



UNITED NATIONS

TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL

UN LIBRARY

JUN 4 1984



Distr.
GENERAL

T/PV.1577
30 May 1984

ENGLISH

UN/SA COLLECTION

Fifty-first session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 30 May 1984, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. RAPIN (France)

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

Attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territories (Trusteeship Council resolution 1369 (XVII) and General Assembly resolution 1413 (XIV) and the situation in Trust Territories with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

Co-operation with the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

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 DC2-0750, 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.

84-60837 5225V (E)

29P.

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

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Council will hear the last of the closing statements by representatives of the Administering Authority. I call on Mr. Oscar DeBrum, Special Representative of the Administering Authority.

Mr. DEBRUM (Special Representative): I wish to express to you, Mr. President, and to the other members of the Council the gratitude of President Amata Kabua and of the Government and the people of the Republic of the Marshall Islands for the invitation that made possible our participation again this year in the annual session of the Council. I wish also to express our thanks to the Administering Authority for including us in the delegation and giving us the opportunity to express the concerns of the Marshall Islands.

In our opening statement we described to the Trusteeship Council how we had negotiated with the Government of the United States of America a relationship of free association set out in a compact that the people of the Marshall Islands themselves approved on 7 September 1983 in a plebiscite observed by the Visiting Mission of this Council.

I trust we have made it clear to the Council that from among the variety of political options discussed and examined by the Marshallese people - including independence and commonwealth status - the free association relationship was accepted and finally approved by a 58 per cent majority of the voters, a percentage that is clearly a statement of the will of the majority in any democratically organized community. The people have spoken clearly and democratically on the basis of the principle of self-determination. The Charter of the United Nations clearly gives to the people of the Trust Territory the right to make this decision through the democratic process.

I might add that the majority has as part of its role the responsibility to protect and respect the minority, as the minority has the obligation to accept the right of the majority to determine the course of developments. In a democracy, in any society, it is the obligation of the minority to convince the majority of the rightness of its views. In the absence of that ability to convince the majority,

(Mr. DeBrum, Special Representative)

the minority must accept the fact that its job is not yet done, but that the majority has its own rights and responsibilities.

The people of the Marshall Islands have spoken, and they have chosen free association as set forth in the Compact. With the approval of the Compact by the people of the Marshall Islands on 7 September 1983, the Marshall Islands became ready to move forward into free association with the United States. It remains now for the United States to approve the Compact. Once again we ask that the Council join with us in requesting that the United States act expeditiously.

I have listened to the comments made with regard to the Administering Authority about "fragmenting" and "dividing" the Micronesians into several national governments and about political and colonial annexation. We do not believe that is the case. To demonstrate this, as stated in our opening statement, and as my colleague from the Federated States of Micronesia reiterated yesterday, as part of the fundamental concept of free association agreed to by the United States there are four unquestionable principles:

First, that the Micronesians' sovereignty resides with the people and its democratically created constitutional government; secondly, that we, the people, possess the right of self-determination and may choose independence or self-government in a relationship of free association; thirdly, that we, the people, would have the right to adopt and amend our own constitution; and fourthly, that the free association relationship should be in the form of a revocable compact unilaterally terminable by either party.

These Micronesian principles should clearly indicate that the free association concept was desired by the Micronesian people, as they so amply demonstrated in the plebiscites of last year.

I should like to quote the profound statement made by President Tesiwe Nakayama of the Federated States of Micronesia on this concept before the United States Senate Committee on 24 May. Allow me to share it with you:

"The fact is that we Micronesians are, and always have been, very American in spirit ... of democracy.

"The relationship of free association as embodied in the Compact serves our people's sense of a need for identity. It meets our ambition, after so long a colonial period, to take a real place in the community of nations.

(Mr. DeBrum, Special Representative)

At the same time, our free choice of association with the United States allows us to accept considerable generosity with a sense of dignity. We make our contribution towards the relationship and maintenance of world peace and security by entrusting the defence of our vast area to the United States."

