct me if I am wrong - that each Bikinian would have received approximately \$2,800 as a lump sum. In addition to that, they would have had the housing that he mentioned and, in addition to that, the trust funds - if you add what has already been put into the trust funds and what would be if the Compact of Free Association was adopted - amounting to some \$31 million in trust for these 1,200 people. Am I correct in that arithmetic?

Mr. WEISGALL: Recognizing that I did very poorly in mathematics in high school, and with that one caveat, I may say those numbers appear to be approximately correct.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I wish to inform the Council that copies of the statement made by Mr. Edward Temengil will be distributed to members of the Council.

Mr. GRIGUTIS (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation has listened with great attention to the statements made by Mr. Weisgall and we understand the great concern expressed in his statements yesterday and today. We respond with great understanding to the comments that he made in respect of the suffering of the people of Bikini and in his accusations against the Administering Authority of violation of the human rights of those people, the people of Bikini and Enewetak, and the horrible suffering that they have endured. Great damage was also done to the health of the people and so they are entitled to turn to any body, including, as Mr. Weisgall said, the International Court of Justice, for a just settlement of all matters relating to Bikini.

We should like to ask Mr. Weisgall whether he considers that as regards the nuclear-weapon testing in Bikini and Enewetak and the resulting resettlement of the Bikinians on other islands, the indescribable living conditions they have, the tremendous and extreme disrespect for their needs with regard to living conditions, medical services and so forth - points that have been mentioned - the Administering Authority is flagrantly flouting the basic human rights and freedoms of the indigenous population of Micronesia and what has been settled in agreements? Has all this been violated? I would like an answer to this question.

Mr. WEISGALL: Before responding, I need a little clarification. I think the first part of the question was whether the actions should be viewed as a violation of the basic human rights of the people of Bikini. The second part was not clear. I think it was whether agreements have been made with respect to those violations.

Mr. GRIGUTIS (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I was referring to the Trusteeship Agreement, the Agreement signed by the Administering Authority and the Security Council.

Mr. WEISGALL: It is difficult to characterize the treatment of the Bikini people over a 38-year period. I think that the neglect they suffered in the early years after their resettlement was serious. The people were first moved in 1946 to Rongerik Atoll, some 125 miles from Bikini, and were left with approximately six weeks' supply of food. One year later a doctor was sent to examine the people and he reported that they were literally starving to death.

This matter would have got nowhere but for the fact that a former United States Secretary of the Interior, Harold Ickes, who published a column in a newspaper, pointed out the plight of the Bikini people at the time - approximately

(Mr. Weisgall)

1947. As a result of that notoriety, measures were taken, and eventually, in March 1948, the people of Bikini were moved to Kwajalein Atoll, where they lived in a tent city for approximately six months. Then in 1948 they moved down to Kili.

The record of the United States in those years was deplorable. The record of the United States with respect to the Bravo shot of 1954 was equally deplorable. The documents that I discussed yesterday, which came to light only in the past 12 months, showed, I believe, a knowing violation of article 6 of the Trusteeship Agreement, under which the Administering Authority agreed to "protect the inhabitants against the loss of their lands and resources". To detonate 23 announced atomic and hydrogen bombs would certainly constitute a violation of article 6. I think that knowingly to detonate a bomb, with full knowledge that the wind was headed towards the other islands of Bikini and that the islands would be rendered uninhabitable, constitutes an even greater level of negligence. So I do not think that anyone here today can deny a violation with regard to the people of Bikini of article 6 of the Trusteeship Agreement.

Indeed, the facts are really not in dispute. United States scientists have confirmed that Bikini must remain off limits for a period of time. In a letter to the United States Congress dated 1 July 1979 the Department of the Interior said exactly that.

So I do not think this is a complicated issue. The problem arises because once the Compact becomes effective there may not be an adequate judicial forum within which to resolve the question. The doors of the United States courts will be closed, not just to past and pending claims but to future claims as well. The people of Bikini currently have two claims pending in United States courts. One seeks damages for the past destruction of Bikini. One seeks a court order directing the United States Government to clean up Bikini. Both of those lawsuits will, according to the United States view, be terminated under the international doctrine of espousal once the Compact becomes effective.

It is for that reason that the people of Bikini have asked this Council, the Security Council or the General Assembly - whichever is appropriate - to request an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice, which is the judicial arm of the United Nations, on the interpretation of article 6 of the Trusteeship Agreement, regarding whether the United States, the Administering Authority, has violated that article in failing to clean up Bikini.

I hope that that answers the second part of the question.

(Mr. Weisgall)

With regard to the first part of the question, whether we are looking here at violations of basic human rights, I think that in the early years, in the late 1940s, the violations were indeed flagrant. The people nearly starved to death. Indeed, on Kili in the 1950s and through the 1960s there were terribly serious food shortages.

