



UNITED NATIONS  
TRUSTEESHIP  
COUNCIL



Distr.  
GENERAL  
T/PV.1559  
10 June 1983  
ENGLISH

JUN 14 1983

Fiftieth Session  
UN/SA COLLECTION  
VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Thursday, 2 June 1983, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom)

- Report of the Secretary-General on Credentials (continued)
- Examination of petitions listed in the annex to the agenda (continued)
- Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1982 (continued)
- Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to observe the Plebiscite in Palau, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, February 1983 (continued)

---

This record is subject to correction.

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

Any corrections of 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 11.25 a.m.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON CREDENTIALS (T/1856) (continued)

The PRESIDENT: I should like to draw the attention of the Council to the report of the Secretary-General on credentials contained in document T/1856.

If there are no comments or objections, I propose that the Council decide to take note of the report of the Secretary-General on credentials.

It was so decided.

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

The PRESIDENT: The Council has already considered the petitions up to T/PET.10/276 and communications up to T/COM.10/L.334. We shall therefore consider today the remaining petitions and communications contained in documents T/PET.10/277, 279 to 292 and T/COM.10/L.335 to 340.

(The President)

I hope that all members have received these two batches of documents, one dealing with the petition series and the other with the communication series.

I should like to propose, subject to the agreement of members, that we continue the practice followed when considering written petitions and communications at the end of our meeting on the subject last week. That is to say that we will take the communications and petitions en bloc. Any member, of course, would be free to raise any question he wishes on any of the petitions or communications. In order to facilitate this, I should like to take these documents in two groups, first the T/PET series and secondly those in the T/COM series.

To summarize my proposal, I should like, therefore, to start by suggesting we take the T/PET series, giving all members an opportunity to raise any questions that arise out of that series of petitions, and then to take the T/COM series, giving members the same opportunity with regard to that series.

Do members agree to proceed in that way? If so, I should like to take the written petitions which start with T/PET.10/277 and end with T/PET.10/292. May I ask whether any member wishes to comment or to raise a question on any of these petitions?

I would not want to hurry any members on this but, if there are no questions or comments on this particular batch of written petitions, I should like to pass on to the next group in the T/COM series.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I wish to draw attention to the first in the T/COM series, if I may, namely, T/COM.10/L.335, which is a communication from the Ponape State Legislature concerning the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The thrust of that petition is, indeed, a resolution adopted by the Second Ponape State Legislature, which requests a postponement of the 21 June plebiscite date on the proposed Compact of Free Association.

I was wondering whether the Administering Authority could provide us with a comment on this communication.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): As members know, the plebiscites by which the peoples of Micronesia will determine their political futures under the observation of the Trusteeship Council are, in fact, under the control of their own elected constitutional Government.

In this petition referred to by my British colleague, one State of the Federated States of Micronesia, one State Legislature of several in the Federated States, seems to be in favour of delay. Our understanding is that the executive branch of the Federated States of Micronesia is in charge of elections. I am sure that the Ponape Government, the Ponape Legislature and the Federated States Government will consider their views, as is appropriate in any democracy.

The Administering Authority would not, however, presume to comment on the internal politics of the State of Ponape or the Federated States of Micronesia. The peoples and Governments of Micronesia will determine their own political processes and future.

I am sure that when the Visiting Mission goes to observe the plebiscite, it will have ample opportunity to discuss this matter with the executive branch of the Federated States, and perhaps with the Ponape authorities as well, who seem to be in favour of delay. However, I would simply repeat that the executive branch is charged under its Constitution with the authority to determine elections, plebiscites and such matters.

The PRESIDENT: Although I am the President, I have a particular interest in this, as I shall be leading the Visiting Mission to observe the plebiscite, and I wonder if I might ask a question myself for factual clarification.

The representative of the United States has explained clearly that this is a resolution from the Legislature of one of the Federated States, and I see in the final paragraph that a copy of this resolution has been sent to the Speaker of the Congress of the Federated States of Micronesia, that is to say, the Legislature of the whole Federation.