At this juncture in our development, I would add one more advantage to our status of free association. Our status is not engraved in stone. It is in a state of flux. But we still have, after 15 years, the option of eventually and finally choosing independence, or perhaps a commonwealth status, or even continued free association in the future should the circumstances so warrant. It is this flexibility that is so attractive. We combine the freedom of choice with the growth of self-government as mandated by the Trusteeship Agreement. Needless to say, had we chosen either the Commonwealth or independence we would have been bound forever. There are two segments in our population, the young and the old. In free association, both value systems can coexist and work together for harmonious, lasting, political, economic and social maturity. Out of this coexistence will evolve the sophistication and wisdom to tailor knowledgeably our ultimate political aspirations.

Now I would like to address some points which have come up during this session. First, Mr. Tony DeBrum's name was mentioned. He is not present simply because he is now the Minister of Foreign Affairs. My Government has assigned Mr. Ingram and me to represent him at this session. He has the capacity and authority to be here, if he so chooses.

Secondly, as to the petitioners who fear discrimination under section 177 of the Compact or who are concerned at the possibility of not receiving a fair hearing under section 177, let me assure this body that the tribunal to be set up under the Compact will act fairly, effectively and independently in determining injury and compensation. Let me also call attention to the statement of the Utirik petitioners, who expressed confidence in the Government and eagerness to have the Compact put into force. Their statements are in the Council's records.

Thirdly - and I do not want to open another debate on the matter - I should address some remarks to the subject of discrimination. The condition of the hospital on Ebeye was cited as proof of racial or national discrimination. The renovation of the Ebeye Hospital has been completed and it has been improved to meet the needs of the population. Kwajalein and Majuro Hospitals continue to

(Mr. DeBrum, Special Representative)

receive referral cases from Ebeye Hospital when needed. As to the shortage of medicine, let me assure the Council that the provision of medicine for our health services is a function of our own Government and shortages do occur from time to time. But this is to be expected, if not excused, as we put our own systems on line and train our people to look ahead to their own needs. I also hasten to assure the Council that no one died last year for lack of aspirin or any other medicine in the Marshall Islands. Again, the Defence Department's Kwajalein Hospital does provide medicine in emergency cases from time to time on a reimbursable basis.

In the same vein, I would note that the complaints by petitioners concerning banking services on Kwajalein are now moot since the Bank of Guam has opened a full service bank on the island of Ebeye itself. Kwajalein is a leased defence facility, it should be remembered, and part of that lease permits the lessee to control entry to that island for security reasons. Everyone knows this and we are grateful for the social and other services which are extended to us by the staff of the Kwajalein facility, including access to their hospital in emergencies.

We respect the right of the various petitioners to speak their mind in these chambers. In no way would we want to curtail the exercise of that right. We also ask that as the representatives of the duly constituted Government of the Marshall Islands, we be given equal time and consideration. In this connection, we offer to provide written responses, if the Council so deems necessary, to all criticisms of the alleged activities of my Government.

I would like to join my statement to that of all of the representatives of the Trust Territory delegation in celebrating the unity of our cause this year. Make no mistake, we are all here for the same purpose: the earliest possible termination of the Trusteeship Agreement affecting the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. We have undertaken a new challenge, that of getting ready for full self-government under the Compact of Free Association. We are no longer interested in using this forum for our disagreements which used to be commonly heard in this Chamber. We are ready and we ask that this Council do all in its power to move forward with us. For us, there is no room for any other issue than that of termination of the trusteeship.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank Mr. DeBrum for his kind words and also for the very helpful contributions he has always made to the work of the Council. We wish him and his associates a pleasant trip home.

I shall now call on representatives who wish to exercise the right of reply.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The very resounding and publicity-oriented version of the situation in the Trust Territory presented at this session by the United States is very far from present-day reality. The purpose of that exercise is to try to mislead the United Nations - the Trusteeship Council, the Security Council and other bodies concerned with the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It is an attempt to confuse them by using empty but eloquent phrases concerning the benefits conferred on the inhabitants of the Trust Territory by the Administering Authority during the nearly 40 years of its administration of that Territory.