The United States Government began to send surplus food to Kili in the late 1960s. So the Council certainly does not face a situation of starvation. The people of Bikini themselves called Kili "the prison island", it being an island that is virtually inaccessible by water for most of the year. That caused many of the food shortages. In fact, one year - I believe 1952 or 1953 - the food situation was so serious that the United States was forced to parachute in food supplies to Kili, which unfortunately were rendered useless when they landed. It is a rather difficult way to get food into Kili.

I would characterize the 38-year period overall as one of neglect, of administrative bungling, especially regarding the abortive resettlement of Bikini between 1969 and 1978, and of a basic failure by the Administering Authority to come to grips with the question.

The representatives of the people of Bikini have appeared before this body for nearly eight consecutive years, I believe, and have appeared before the United States Congress on perhaps two dozen occasions. Time is running out on the Trusteeship, and the question whether the people of Bikini will go home remains unresolved. What the people of Bikini want more than anything else is to have these matters resolved before the termination of the Compact.

Mr. GRIGUTIS (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I thank Mr. Weisgall for his full answer to my question. There is another question on which I should like some clarification. How does the Administering Authority explain to the people of Bikini its reluctance to take serious steps to remove the consequences of its nuclear tests, to clean up the radiation, and to create normal living conditions that would enable the inhabitants of Bikini to return to their homeland?

We fully understand Mr. Weisgall's statements of yesterday and today that the territory is still affected by radiation and that the people cannot yet return home. This matter will have to be resolved at some level.

Mr. WEISGALL: I personally do not think that there is an argument on the other side of the question. The United States, in the 1970s, recognized that it had contaminated parts of Enewetak Atoll, and in 1972 it made a commitment to the

(Mr. Weisgall)

people of Enewetak to conduct a radiological clean-up of large parts of that atoll. The United States spent approximately \$105 million - mind you, in the dollars of 1977-1978 - to clean up Enewetak. The people of Bikini want no more and no less.

There is a commitment here. The United States recognized that commitment with respect to the people of Enewetak, and I think the obligation exists with respect to the people of Bikini. I submit that there is no justification for the failure of the Administering Authority to clean up these islands. There certainly are budgetary considerations; after all, Bikini is now of absolutely no use or value to the United States Government. It did, however, provide a valuable testing-ground in the 1940s and the 1950s. But today it is a much more difficult matter to try to enforce the Bikinian side of the agreement. After all, the Bikinians lived up to their half of the agreement: they moved off their island and let the United States test nuclear weapons there.

They are obviously in a difficult situation today, and it is for that reason that they have sought support through every possible avenue. They have turned to the executive branch of the United States Government. That has been unsuccessful: there is nothing in the Compact to take care of the clean-up of Bikini. They have turned to the United States Congress, and they remain hopeful that action will be taken by that branch of the Government. They have gone to the United States courts, but, as I stated earlier, the Compact would purport to terminate those lawsuits. It is for that reason that they ask this body to go on their behalf to the International Court of Justice, to see if the pressure of world opinion would not have some influence on the United States Government. We are, after all, dealing here not only with legal issues but with moral issues as well.

The people of Bikini themselves cannot bring an action in the world Court; only sovereign States, Members of the United Nations, can bring actions before that body. However, organs of the United Nations may seek advisory opinions, and it is precisely such a course that the people of Bikini urge this body to take.

Mr. GRIGUTIS (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I thank Mr. Weisgall. There is a further detail on which I should like clarification. We have heard that the people of Bikini have appealed to various bodies: the legislative bodies of the United States, the Trusteeship Council and other bodies. Could Mr. Weisgall give us a list of the bodies, agencies and institutions - including international organizations both within and outside the United Nations - to which the people of Bikini have appealed?

Mr. WEISGALL: In a general sense, the people of Bikini have, over the years, appealed to all three branches of the United States Government: the executive branch - which is represented here at the United Nations in this body; the legislative branch - the United States Congress; and the judicial branch - the court system. I think it is fair to say that their appeals are currently pending with the Congress and the courts.

With respect to other organizations, the representative of the Soviet Union has accurately stated that appeals have been brought to this body. The only other organization to which the Bikini people would like to appeal is the International Court of Justice. No action has been brought there by the people, for reasons I explained earlier, but they would like to request such an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice. That advisory opinion, however, can be sought only by an organ of the United Nations; it cannot be sought by the people of Bikini themselves.

Mr. GRIGUTIS (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I wish once again to thank Mr. Weisgall for the information he has provided here. What he said was of great interest to us, for it supplemented the information available to the Trusteeship Council. We shall, of course, make use of that information in our subsequent work in the Council.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I call on Mr. Weisgall.