Could I ask whether the representative of the United States has any indication as to how the Legislature, the Congress of the Federated States of Micronesia, has reacted to this resolution, if, indeed, they have reacted at all.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): We are not aware of any reaction at all. We have not been notified of any delay and we do not know whether the Congress of the Federated States of Micronesia has reacted to this resolution of the Ponape Government.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): Document T/COM.10/L.335 also attracted the attention of my delegation. During the regular visit of the Visiting Mission on 7 July meetings were held with the Ponape Legislature and a number of speakers stated that the State of Ponape was contemplating the possibility of separating from the Federated States. Both the representative of the United Kingdom and I pointed out that the Trusteeship Council felt that the wishes of the population must be respected but that a process of fragmentation would lead to the complete "atomization", so to speak, not only of Micronesia but even of the Federated States of Micronesia. I must say that we were very satisfied to see that the President of the Federated States of Micronesia had been successful in opposing this, because he vetoed an attempt made by the inhabitants of the island of Fat Chuk, who had also contemplated seceding. The problem in Micronesia - and all delegations present here have emphasized this - is that the most favoured islands, archipelagos and atolls say, "why should we not secede and leave the rest to themselves?"

I therefore think we should bear in mind not only the petition presented by the Legislature of Ponape but also the decisions taken by the Federal Congress - as you yourself have emphasized, Mr. President - or even by the President of the Federated States, who is the highest executive authority and who took the decision that the plebiscite should be held on the date planned.

It will be for the Visiting Mission to consider what has been said and to ascertain whether all the necessary translations have been distributed in time, whether the people were aware of the main issues raised, and so on. I think it will also be for the Visiting Mission to make quite certain that all this has been done.

The PRESIDENT: Certainly the fragmentation of the Trust Territory is a real problem which is of concern to all members of the Council and to which reference is constantly made by the representative of the Soviet Union. I would, therefore, certainly not like to do anything which might have the effect of encouraging still further fragmentation of these small entities.

Are there any further comments on that communication, T/COM.10/L.335, or any of the subsequent ones in the series up to L.340?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We have a question on document T/COM.10/L.336, which is actually a letter accompanied by petitions. The petitions have apparently been signed by a number of citizens. These petitions have not been distributed or annexed to the letter and we would ask the secretariat how voluminous those petitions are and what is the substance of the petitions annexed to the letter. There is a note at the end of the letter to the effect that the petitions have been placed in the files of the Secretariat and are available to members of the Council for consultation. We should like a clearer picture of the situation.

The PRESIDENT: I have asked our Secretary, Mr. Abebe, to have that particular file brought down so that he may answer that question fully. In the meantime perhaps we might pass on to consideration of other communications, to allow Mr. Abebe's staff time to bring the file from his office.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I have a further question on communication L.336. Possibly it should be directed to the representative of the Administering Authority. In the second paragraph on page 2 it says:

"... we have well-founded reports that the State Department is moving to implement the compact before Congressional investigation or approval."

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

We would like to ask the representative of the Administering Authority what Congressional investigation is referred to here. Perhaps it is something we are unaware of. I should like to have his comments on that paragraph.

Mr. SILERMAN (United States of America): I am aware of no such investigation. This is the writer's choice of words.

My Government has no further comments or observations on this communication.

The PRESIDENT: While we are awaiting the file to enable Mr. Abebe to answer the question on communication L.336, are there any other questions on the remaining documents in this series?

(The President)

I cannot see that I can logically move on to the next stage of our proceedings - which is to take decisions on the communications and written petitions - until we have exhausted the questions, and there still remains one answer to be given. So I fear we must just be patient for a few minutes.

I call upon the representative of Papua New Guinea.

Mr. KAREPA (Papua New Guinea): While we are waiting for the documents, Sir, I wonder if it might help the work of the Council if you were to ask for the reaction of the executive of the Federated States of Micronesia and its Legislature to the petition referred to in document T/COM.10/L.335 so that we could have some indication before the mission departs as to their feelings on that resolution.

The PRESIDENT: This is on the earlier communication that we discussed - L.335. I wonder whether, in the light of that suggestion by the representative of Papua New Guinea, the representative of the United States could inquire what the reaction of the Congress of the Federated States of Micronesia has been to that communication from the Ponape State Legislature.

Mr. KAREPA (Papua New Guinea): Also, perhaps we should ask about the reaction of the executive - that is, the President and the Government - of the Federated States of Micronesia.

The PRESIDENT: I think that would be helpful, if the United States representative could set that in train.

Mr. KINNEY (United States of America): My delegation would be pleased to make that inquiry of the Federated States of Micronesia Government on behalf of the Council.