For many years now the delegation of the Soviet Union in the Trusteeship Council has adduced, as it has at this session, numerous facts culled from official United States sources, scientific publications, eye-witness testimony, the statements of Micronesians themselves and oral and written petitions. Even the reports of the Visiting Missions of the Trusteeship Council and of the Administering Authority itself show that the obligations imposed on the United States by the Charter and its obligations under the Trusteeship Agreement and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples have not been fulfilled by the Administering Authority in the Territory.

At yesterday's meeting of the Council the representative of the United States claimed that criticism of United States policy in Micronesia by the Soviet Union was motivated not so much by concern for the people of Micronesia as by hostility towards his Government's policies as a whole. That is a well-known propagandist thesis devised by the United States and other Western colonial Powers in order to replace the problem of decolonization by some problem of East-West relations - in this case the problem of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. In using such a bogus propagandist device the colonialists - not just the United States - are trying to make people believe that the problem of decolonization no longer exists, that colonizers no longer exist, and that there is no one and nothing for the oppressed colonial peoples to struggle against, therefore they should stop their struggle for emancipation.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

Fortunately, the peoples of the world do not believe this neo-colonialist propaganda, and each year in the General Assembly the United Nations confirms the need to put an end to colonialism and reaffirms the right of peoples in colonies and dependent Territories to struggle for their liberation.

The substance of the problem of Micronesia lies not in East-West or Soviet-American relations - which, we note in passing, through the fault of the United States Administration are currently far from desirable or even normal - but in the fact that in the Territory of Micronesia there is a modern type of colonialism, which the United States is trying to consolidate and impose in perpetuity under the label of free association. The people of Micronesia have the right to struggle for their freedom and independence and in that struggle are entitled to count on the support of the United Nations and the entire world community.

Yesterday the representative of the United States claimed that the Micronesians themselves wanted to dismember their Territory and had rejected the option of independence. But everybody knows that there was a Micronesian Congress, which, speaking on behalf of the whole of the Micronesian people, pronounced itself in favour of a single Micronesian State. Everyone knows also what became of that Micronesian Congress. Among United States delegations in the past there were Micronesian representatives who did not reject independence as an alternative to free association, but recently those Micronesians have been missing from United States delegations to the Trusteeship Council and from the Council in general.

The United States cannot refute the fact that a single Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands exists and that for the United Nations it is still a single Trust Territory. However, the United States policy of dismemberment has led that Territory to the stage where its territorial integrity is being destroyed. The Trust Territory has been split into four parts, not by the Micronesians but by the Administering Authority, those four parts have been carved out of the Territory in the manner most favourable to the United States and each of those parts has had imposed upon it conditions that are beneficial first and foremost to the United States. These anti-Charter, unlawful actions of the United States in respect of the peoples of the Trust Territory are a flagrant violation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and of the repeated

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

United Nations decisions unambiguously condemning any action aimed at the partial or complete disruption of the territorial integrity of dependent and colonial Territories.

The representative of the United States has acknowledged that the economic development of Micronesia is far from what should be desired, but he claimed that this was because the resources which had been made available in abundance by the Administering Authority had been misused by the Micronesians. However, this too is simply a propaganda ploy, and a very unconvincing one at that. The true reason for the economic backwardness of the Micronesians and their dependence on the United States is that throughout its entire tenure as administering Power the United States has deliberately impeded and slowed down the economic development of the Territory, in a manner clearly designed to prevent the Micronesians from embarking on a course of autonomous economic growth.

The United States, for this purpose, has done its utmost to prevent the establishment of an autonomous, viable Micronesian economy in the Territory. The consequences of the United States policy are well known. At the present time the Micronesian population is less self-reliant than it was at the beginning of the trusteeship. In this regard the Soviet delegation prefers to believe the statements made by the Micronesians themselves, who have said that the economic dependence of the Micronesians on the United States is one of the levers -

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The representative of the United Kingdom wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom): I apologize for interrupting the proceedings, but we are meant to be listening to a statement in exercise of the right of reply. I note that that statement has already gone on for 10 minutes and I fear, from the length of the notes which Ambassador Oleandrov has, it may go on for much longer. I have always understood that brevity is the essence of a statement in exercise of the right of reply, but, rather more important, I would question whether he is in fact replying to any of the particular points made by the representative of the United States in his speech, which is the reason Ambassador Oleandrov asked for the floor.