Mr. WEISGALL: Permit me to add one brief point. For this body, or, indeed, the General Assembly or the Security Council, to seek an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice would not be without precedent. For example, in the 1960s -

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

Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom): I am not sure quite why Mr. Weisgall has asked to speak. As I understand it, we are now at the stage of asking questions of him, and I think the questions have now ceased. I do not wish to muzzle him, but he has had an admirable opportunity to say everything that he should say. May I have a ruling, Mr. President, on whether he should be addressing us now?

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I had understood from the beginning of Mr. Weisgall's statement that he wished to add a clarification to the last answer he gave to the representative of the Soviet Union. I call on him, and ask him to be very brief.

Mr. WEISGALL: I wish only to add one simple point with respect to the question asked by the representative of the Soviet Union about other bodies. The United Nations has on occasion sought advisory opinions from the International Court of Justice. One example was in the 1960s when a question arose as to how payments should be made for the supervisory force in the Congo. The International Court of Justice gave an advisory opinion and it led to the resolution of that dispute.

I wished only to bring to the attention of the Soviet delegation that the seeking of an advisory opinion is specifically called for under the Charter of the United Nations and, indeed, has been done previously by the United Nations.

EXAMINATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 1983: TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (continued) (T/1863; T/L.1240 and Add.1)

THE PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I propose now to call on those members of the Council who wish to ask questions of the Administering Authority.

Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom): I would like to begin by asking a question on a matter which is fresh in our minds because it was the subject of a petition yesterday on which we have subsequently asked a good many questions. I think it would be very helpful, therefore, if we could complete our picture of this problem of the Bikini people by asking the Administering Authority if it would comment on what we have heard. Could the Administering Authority give us an account of what it is seeking to do to remedy the situation which has been outlined by Mr. Weisgall?

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): I listened with a great deal of interest to the presentations made yesterday by the various petitioners. No one can fail to be moved by the situation in which the former inhabitants of Bikini and Enewetak have found themselves since the nuclear testing in the atmosphere conducted three decades ago. The petitioners perform a very useful service by reminding us all of the dimensions of the plight of the Bikinians and those in Enewetak.

The lawyers who have spoken for the petitioners, however, do not have a monopoly on compassion, as some may have been led to conclude by the nature of their eloquent statements. In the first place, the popularly elected Government of the Marshall Islands, I would submit, has a very clear understanding of the troubles and needs of its people. After all, it is a democratic Government and

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

therefore must be responsive to the wishes of its citizenry. Secondly, the United States Government has long demonstrated, and continues to demonstrate, a profound desire to relieve the burdens and sufferings imposed on the peoples of the affected atolls.

The United States Government, like the Governments of other nuclear Powers, has learned sad lessons from the period prior to 1958 when nuclear tests were still conducted in the atmosphere. Our executive branch and our courts have been struggling to find a formula for compensating possible victims of early testing in our western states. Likewise, the United States Congress is currently considering various proposals for compensation to Marshall Islanders affected by nuclear tests. It has taken strong measures in the past to compensate them.

I would like it to be clearly understood that the United States Government has recognized its responsibility to those Marshall Islanders afflicted by the nuclear explosions. The United States Congress has made to the exposed people of Utirik and Rongelap ex gratia payments totalling \$2.75 million to date and to the people of Enewetak a total of \$1.2 million to date; and in 1982, the United States Congress appropriated the total sum of \$21 million for the creation of a trust fund and preliminary study regarding the resettlement of Bikini. Of the \$21 million, \$400,000 was used to fund a commission to study resettlement options. The balance, \$20.6 million, established a trust for the use of the Bikinians in a resettlement effort. There currently exists \$19.7 million in this trust fund. This trust fund also provides for periodic payments for the benefit of the Bikini people for rehabilitation of their present location. Those funds are independent of those referred to in the Compact of Free Association.

The Bikinians, in addition to the various trusts, receive free medical treatment, free education, food programmes from the United States Department of Agriculture amounting to \$320,000 yearly; and the money from the various trusts allows also for the hiring of private teachers on Kili - a capability which is not shared by the rest of the Marshall Islanders.

The United States Government believes that, as regards the post-trusteeship period, the Compact of Free Association establishes the means and mechanisms for providing a long-term and equitable solution to the problem of resolving claims arising from the United States nuclear testing programme. The features of this agreement designed to offer that relief are several. For this reason, I believe it would be instructive and useful to talk about some of the more important elements at this time.

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

At the outset, I would like to stress, in view of the discussions yesterday and today, that section 177 of the Compact of Free Association contains as its initial and basic premise acceptance by the United States of its responsibility for compensation for loss and damages caused during the United States nuclear testing programme. I would like to assure the Council that we take this responsibility seriously. For this reason, the United States has agreed to provide to the Marshall Islands Government the sum of \$150 million for the establishment of a trust fund which, when invested, will provide the resources to address the expressed concerns of the affected atolls and their inhabitants.