The PRESIDENT: To recapitulate, that would be two reactions we are interested in: one from the executive of Ponape State, and one from the Congress of the Federated States of Micronesia.

Mr. KAREPA (Papua New Guinea): I meant the executive of the Federated States of Micronesia, not the executive of Ponape State.



The PRESIDENT: May I then correct that - it is both the executive and the Legislature of the Federated States. Are we not interested, though, in the reaction of the executive of Ponape State?

Mr. KINNEY (United States of America): I would make inquiries at both levels as long as it is clear that it would be through the executive of the Federated States of Micronesia, which is in touch with the Administering Authority and the proper channel.

The PRESIDENT: I think that would meet all our wishes. I shall now call on Mr. Abebe.

Mr. ABEBE (Secretary of the Council): In response to the question asked by the representative of the Soviet Union, we have counted the number of signatories and the total is about 240. These are of course available for inspection by any member of the Council in the files of the Secretariat.

The PRESIDENT: Perhaps I could quickly read out the text to which the 240 or so signatures have been appended. It states:

"Nuclear-free Pacific Palau Coalition Statement. We, as organizations and individuals, join together to express our support and recognition for the democratic process and principles embodied in the Constitution of the Republic of Palau in the face of tremendous United States pressures to yield their territory to the presence of military bases and nuclear weapons. The citizens of this culturally and environmentally unique island nation have repeatedly voted to maintain their territory as a 'nuclear-free zone'. The willingness of the State Department to associate with and assist the Palauans must not be contingent on military priorities. We call upon the United States Government to respect the terms of the United States Trusteeship Agreement and the democratic decision-making process."

Then the 240 or so signatures are appended.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It seems to me that, in general, the petitions, regardless of their nature, should be issued as documents of the Trusteeship Council - in particular, this petition which has more than 200 signatories.

This petition is of a very serious nature. It deals with extremely serious matters. It seems to me that, in general, the members of the Trusteeship Council should be able to take cognizance of it and to see its contents and who signed it, and not have to be content to be informed of this through questions. I think that all petitions that are received in accordance with the usual procedure of the Trusteeship Council should be issued and distributed, and this petition should also have been distributed, especially as there are not that many members of the Trusteeship Council.

The PRESIDENT: The action of the Secretariat was, of course, taken under rule 85, paragraph 3, but it is open to the Council if they wish to decide that the whole communication, including the signatures, should be circulated as a Trusteeship Council document. I think the only argument against this is one of cost, but I am entirely in the hands of the Council on this matter. If it is decided to have the text circulated plus, perhaps, the numbers of the signatories, I would be happy to arrange that. May I ask for comments on that suggestion?

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Soviet Union would prefer that the text be published.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): Could you tell us how many pages will be required for the names of the two hundred signatories?

The PRESIDENT: Is the representative of the Soviet Union suggesting that, in addition to the text which I read out, all the names of the 240 signatories be circulated or whether he suggests that after the text there should be added a sentence saying that 240 signatures are appended thereto? It would, of course, cut the cost very considerably.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I would like to ask whether the signatures are those of private citizens, or are there also organizations among them?

The PRESIDENT: They all appear to be signatures of individuals. A very great many seem to have their addresses in the United States. I would not like to give an estimate as to how many give their addresses in the United States and how many elsewhere, but they all appear to be signatures of individuals.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In order to settle this matter, I would like to propose that the document be published as it has been presented, in its entirety.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I asked how many pages would be required in order to include the list of people, organizations and addresses.

The PRESIDENT: The list of signatures and addresses is on 12 pieces of paper. I imagine that, if that was printed, it would cover fewer than 12 pages because the type is much smaller than the actual handwriting.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I fully share the concern of my Soviet colleague that the text of this petition should be published, but it seems to me that the essence of any petition is surely the number that sign it, not the individuals. Surely it would be a suitable compromise to suggest, as you did yourself, Sir, that underneath the text the words "This petition was signed by \_\_\_\_ number of petitioners" should be added. I can see little merit in including the names or addresses of all 240 signatories in this document.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): As you have emphasized, Sir, and as stressed by the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, I think that the text of this petition is especially important. It could be distributed as a document of the Council, with an addition to the effect that this petition bears 240 signatures and the Secretariat could make photocopies for the four members of the Council, with the names and addresses. I think it would be pointless and too costly to distribute the names and addresses as part of the publication to be sent to all the missions. The run-off of a petition which costs \$400 in the six languages would cost \$4,800 for 12 pages. It would be an extravagance for an organization which is asked to economize, to pay \$4,800 for a list of names and addresses. It is the members of the Council who are primarily interested in this. The Secretariat could photocopy the names and addresses, which would enable each member to send a letter, if he so wishes. The petition itself, to which a sentence could be added to the effect that it had been signed by 240 persons and organizations could, however, be distributed as a Council document.