We are not so much listening to a statement in exercise of the right of reply as to a reassertion of a well-known theme which Ambassador Oleandrov gave us in his speech in the general debate. In fact, if we may just look at that point, this

(Mr. Margetson, United Kingdom)

well-known theme was given first by Mr. Oleandrov in the general debate, and it was answered by the United States delegation, but now Mr. Oleandrov has asked for the right of reply merely to repeat this theme. I wonder whether we could ask Ambassador Oleandrov to reply to specific points, which, as I understand it, is the essence of the exercise of the right of reply.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Contrary to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, our rules of procedure do not set a time limit on statements made in exercise of the right of reply, except those suggested by tradition and good taste. As for the substance of this matter, it is obviously difficult to circumscribe it in a statement in exercise of the right of reply, since it has to do with the Trust Territory.

I understood from Ambassador Oleandrov's statement yesterday that he wished to respond to the criticism of his Government's position made in the Administering Authority's statement. I am sure that Ambassador Oleandrov will use his eloquence in such a way as to make sure that his statement will not go on too long or be too repetitive.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not know where the representative of the United Kingdom was a moment ago when I began my statement and continued with it. His statement must have been prepared in advance, before he came to the Council, in order to interrupt me, because each paragraph of my reply begins with a quotation from what the representative of the United States said yesterday. After referring to the relevant paragraphs of the United States statement, I have been giving the reply of the Soviet delegation. It simply remains for me to invite the representative of the United Kingdom to be a little more attentive to what I am saying here.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The representative of the United Kingdom wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom): I may assure my Soviet colleague that I am highly attentive to what he is saying. Unlike my Soviet colleague, I do not have a prepared script. I speak extempore this morning and on most other occasions. The mere fact that he puts one sentence as a quotation from the United States speech at the head of a long several-minutes speech to us does not mean to say that he is actually replying to that point. On the contrary, he merely uses that as a peg on which to hang many remarks which are not statements in exercise of

(Mr. Margetson, United Kingdom)

the right of reply but merely a reaffirmation of his well-known theme, which, I may say, we have heard many times at this session and many times at the last session. We know it so well I could write it for him.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The arguments adduced by the representative of the United Kingdom here in his previous statements in the Trusteeship Council and also today have been heard by us dozens of times, even hundreds of times, in this Council. It is exactly the same endless record of colonial policy that is being played, and we also know the whole record by heart. At this session the record has been playing a little louder than at other sessions of this Council. There must be some reasons for that.

I shall continue my statement. I wish to say that the Soviet delegation prefers to believe, not the statements of the Administering Authority - in particular what was said yesterday by the representative of the United States - but the Micronesians themselves, who have been saying that the economic dependence of the Micronesians on the United States is one of the levers that have been used by the United States to impose the Compact and to secure United States interests in Micronesia.

The representative of the United States had the temerity to say yesterday that the Micronesians had always been free in the choice of their political status. However, the facts show the opposite to be true. Finding themselves in a situation of complete economic dependence, and not only economic but also political dependence, inasmuch as the administering Power has the right of veto over any actions of the Micronesian authorities, could the Micronesian people have conducted negotiations on equal terms with the Administering Authority concerning their status or their future development? Obviously not. It is not only the Soviet delegation in the Trusteeship Council that has been saying that. The Micronesians themselves, in addressing the sessions of the Council, have been saying it. They have sent in written petitions. United States organizations speaking in defence of the rights and freedoms of the Micronesian inhabitants have also been saying the same thing. Mr. Glenn Petersen, of Bernard Baruch College, in his study on Palau quotes frank assertions by Palauans about the nature of United States-Palau negotiations:

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

"We Micronesians are not sovereign and therefore we cannot conduct negotiations on what we should like to negotiate about. We are obliged to accept what the United States proposes to us."