Specifically, the Compact, under the terms of the pertinent subsidiary agreement, provides that over the course of 15 years the people of Bikini will receive \$75 million; the people of Enewetak \$48.75 million; the people of Rongelap \$37.5 million; and the people of Utirik \$22.5 million.

It should be emphasized that disposition of these funds is to be at the discretion of the islanders themselves - the locally elected Government, not the central Government.

The Compact of Free Association also provides for further important steps to assist in the resettlement of Bikini Atoll at a time which cannot now be determined. Of equal significance, in our view, is the provision that the sum of \$30 million will be utilized by the Marshall Islands Government - again, over the course of 15 years - to support health-care programmes and services related to after effects of the nuclear testing programme. Likewise, there is provision for continuation of the planting and agricultural maintenance programme on Enewetak and for continuation of food programmes for the people of Bikini and Enewetak for as long as the programmes may be required. It is contemplated that these services will be provided in large part by the United States.

Lastly, \$3 million is earmarked for medical surveillance and radiological monitoring activities. These measures may not be identical to those proposed by the petitioners and their lawyers, but I would contend that they are none the less fair, generous, responsible, long-lasting and appropriate.

The United States delegation has listened with great interest to the petitioners addressing this session as to the need for an impartial judgement on their claims. To address this concern, the Compact sets aside monies for the establishment of an independent claims tribunal in the Marshall Islands, as well as

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

the sum of \$45.75 million to be made available to the tribunal for payment of monetary awards, as it may decide, to claimants for damages resulting from the tests. These amounts of course would be in addition to those already designated for Bikini, Enewetak, Rongelap and Utirik. Such a mechanism, we believe, provides the most effective way of handling any future claims that may arise as well. In this context, the United States believes that espousal of claims by the Marshall Islands Government constitutes the most effective and affirmative manner in which to treat this issue as we begin to consider the evolution of the Marshall Islands as part of the Trust Territory to a freely associated State. I might add that precisely because of the espousal arrangement contemplated between the United States and the duly constituted Government of the Marshall Islands the establishment of the independent claims court is made possible.

In conclusion, it should be reiterated that the provisions of the Compact of Free Association effectively build upon the grants, health-care programmes and trust funds already established by the United States for the affected atolls in its role as Administering Authority. The United States and the Marshall Islands Government are mutually resolved that the solutions I have discussed will last in perpetuity.

I would like at this point to suggest that perhaps the representative of the Marshall Islands, Mr. Oscar DeBrum, might also have comments to make on this overall question.

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

Mr. DeBRUM (Special Representative): We thank the Administering Authority for the recognition given to the duly constituted constitutional Government of the Marshall Islands. It is a genuine Government, with three branches - executive, legislative and judiciary - and judicial rulings have in some cases supported the Government and, in others, been against it. It is indeed a constitutional Government.

I should like to state that certainly the people directly affected by the radiations were given an opportunity to participate in the discussions held with regard to section 177 of the Compact, which is the portion that is most objected to by the petitioners. I request permission to submit my further response in writing at a later date.

(Mr. DeBrum, Special Representative)

I have with me a person who was directly involved in the negotiation of section 177 of the Compact of Free Association, Mr. Carl Ingram, and I should like to ask him to speak on this point on behalf of the Government of the Marshall Islands.

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

Mr. INGRAM (Adviser): We have heard quite a bit today and yesterday about the section 177 negotiations. We would like it to go on record that we consulted fully with the people who were most affected and took their concerns under advisement, and that those concerns are reflected in the agreement. Indeed much of the language was drafted by their attorneys.

In the course of our negotiations we were cognizant of the fact that similar claims were being made in the United States by various veterans' groups for damages resulting from the use of Agent Orange in the Viet Nam war. Recently there has been a settlement in that case by which \$180 million will be available for approximately 20,000 claimants. We feel that in comparison we have been able to achieve a very equitable settlement. It is also a settlement that meets the needs of the people and helps to compensate them for what they have lost. Obviously complete and total compensation, is impossible and one never gets, in the course of any negotiations, everything that one would like to have, but by and large we feel that it is fair and that it forms the basis for concluding the trusteeship relationship.

I think perhaps Mr. Weisgall might want to review his arithmetic on the trust fund's money. If it has \$2.6 million available over a 15-year period of time, that does not total \$25 million but exactly \$39 million, without interest. If we add interest, that figure probably comes much closer to \$50 million in trust to meet the future needs of the people of Bikini.

Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom): I would like to continue the questioning of the Administering Authority on matters which have arisen as a result of listening to petitioners, and in this case I refer in particular to the statement of Senator Balos, the Chairman of the Kwajalein Atoll Corporation. He spoke of the adverse conditions on the island of Kwajalein, and he said that there was no high school and that the hospital was far too small for the island's needs.