The PRESIDENT: We seem to have a compromise proposal that the wording of the petition should be published as an official document of the Trusteeship Council and circulated as an addition to L.336, which is, of course the covering letter from Paulette Wittwer, and that at the end of the text there should be a note added giving the number of signatures that appear, and that the full 12 pages of signatures should be Xeroxed and copies given to all members of the Council. Would that meet the needs or wishes of the representative of the Soviet Union?

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Let me say first of all that the established practice concerning official documents does not allow for any mutilation of the document. The document exists as a whole and should be published as a whole as a general rule. In this case we can only consider an exception to the rule. Taking into account the views expressed by you, Mr. President, and by other members of the Council, we could, as an exception, accept the procedure which you have proposed, Sir, but I think that a note must be put in the official document which will be published, indicating that the full text of the document with all the signatures is to be found in the original in the Secretariat files, at such and such a place. Members of the Trusteeship Council, of course, will receive Xeroxed copies of the full text of the document.

The PRESIDENT: If that proposal is acceptable to all, we can go ahead. I would just like to repeat it so that there shall be no misunderstanding.

The full text of the petition, which I read out, will be distributed as an addendum to T/COM.10/L.336, and at the end of the document there will be two notes. One will state the total number of signatures that appear, and the other will state that the text in full, with all the signatures, is to be found in the Secretariat files. Perhaps our Secretary will give the reference number of that file. In addition to that, the Secretary will arrange for a Xeroxed copy of the petition, in full, with all the signatures, to be distributed to all members of the Trusteeship Council.

I take it that meets the wishes of everyone.

We have, I believe, now completed the questions and observations concerning the communications and petitions. The Council will proceed to take decisions, first on the communications and then on the written petitions.

With regard to the communications in documents T/COM.10/L.310 and L.314 to L.340 - that is, the total number of documents in that series which we have considered during our meetings today and last week - I propose that the Council decide to take note of these.

If I hear no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I would like now to pass on to the written petitions which appear in documents T/PET.10/200, 201, 206 to 252, 259, 262 to 266, 269 to 275, 277 and 279 to 292 - that is to say, all the written petitions which we have considered today and at our meetings last week.

I propose that the Council, in accordance with precedent, decide to draw the attention of the petitioners to the observations of the representatives of the Administering Authority made at the Council's current session, as appropriate.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, we are not opposed in principle to the procedure which you have proposed, but I would like to ask a question. As you may recall, at the last meeting at which we considered petitions and communications, the administering Power flatly refused to say a word about them and did not wish to comment on these petitions. How can we then draw the attention of petitioners to observations which the administering Power has refused to make?

In my view we should draw the attention of the petitioners not only to the reaction of the administering Power as expressed at meetings of the Trusteeship Council, but also to comments made about the petitions by other members of the Council. In any event, the Trusteeship Council must draw conclusions from all of that.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, my delegation supports what you have proposed.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to make one comment on the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union. My understanding is that the words "as appropriate" which appear at the end of what I read out are meant to cover the very point that he has raised. It is perfectly true that not all the petitioners receive comments or observations by the Administering Authority. The words "as appropriate" were presumably in previous years put into this formula so as to cover that.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): That explanation seems to us to represent the factual situation in the Trusteeship Council at the present time. In a spirit of good will, therefore, we will not oppose your decision.

The PRESIDENT: I am grateful for the co-operation of the representative of the Soviet Union in this matter. If there are no further comments and no objection, it will be decided that the Council will draw the attention of the petitioners to the observations of the representatives of the Administering Authority made at the Council's current session, as appropriate.

It was so decided.

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS, 1982 (T/1850, T/L.1236) (continued)

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO OBSERVE THE PLEBISCITE IN PALAU, TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS, FEBRUARY 1983 (T/1851, T/L.1237) (continued)

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now consider and take decisions on the draft resolutions contained in documents T/L.1236 and T/L.1237, concerning the two reports. The first, in document T/L.1236, deals with the report of the Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in 1982, and the second, in document T/L.1237, deals with the report of the Visiting



(The President)

Mission to observe the plebiscite in Palau, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, in February 1983.