Later in the same study we read statements by the Micronesians themselves:

"The United States controls everything. It determines the form and substance of the negotiations with the Micronesians. It organizes things in such a way that the plebiscites meet its interests and satisfy its demands."

Our delegation's refusal to recognize the legitimacy of the plebiscites gave rise to feigned indignation on the part of my United States colleague, who gave us a lecture on the way in which free peoples exercise their rights and alleged that it was not the United States Government but the people of Micronesia themselves who had conducted the plebiscite. In order to refute that statement, suffice it to mention how much time and effort were devoted by the United States authorities to formulating questions for the ballots in the plebiscites in such a manner that the Micronesians voted in favour of association with the United States and did not really understand the second part of the ballot paper, which referred to alternatives to the Compact. In the first versions of those ballot papers there was no alternative, such as independence, which caused a protest among the Micronesians and was criticized in the Trusteeship Council.

In regard to United States experience in promoting the exercise by free peoples of their rights - to use the words used by the United States representative yesterday - I would point out that the United States twice organized so-called independent elections in El Salvador, and the experience of Chile is a clear example of democratic processes actively promoted by the United States.

Finally, I come to the militarization of Micronesia. The representative of the Administering Authority would have us believe that the United States is very little concerned about the military uses of Micronesia; it appears that it does not want very much. In the past the United States conducted a series of tests of nuclear weapons. At present it uses the missile range to improve missiles which are the last word in the global nuclear missiles resulting from the arms race. The United States wants only trifles; it wants simply to station certain types of weapons of mass destruction, nuclear and chemical weapons, use some land for military manoeuvres and turn the ocean surrounding Micronesia into a region completely dominated by the United States Navy. These are mere trifles, are they not?

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

The people of Micronesia are protesting about these "trifles" and resisting them. The people of Palau, the people of Kwajalein, the people of Micronesia do not want their territory to be transformed into a military strategic base for the United States. They do not want to become a nuclear hostage of the United States in the Pacific Ocean. That is why the petitioner from the Marshall Islands, the Senator and the leader of the opposition party stated at this session that the Compact agreement for the islands was not acceptable to the people of the Marshall Islands. They said that it was not constitutional and was amoral, with particular reference to section 177 of the Compact.

The petitioner representing the Focus on Micronesia Coalition made some serious accusations against the Administering Authority. He said that section 177 released the United States from further responsibility for the effects of the nuclear tests in Micronesia, and for the irremediable damage to the people of the Territory. He also said that the long period within which the United States may use the land for military purposes and the so-called responsibility of the United States for defence prejudiced the possibility of the free expression by the Micronesians of their desire for self-determination upon termination of the Compact.

In his statement yesterday the representative of the Administering Authority did not - nor could he - reject what Ambassador Zeder had said in the United States Congress about the real interests being defended by the United States delegation in the so-called talks with the Micronesians on the Compact conditions. I shall again quote that statement by Ambassador Zeder, who said:

"One of the most important points in the exercise was our defence position in the Pacific Ocean, and in that respect the Defense Department is very pleased with the provisions enshrined in the Compact."

That means that in the Trusteeship Council the representative of the United States is alleging that the Administering Authority is concerned primarily with the interests of the Micronesians, but that in the United States Congress another representative of the Administering Authority is saying quite the contrary - that the main point was the strategic interests of the United States. This is not in a statement by the Soviet delegation but in a statement by the head of the United States delegation, half of whom were representatives of the Pentagon, in the talks with the Micronesians.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

We have mentioned here many times the nature of the plebiscite and the referendum imposed by the United States on the people and local authorities of Micronesia and I shall not repeat what we have said. We are talking about a neo-colonialist fiction, a propaganda show that has nothing to do with the genuine free self-determination of Micronesia.