It would be very helpful if the Administering Authority could give us its comments on those points.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): Referring to the comments on the hospital, it was the island of Ebeye that the gentleman was referring to, which is across from Kwajalein. The entire hospital there is being completely renovated and at the present time we already have \$722,000 appropriated for that. I was on Ebeye not too long ago, and the hospital is coming along very nicely. I am afraid I cannot answer the question on the school situation on Ebeye at present. Perhaps the representative of the Marshall Islands could supply that information.

Mr. DeBRUM (Special Representative): It is correct that there is no high school on Kwajalein, as well as on many other islands in the Marshalls group. High school education is centralized in Majuro, the seat of government, as well as in Jaluit, where students from all over the Marshall Islands go for high school education.

One of the reasons why there is no high school on Ebeye is because land is very limited there. Through the grant obtained through the Interim Use Agreement with the Defense Department, we do have a plan to lengthen the island and to connect it with the next island group within the atoll. It is our hope that when we have more space, we shall be able to plan for a high school, as well as recreational facilities.

It is all very well to compare the conditions on Ebeye with those of Kwajalein, located three miles away, but one has military installations on it, whereas the other is a private residential area. The two cannot be compared because they are not equal. It is also true that the high school facilities on Kwajalein are for the citizens and for employees of those engaged in defence activities there. We shall do our best, in co-operation with the Ebeye people and their leaders, to work on setting up high schools, which they deserve.

Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom): I would just like to ask one other question, which also arises from the petitions we have heard. Mr. David Anderson, who spoke to us on behalf of the people of Enewetak, laid stress on the importance of the food programme, which I understand is the provision of free food by the authorities on that island. He expressed concern particularly that the food programme might stop once the Compact had been enacted. I can quite see that there could be a problem there, in that there obviously must be a period of time for the agriculture of Enewetak, once it is rehabilitated, to become productive. I wonder if the Administering Authority would give us its views on whether or not this is a problem and, if it is, how it might be tackled.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): The Administering Authority has set forth needed weeding and fertilizing programmes in the 1984 resettlement status report. A five-year plan, outlining the needs, and a discussion of each programme are currently under preparation. This plan will enable the Administering Authority, the Republic of the Marshalls, or the people of Enewetak, to continue each of the programmes without interruption.

I think Mrs. McCoy may also wish to add to this response.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): As Mr. Sherman mentioned in his opening statement, plans call for the continuation of the food programme for both Bikini and Enewetak as long as necessary. I can report that the planting on Enewetak is coming along nicely. We spend about \$400,000 on food for the Enewetak people. We have also added a motor sailer, which goes back and forth to Ujelang and brings back good fresh vegetables to Enewetak as well as the typical fruit that has always been a part of their diet. We have great hopes that our agricultural programme will begin to show results this year, so I think the food situation is well in hand.

Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom): I should like to thank the Administering Authority for the answers that have been given to those three questions, which really arose because of the petitions we have heard. They were all, to my mind, important questions, and listening to the Administering Authority has been extremely helpful to me in getting these questions into correct perspective.

I would like now to go on to ask questions that do not relate to the petitioners we have heard. My first one concerns the plans for the economic development of the Trust Territory. We proposed at last year's session of the Trusteeship Council that it might be wise to draft a development plan for the entire region - not merely for the individual entities within the Territory, but for the whole of the Trust Territory - prior to the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement.

May I ask whether this suggestion has been taken up and whether any progress has been made on this? I ask this question because in the days when I was involved in administering a trust territory myself, we did this and we found that by sketching out a development programme and by costing it carefully one got an invaluable programme for future years and had something with which to work when it came to the difficult problem of funding. Of course, as the years go by, as we all

(Mr. Margetson, United Kingdom)

know, programmes do not quite work out as one had originally hoped but, nevertheless, it provided an invaluable framework, which the Administering Authority of the Territory with which I was involved found to be a great help in the development of that country.

So I would like to ask whether the Administering Authority has tackled this, whether it thinks it will be helpful, and if it has tackled it, how far it has got.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): I would point out that our governments consider economic planning as their prerogative and as their own decision and priority. In connection with the Compact, each government has been working on an economic development plan. That is one of the parts of the Compact, one of the requirements in connection with it. So there are economic plans going forward. A trusteeship-wide plan was undertaken originally by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and finished in 1978.

It became apparent, however, shortly after it was adopted that an overall economic plan was not feasible for such diverse types of governments. Hence, the individual Governments are now handling this matter on their own.

Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom): I perfectly understand the emphasis that Mrs. McCoy places on the economic development plans of the individual governmental entities. If there is not to be a single plan, however, are steps being taken to ensure that the individual development plans for the individual governmental entities do not lead to perhaps unnecessary competition in particular areas and that the full advantages of working together can be achieved? In other words, would it be sensible to have some co-ordinating mechanism so that all these individual plans could at least pull in the same direction?