I call on the representative of the United Kingdom to introduce the draft resolution in document T/L.1236.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): The draft resolution contained in document T/L.1236 of 27 May 1983, which I have the honour to introduce, follows closely the pattern of resolutions that have been approved in respect of Visiting Missions' reports in past years. In the present draft resolution the Council takes note of the report of the Visiting Mission; it expresses its appreciation of the work accomplished by the Visiting Mission on behalf of the Trusteeship Council; it decides that it will continue to take the recommendations, conclusions and observations of the Visiting Mission into account; and, finally, it invites the Administering Authority to take into account the recommendations and conclusions of the Visiting Mission as well as the comments made thereon by the members of the Trusteeship Council.

Since I have no pride of authorship concerning either of the reports that are before us, I am not constrained by modesty from recording my delegation's appreciation both to the Visiting Mission members and to the Secretariat staff that so ably assisted them for having produced what I consider to be comprehensive, educative and eminently readable documents. As a newcomer to the Trusteeship Council, I regard them most definitely as required reading, but even for those familiar with the Trust Territory I am sure they contain a mine of information, observation and valuable analysis. The authors of both should be commended. I commend in particular the report of the Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory in 1982, the draft resolution on which I have just presented.

The PRESIDENT: Are there any comments by members on this draft resolution before it is put to a vote? Of course, after the vote there will be an opportunity for explanations of vote.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation has studied very carefully the report of the Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, that is, Micronesia, in 1982. Naturally, this report cannot be regarded as independent or something divorced from the entire consideration of this issue in the Trusteeship Council itself, since the mandate of the Visiting Mission was to present to the Trusteeship Council information about steps being taken in the Trust Territory to achieve the objectives set forth in the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement. For that reason the report of the regular Visiting Mission of the Trusteeship Council and the results thereof should be seen in the context of other documents which are available to the Council, in particular the report of the Administering Authority on the situation in the Territory for the period under review, the written and oral petitions, the statements made by delegations during the general debate and other documents and material pertinent to the situation in Micronesia. Above all, of course, it should be seen in the context of the United Nations Charter, the Trusteeship Agreement and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

In recognizing the efforts made by the Visiting Mission, it should be pointed out that the report contains a great wealth of material indicating that the Administering Authority, the United States, has not fulfilled its obligations under the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement in any of the areas of life in the Territory - political, economic, social or other.

Having said that, I would at the same time point out that, to our great regret, having gathered a great wealth of factual material on the situation in Micronesia, the Visiting Mission of the Trusteeship Council nevertheless did not present this factual material in such a way as to make it possible for valid conclusions to be drawn from it so that specific proposals could be put forward in the Trusteeship Council with the objective of radically altering the situation in the Trust Territory.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

It cannot be said that no attempts were made to do this. It is clear from the Mission's report that such attempts were made, but those attempts did not yield any results because of the situation in Micronesia. The report does not give due consideration to the fact that the United States, as administering Power, has illegally divided up the single Territory of Micronesia which was entrusted to it into four separate entities, which are subject to United States rule. Nor does the Mission's report give due consideration to the fact that the United States has given those entities a neo-colonialist status, a so-called commonwealth or free association status. The report is completely silent on a situation to which consideration should have been given - the fact that there has been illegal military activity on the part of the Administering Authority in the Trust Territory and that this activity continues. Nor is it mentioned that the United States has further strategic plans to expand its military activity and turn the Trust Territory into a military-strategic staging-point in the Pacific region.

Unfortunately, the report contains no objective evaluation of the responsibility of the United States for the catastrophic situation of the Trust Territory's economy. Nor does it contain any conclusions that would compel the Administering Authority at last to discharge its obligations to the people of Micronesia.

These comments of the Soviet delegation are equally applicable to other sections of the Visiting Mission's report.