Yesterday the United States representative gave in to the temptation to talk about the mythical Soviet military threat, in order to intimidate naive people and to justify the annexationist and militaristic policy pursued by the United States in Micronesia. But the Soviet military threat was long ago revealed as a myth, and very few people believe in it. In fact, the Soviet Union recently made a number of proposals to reduce the state of military confrontation, to destroy nuclear weapons and to limit naval armaments and naval activities. Yesterday the representative of the United States alleged that Micronesia was threatened by the Soviet fleet. Instead of frightening the Micronesians with this non-existent Soviet threat the United States should give a positive answer to the Soviet Union's proposals on limiting naval activities and naval armaments. This would be a positive reaction by the United States which would affect the Pacific Ocean and Micronesia.

Mr. BADER (United States of America): I do not propose to take much of the Council's time in responding to the statement that we have just heard from the Soviet representative in exercise of the right of reply.

I think that the most eloquent statement that we have heard in this Council during this session is that by Mr. Amaraich of the Federated States of Micronesia when he was preparing to respond to a statement alleging racial discrimination in Micronesia and began that response by saying that he hesitated to speak because he did not know what was going on here. Unfortunately, those of us who have been here during earlier sessions and have heard statements of the sort we have just heard do know what is going on here.

What is going on here is what, to use the felicitous words of Ambassador Margetson, might be referred to as the gramophone phenomenon. We have once again heard familiar Soviet allegations concerning United States militarization and dismemberment of Micronesia and compulsion of Micronesians in negotiations. We have heard nothing new. We have heard the old gramophone record.

(Mr. Bader, United States)

In the statement he just made Oscar DeBrum referred to the statement made recently by the Soviet representative concerning the absence of Tony DeBrum. This is a good illustration of the gramophone phenomenon. In looking over the records of last year's Council meetings one notes that the same charge was made - that Tony Debrum had been excluded from the American and Micronesian delegations because of his "dissident views" - and at that time the statement was answered, and answered satisfactorily.

We have once again heard Oscar DeBrum respond to this, explaining that Tony DeBrum, as Minister of Foreign Affairs, could not be here. In fact, as members of the Council know, we expected Tony DeBrum to come until the last minute, when he had to cancel. There was no thought of silencing Mr. DeBrum because of his dissident views. But we still hear this charge repeated year after year, despite the fact that it has absolutely no credibility.

We hear repeated discussions of nuclear tests that took place 30 years ago at Bikini and Enewetak, as if these were new phenomena. This is roughly comparable to the Human Rights Commission's having continuing discussions of the Katyn forest massacre, the Slansky trial or the death of Tomas Masaryk, all of which are important events, but hardly current events.

The Soviet representative referred once again today to United States militarization of the Trust Territory. He referred to the "mythical" Soviet threat in the region. I should like to cite a recent editorial in The Washington Post. I know that the delegation of the Soviet Union is very fond of quoting from The New York Times, so I assume there will be no objection to my giving equal time to The Washington Post. Citing authoritative Soviet official and media sources, it quotes Soviet official statements made during the course of the past year. With regard to Japan, Soviet officials say:

"Its defence programmes 'make Japan a likely target for a nuclear response strike.' Scandinavian countries are 'to burn in the fire of nuclear war in the name of "Atlantic solidarity".' Helmut Kohl's election could result in West Germany's 'ascending a nuclear gallows'. Deployment of United States missiles could make all of Italy 'a Pompeii'." (The Washington Post, 23 May 1984)

I do not think that this constitutes a mythical threat.

That is all that I wish to say in response to the Soviet statement, but the High Commissioner has several comments she would like to make.

Mrs. MCCOY (Special Representative): Much has been said at this session about how the annual report puts people to sleep, but I find myself wondering if perhaps the hearings themselves are putting the Soviet representatives to sleep.

They repeatedly bring up the choice of the Micronesian Governments, their own choice, of their own style of government, and they keep claiming that this is not true, that it has not been a free choice. Representatives of the Micronesian Governments have been present at this session and two of them are even now in this chamber, and they have stated and explained thoroughly how their choice of self-government was arrived at.