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): I take the point of the United Kingdom representative. I agree with him that in principle some sort of co-ordination would be useful to guard against competition that might be wasteful or mutually destructive. That would, however, be the responsibility and function of the several independent Governments operating under the Compact of Free Association and not of the Administering Authority, once the trusteeship had been terminated.

My colleague Mr. Thomsen wishes to give some additional information.

Mr. THOMSEN (Adviser): Under the terms of the Compact, the United States will have an opportunity to give counsel and advice. I agree with Ambassador Sherman that we shall certainly take very seriously the observations of the representative of the United Kingdom.

The representative of the Marshall Islands would also like to comment on this matter.

Mr. DeBRUM (Special Representative): I thank the United Kingdom representative for the suggestion he has made. I should like to give the Council the following information.

Last year what have been called the Saipan Accords were signed in Saipan. The Presidents of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Marshall Islands and the Republic of Palau signed an agreement, recognizing the need for co-ordination in such areas as economic development, where there could be benefit in mutual undertakings; they recognized, however, that there were other areas in which efforts could best be pursued by individual Governments.

The point made by the representative of the United Kingdom has already been addressed through the governmental relationships.

Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom): I am grateful for the answers I have received, and particularly for the point just made by Mr. DeBrum about the Accords that have been signed. That is a very encouraging sign for the future.

I would turn now to what I might call the more external affairs of the Trust Territory. It does strike anyone who visits the Territory that these islands are extraordinarily isolated, in an enormous ocean. Having in mind particularly the future of these islands, I should like to know what the picture is in regard to co-operation with the countries of the South Pacific region. What is being done to encourage closer co-operation between the Trust Territory, its various governmental entities and the countries of the neighbouring area, the South Pacific region.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): The United States has fully supported the efforts of the constitutional Governments of the Trust Territory to establish ties with their neighbours in the Pacific and to participate in them in all appropriate regional forums. For example, all are members of the South Pacific Commission - which, in fact, held its most recent annual conference in Saipan last October. At the moment, the Trust Territory as a whole is an associate member of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP). We welcome

(Mr. Sherman, (United States))

the participation of representatives of the individual constitutional Governments as part of this delegation. The United States does not think it appropriate, until the Trusteeship Agreement is terminated, to consider separate ESCAP membership for each of the constitutional Governments. They are, however, participating as the Trust Territory.

In our view, there is a major distinction with regard to the ability of the constitutional Governments to conduct their own foreign affairs before and after the termination of the trusteeship; including such aspects as membership in international organizations. We would not encourage their applying for membership now, so as to avoid blurring this important political and legal distinction.

In general, my colleagues in the Trusteeship Council can rest assured that we will do everything possible to encourage an international presence of and international participation by the respective entities in the Trust Territory and to ensure that in a post-trusteeship relationship we shall also do whatever we can to assist these peoples with which we have had such long and productive relations.

Mrs. McCoy wishes to make an additional statement.

Mrs. McCoy (Special Representative): In view of the views expressed the day before yesterday by our colleague from the United Kingdom regarding our annual report to the Trusteeship Council, I would hope that before he fell asleep he had reached page 20. Indeed, on pages 20 and 21 of the report there is a section on international and regional relations. I think the information there might answer some of the questions he has asked.

Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom): I am very grateful for that answer. Indeed, as I look at pages 20, 21 and 22 of the annual report - with my eyes wide open on this occasion - I see that there is a lot of additional information. I very much welcome this. It is obvious that the future welfare of the Trust Territory will depend in great measure on the co-operation within the region.

The High Commissioner, in her opening statement, mentioned one particular island which, alas, I have not had the pleasure of visiting, Kosrae, and she gave some good news. She said it had been chosen as a trans-shipment port by a major Pacific shipping company. I hope I quote her correctly. May I ask when this is likely to become operational, and could she give some idea of the benefits to Kosrae - which I hope will be very considerable - and how quickly these may occur?

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): The new trans-shipment arrangement is already in effect. The dock had been completed, and that was why the Philippines, Micronesia and the Orient shipping line, out of San Francisco, chose it. There is a considerable market in the south Pacific - Papua New Guinea, Bougainville and several other places - where there are large mining operations and where they are having trouble in obtaining sources of food, equipment and that type of thing. Kosrae, because of its geographical location, is an ideal spot and one of the big shipping firms in Australia will now come up there. Those that service Papua New Guinea and other places will now come to Kosrae and PM & O will bring things over, and they will trans-ship the containers there. We were able, fortunately, to find a generator that they could use so as to have a full electrical service there. Under this year's capital improvement programme in Kosrae, the dock will be finished as far as electrical power and water are concerned. It will also be right at the new airport. So we feel that the benefits to Kosrae alone - although I certainly could not come up with a figure at this point - will be considerable. There is warehouse construction, for instance, and food marketing will give a chance for Kosrae's marvellous produce. Its citrus in particular is superb, and shipments of that will help the economy and, of course, employment. So it was with great interest and a great deal of happiness that we found that all this fell together, and it is already partly in operation.

Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom): I should like to turn to another point which the High Commissioner made in her opening statement, and that concerned the welcome news of foreign investment. She mentioned particularly tourism and clothing factories. I have seen references to this in the report of the Administering Authority, but it would be very helpful if Mrs. McCoy could perhaps be a little more specific and give us some details of the size of these foreign investments. Where is the money coming from? Is this investment from other countries in the Pacific or is it investment from the United States? It would be interesting to know which countries are showing confidence in the economic potential of the Trust Territory and how much money they are putting into it.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): We are encouraged by investment of foreign moneys in the individual entities. We are happy about the tourism aspects. New hotels are going up - one has gone up in Majuro. Another one will be finished towards the end of 1985 in Palau. One hotel has opened in the centre part

(Mrs. McCoy, (Special Representative)

of Koror. Another is opening in Airai, and another is being built as a resort complex also in Palau.

As far as the garment factories are concerned, those are in Saipan. As I pointed out yesterday, one of the advantages further downstream, after the Compact is in effect, will be what we call headnote 3a, which gives a great tax break for exports to the United States. Some of the countries that have been investing in the Trust Territory are Japan, Hong Kong, Nauru, Australia and of course the United States.

We are continually advancing the cause of investment in the Trust Territory. As I think I reported a year ago, we have had one of the representatives from the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. The head man made a whole tour throughout the Trust Territory, meeting with Government leaders. The whole reason for this corporation is to promote investment by the private sector of the United States in the third-world developing countries. I am pleased to say that as soon as the Compact is in place we will have that connotation, but we have gone ahead and started laying some of the groundwork for it already.

For a more detailed answer to the question, perhaps you would agree to call on the individual Governments, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Do any of the representatives of the Governments of the Territory wish to speak at this stage?

Mr. OITERONG (Special Representative): I only wish to add something to what the High Commissioner said about the investment taking place in Palau.

It has been mentioned that several hotels are being built, and by next year those hotels will be in operation. I should like also to mention that an international power system is also being built, which is going to be very useful for the economic development of the main island. In past years development has been concentrated in the population centre. This plan for the installation of a power system on the main island will be very valuable for the expansion of economic development in the area of agriculture and fisheries on that island. As the High Commissioner has mentioned, the investors are mostly Japanese or Taiwanese at this time. One of the hotels which was recently opened was built by Taiwanese.

Mr. DeBRUM (Special Representative): Following what the High Commissioner, Mrs. McCoy, and the representative of Palau have said, the Republic of the Marshall Islands has also engaged in foreign trade and business activities in the Marshall Islands. Currently, under an agreement with Japan, we are building a fishing base and dry-dock and cold-storage facilities for the development of fisheries in the Marshall Islands. Together with Nauru and Japan, in the private sector, we are developing hotels: one is completed and operational; the other is in the process of completion. In co-operation with Taiwan, we have agricultural technicians from there helping us with the development of agriculture and of subsistence crops for the Republic of the Marshall Islands. We also have British expertise managing the Marshall Islands power-plant, which has been shifted to the private sector. So we too have begun, and hope to increase, foreign trade and foreign business ventures as has been reported.

Mr. AMARAICH (Special Representative): In addition to those possibilities that have been indicated by the Governments of Palau and of the Marshall Islands and what the High Commissioner has reported, I thought I should mention that there is a great deal of interest indicated not only by private companies but also by Governments in investing in the Federated States of Micronesia.

When I left, there were applications for foreign investment permits pending at the national level dealing with construction, general business, accounting and law practices. Previous to those there were applications for banking and, as the Council may know, we have the Bank of Guam in Ponape in addition to the Bank of Hawaii. What is even more interesting is that we have been visited by an unusually high number of government and private business representatives during the past year and I think that the interest there is prompted by the possibility of a compact of free association with the United States. So there are people who are interested in foreign investment but who are apparently waiting for something to happen and that something is the Compact of Free Association.

As a matter of policy, my Government encourages foreign investment and also emphasizes joint ventures with foreign investors. This is a very important part of our policy. We welcome foreign investments, but they have to come in with the understanding that they must help us participate in them. As for specific countries, Japan has indicated interest and we have been visited by representatives from Australia, New Zealand and the Philippines, who have come to Ponape and the

(Mr. Amaraich)

other states to familiarize themselves with conditions and talk to us about future possibilities. So it is very encouraging in terms of development, but there is one thing that is standing in the way and that is the lack of certainty about our future. I feel very strongly that once the status is determined or approved we shall be able to benefit from foreign investments.

Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom): I find that series of answers not only very interesting but very encouraging for the future of the Trust Territory. I do not want to monopolize the floor. I have a great many more questions to ask, but I think it would perhaps be more suitable if I yielded to some other member who might wish to ask questions and I could ask further questions later on.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I propose now to call on delegations who wish to address questions to the Administering Authority.

Mrs. COCHEME (France) (interpretation from French): We should like to put some questions fairly early on to the Administering Authority; perhaps it is really too early to deal with the problems as a whole. At this stage this morning we shall not go into the substantive political, economic and social aspects, which perhaps require further study of the petitioners' statements. However, my delegation is pleased to take this opportunity to put a certain number of mostly factual questions, which may require some delay in answering, but which could cast light on our work.

These questions concern the petitioners who have spoken thus far and information contained in the report of the Administering Authority.

My first question concerns a problem raised yesterday by one of the petitioners. He described the Compact of Free Association adopted by the majority of the inhabitants of the Marshall Islands as unconstitutional. Could the Administering Authority give its views on this issue and, more specifically, does it feel that the Compact could be considered, legally speaking, as unconstitutional?

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): Needless to say, I think it is the view of the United States that there is no room for a charge of unconstitutionality as regards the Compact of Free Association. Such arrangements are foreseen, not only in international law, but also in various resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly. I frankly am bemused as to what particular aspect of the Compact was referred to as unconstitutional by the petitioner yesterday and I do not know what he was alluding to. It may have to do with the situation in Palau, which is a very special one under the Palauan Constitution, but without more clarification I do not think I can respond definitively.

Mrs. COCHEME (France) (interpretation from French): In view of the late hour, I do not want to go into an in-depth discussion of problems which we shall no doubt have an opportunity to return to in detail this afternoon or tomorrow. At this stage my delegation is concerned with more factual matters, particularly figures, statistics and raw information, which are essential because they depict the reality and make it possible for us to grasp the problems. My questions relate particularly to the last part of the report, which is devoted to statistics.

My first question - a simple one - is about the figures relating to populations in the Territory. Why does the first page of the 1983 report contain a map of the islands with the number of inhabitants dating from 1979, whereas in the 1982 report the map is dated 1980? Is it a simple mistake, or is there another reason?

Mrs. MCCOY (Special Representative): This is a printer's error, and by the time we caught it, it was too late to do anything about it. We take full responsibility for the confusion.

Mrs. COCHEME (France) (interpretation from French): My other questions are about the statistics at the end of the report. With your permission, Mr. President, I will ask them all now, in order to spare the Council a series of interventions.

All my questions concern points on which, in our view, the statistics presented in the report give only a partial answer. The methodology chosen by those who prepared the report was to organize the 114 statistical tables by geographical zone, which seems to us to be a legitimate choice. However, when one regroups the 114 tables by issues rather than zones, one observes a strange phenomenon. Certain questions dealt with in detail in one or another island are ignored in others. It is in the economic field that this gives rise to the most problems.

I shall give some examples. Figures concerning agriculture are given in detail for the Northern Marianas, but are not to be found for the Federated States of Micronesia, or are to be found only for Kosrae, and they are completely missing for Palau. The table "Types of Business Establishments" is to be found only for the Northern Marianas. There is nothing for the other islands, although details are given of fish catches, species by species, and year by year. The employment figures are given only for the Northern Marianas and the Palau Islands. On the other hand, salaries are given only for the Northern Marianas.

(Mrs. Cocheme, France)

My conclusion is that for someone who has never been to Micronesia, which is unfortunately true of myself, it is difficult to gain an idea of their choice of economic development. Therefore, I should like to ask the Administering Authority, if it would be possible, in regrouping the various points on which my delegation would like to receive more complete information, to give the Council statistical tables providing zone by zone information on the following matters: active population, unemployment rates, demographic structure, average per capita income, industrial production by branch, agricultural production by sector, number of tourists, structure of imports and exports, and precise ideas of trade balances.

Mrs. McCoy (Special Representative): I suppose that I should again start with an apology, but compared with how bad the report was last year I can only feel that we have done a much better job this year than in any previous year. We put what perhaps can be called a disclaimer on the general contents page, where we say:

"In conformity with the degree of self government conferred on the component constitutional government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in FY 1983 the governments of the Northern Mariana Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Marshall Islands and the Republic of Palau have all contributed information to parts of this report. The source of each entry is identified by the caption at the heading of the appropriate textual materials. The Trust Territory Administration has edited some of the materials to conform with the style requirements of the report."

Granted that statistically there are wide variations, we think we are doing better. Each of the Governments deserves congratulations on the strides it has made in statistical reporting. This is one of our weaknesses, but we are working on it.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): If there are no other observations at this stage, I propose that we continue consideration of questions addressed to the Administering Authority at a later meeting.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.