I should like also to note that the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution reads: "Having heard the statements made by the representatives of the United States of America concerning the report". Surely those statements cannot be regarded as the sole source of the Trusteeship Council's supplementary information regarding the situation in the Trust Territory of Micronesia. The other members of the Council, many petitioners and Special Advisers have also expressed their views. We therefore believe that, in order to be perfectly objective, the sponsors of this draft resolution might have made reference not only to the statements made by the representatives of the United States of America, but also to other statements made here in the Council.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

However, since the report of the Visiting Mission does contain a certain amount of factual information and in view of the presence in the draft resolution of a paragraph inviting the Administering Authority to take into account the comments made on the Visiting Mission's report by the members of the Council, the delegation of the Soviet Union will not oppose the adoption of the draft resolution, but will abstain in the vote.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation has taken note of Ambassador Oleandrov's observations on the report of the regular Visiting Mission. We would be pleased if the Soviet Union would agree to participate in the next Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory, as it did most usefully in a past Mission.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In response to the remarks of the representative of France I should like to say that the Soviet Union was once involved in such a Visiting Mission, as members of the Council know. We therefore have some idea of the way in which these Missions are conducted and of the possibilities for the Soviet delegation to base its opinions and assessments on such a Mission and make them known to the members of the Council. We have a very clear idea of how the machinery of these Missions works, how their reports are prepared and how their conclusions are reached.

In the past we have had occasion to point out that the Mission in which the Soviet Union was involved did not see fit to take account of the views expressed by the Soviet delegation or to reflect them in its report. Thus the work done by the Mission and its evaluation and results were to a large extent one-sided.

For those reasons, the Soviet Union has not since that time participated in Visiting Missions, including last year's Mission.

The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution T/L.1236.

The draft resolution was adopted by 3 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of France, who wishes to introduce draft resolution T/L.1237 on the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to observe the plebiscite in Palau, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, February 1983.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): The draft resolution that I am to introduce is contained in document T/L.1237 and concerns the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to observe the plebiscite in Palau in February 1983.

As I have already said, the Council may recall that that Mission was sent after the special session held in December last year in this very room. Two members of the Council, the United Kingdom and France, and members of the South Pacific Forum, Papua New Guinea and Fiji participated in it. These four delegations drafted the report contained in document T/1851, which the Council has before it. In the draft resolution I am introducing today, the Trusteeship Council first takes note of the report of the Visiting Mission and then expresses its appreciation of the work accomplished by the Visiting Mission on its behalf, that is, by its four members.

The PRESIDENT: Would any members of the Council like to make any comments on draft resolution T/L.1237?

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With respect to the report of the Visiting Mission of the Trusteeship Council to observe the plebiscite in Palau and the draft resolution on that subject, I should like to make the following remarks.

The Soviet Union has frequently drawn attention to the actions of the United States regarding the strategic Trust Territories under its administration in the Pacific, aimed, in violation of the United Nations Charter and in circumvention of the Security Council and despite the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, at the dismemberment and annexation of those Territories. The last stage of the United States policy in Micronesia was the organization and the holding, together with the local authorities, of a plebiscite in Palau. The purpose of that plebiscite was to give a separate status to those island groups under the false slogan of a free association of Palau with the United States of America. Thus, by granting such a status, the United States was able to carry out its annexation of the Territory. Similar tactics were already used by the United States: in 1975, in another part of the Trust Territory, the Northern Mariana Islands. They were cut off and had foisted on them an annexationist commonwealth status in a form of political association with the United States. In order to give a semblance of a United Nations participation in this illegal process,

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

the United States is proposing that a visiting mission should be sent to the Trust Territory from the Trusteeship Council allegedly to observe the plebiscite. This has taken place in Palau; in the future this will take place in other parts of the Federated States of Micronesia and also in the Marshall Islands.

The delegation of the Soviet Union voted against the setting up and sending of this Mission to Micronesia and its individual parts. In view of what is set forth in the United Nations Charter, any change in the status of strategic Trust Territories should be carried out solely on the basis of a decision taken by the Security Council and therefore any other decision has no legally binding status. No visiting mission of the Trusteeship Council, allegedly to observe the plebiscite in the strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands can camouflage or even less legitimize such a decision by the United States, which has been carried out unilaterally. The actions of the United States in trying to arrogate to itself the right to decide the fate of Micronesia and the other Territories circumvent the Security Council and are in violation of the provisions of the United Nations Charter. This is what happened in the case of the trusteeship Mission to the island of Palau in 1983.

In its report, which is before the fiftieth session of the Trusteeship Council, this Mission did not produce any convincing arguments to prove that the plebiscite held in February this year in Palau to approve the Compact on the so-called free association of Palau with the United States was carried out in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations on a proper and free basis. On the contrary, even the very cautious formulation to be found in the report of the Mission indicates that the United States, as the Administering Authority, violated its obligations under the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement. This is eloquently borne out, too, in the statements made during this session and at the fifteenth special session of the Trusteeship Council by numerous petitioners. This has also been indicated by the legislative instruments which reached the fiftieth session of the Trusteeship Council in the form of written petitions and also the communications from Palau and other parts of the world. Even the report of the Visiting Mission on the plebiscite quite frankly admits that, during the political campaigns in Palau, serious discussion was given only to the question of free association. We are aware of how the plebiscite was prepared from the numerous petitions, both written and oral, presented here in the Trusteeship Council. Those petitions indicated that the

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

plebiscite was held in a context of unilateral preparations, a politically tendentious atmosphere, which made a proper expression of will by the population of Palau impossible.

During the special session of the Trusteeship Council, the Soviet delegation emphasized that, in sending its Mission to Palau, the Trusteeship Council was virtually an accomplice of the United States in its unlawful activities in the Trust Territory. In fact, the Council was asked to confirm the results of a plebiscite on part of the Trust Territory on the basis of a neo-colonialist treaty, a treaty which is aimed at accomplishing the expansionist aims of the Administering Authority. The Council, it is proposed, should play the part of an authority here in the United Nations which, faced with a fait accompli - that the United States has annexed the Trust Territory - must now rubber-stamp the results of this activity of the United States, which is in contradiction to the Charter, and to cover this with the flag of the United Nations. The Soviet Union cannot agree to the Trusteeship Council's playing such a part. It contravenes the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter. It also flies in the face of the obligations assumed by the United Nations to implement and perform its function of trusteeship over Micronesia.



(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

This role is also in contradiction with the Declaration on decolonization. In view of this fundamental position of ours, the Soviet delegation voted against the idea of sending a Mission to observe the so-called plebiscite in Palau and will vote against the draft resolution taking note of the report produced by that Mission.

The delegation of the Soviet Union would like to appeal that everything be done to ensure that the people of the Trust Territory of Micronesia, in full accord with the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on decolonization, should be allowed to exercise their legitimate and inalienable right to genuine freedom and independence without any let or hindrance - and I should like to emphasize that this should be genuine freedom and independence.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Yuri Vladimirovich Andropov, in speaking at a reception in the Kremlin in October 1982 to celebrate the Sixtieth Anniversary of the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, said, when describing the policy of the Soviet Union:

During the 60 years of its existence, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has firmly taken its place in the world as a staunch defender of the cause of peace and friendship among peoples and respect for the right of all peoples to independence, freedom and progress, and each people and each State which is prepared to co-operate with us on the basis of these principles will always encounter on the part of the Soviet Union goodwill, an open heart and an outstretched hand of friendship."

The PRESIDENT: Are there any other comments on draft resolution T/L.1237? Since there are no further comments, I now put that draft resolution to the vote.

Draft resolution T/L.1237 was adopted by 3 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT: Does any delegation wish to explain its vote? Since no delegation wishes to do so, I should like, as President of the Council, to congratulate the members of the Visiting Missions on their hard work in producing these two reports. That work involved a great deal of tiring travel, much patient attendance at very many meetings and the arduous task of drafting the reports. Regardless of the contents of the reports, with which, I understand, one member of the Council does not entirely agree, the Trusteeship Council has good reason to be very grateful to the members of the two Missions and the staff of the United Nations Secretariat who accompanied them to the Trust Territory. In particular, I should like to mention Mr. Paul Poudade, Chairman of both Missions, and Mr. Bal Ram of Fiji, who is here today. Perhaps I could also mention those members who are not here with us but who also played their part: Mr. Stephen Igo of Papua New Guinea and Mr. Goulding and Ms. Sheila Harden of the United Kingdom. Ms. Harden is well known to us all, and I do not know of anyone who has visited the Trust Territory more on behalf of the Trusteeship Council than she has.

That completes the work programme of the Council for today. If I may, I should like to add a word of congratulations to members of the Council because the points we have taken up today have not been easy and we have nevertheless managed to get through them with considerable speed while allowing plenty of time for all members to have their full say.

If there are no further comments, I propose that the Council hold its next meeting on Wednesday, 8 June, at 3 p.m., when the report of the Drafting Committee, which is currently working on it, will be introduced.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.