Yet the Soviet representative has obviously ignored their statements. He quotes from petitioners' statements but he has yet to quote from the Micronesian Government representatives themselves, who have been freely chosen by their fellow citizens to come to this Council and present their views on their type of government.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I must note that, in response to the specific facts and arguments that the Soviet delegation adduced in respect of yesterday's statement by the United States delegation, so far we have not heard any consistent or specific answers to the questions we touched on that might refute even one of the arguments adduced by the Soviet delegation.

The United States representative started remembering ancient history and the propaganda of a time long past which has nothing to do with Micronesia. He started quoting from newspapers passages which have nothing to do with United States propaganda about the mythical Soviet military threat and nothing to do with this question of Micronesia.

This shows that the administering Power is left with very little to say to justify its illegal colonialist policies of annexation and seizure of the Trust Territory of Micronesia.

Mr. BADER (United States of America): The representative of the Soviet Union is quite correct in saying that we have very little left to say in response to the charges that he has made today. The reason is that our statement has made very clear our answers to all of his charges. If the representative of the Soviet Union will simply review Ambassador Sherman's opening and closing statements he will find therein responses to all the allegations he has made.

(Mr. Bader, United States)

Our delegation sees no advantage in repeating once again simply for the record that which we have already said.

ATTAINMENT OF SELF-GOVERNMENT OR INDEPENDENCE BY THE TRUST TERRITORIES (TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL RESOLUTION 1369 (XVII) AND GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 1413 (XIV)) AND THE SITUATION IN TRUST TERRITORIES WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS 1514 (XV) AND 38/54)

CO-OPERATION WITH THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 1654 (XVI))

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I suggest that in accordance with custom the Council discuss these two items - items 13 and 14 of our agenda - together.

It was so decided.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Today the Trusteeship Council begins its consideration of agenda items 13 and 14. The first concerns the question whether the Administering Authority, the United States, has been fulfilling its obligations with regard to the attainment by the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands of self-government or independence. The second deals with the question of the situation in that Territory regarding the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and co-operation by the Trusteeship Council and the Administering Authority with the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration.

First of all, we must emphasize once again that in its annual report the United States, as the Administering Authority of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, has persisted in circumventing the question of the situation in the Territory with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In the reports of the Administering Authority and in statements in this Council by its representatives, by special advisers or by other advisers from Micronesia, there has been a stubborn silence on this question: nothing has been said in any of those reports or statements about what has been and is being done in the Trust Territory with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

One is perfectly entitled to ask why that is so. It is clear that the United States is not interested in ensuring that the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples shall be implemented and applied in the Trust Territory of Micronesia, at present under its administration.

It is precisely for that reason that the Administering Authority of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands has refused to report on this question either to the Trusteeship Council or to any other United Nations body. The Soviet delegation, however, believes that the Trusteeship Council must give its most careful consideration to the question of the implementation of the Declaration as regards the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, which is under the trusteeship of the United States.

The adoption - on the initiative of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community, with the broad and active support of countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America - of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples marked a new phase in the struggle of oppressed peoples for liberation. The Declaration has played, and will continue to play, an important role in providing assistance to all peoples under colonial rule in their struggle for freedom and independence, and in mobilizing world public opinion in favour of the struggle for the final elimination of colonialism.

The discussion in the Trusteeship Council has shown that the current situation in Micronesia urgently requires the attention, not only of the Trusteeship Council and the Security Council, but also of the General Assembly and other United Nations organs, which share the responsibility for the Trust Territory and for its decolonization.

The Territory was once a single entity, but it has been split up into four separately governed entities. This was done with a specific political purpose in mind, namely to weaken the resistance of the people of Micronesia to the neo-colonialist, annexationist policies of the Administering Authority, and it runs counter to the Declaration on decolonization.

Until the problem of implementing the inalienable right of the Micronesian people to genuine self-determination and independence is solved, the United Nations is entitled - indeed, obliged - to oppose neo-colonialist policies in all their manifestations and to oppose the conversion of the Trust Territory into a military and strategic beach-head, which would impede the attainment by the people of Micronesia of self-determination and independence and run counter to the interests of international peace and security.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

In the General Assembly's programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration, we read:

"Where [the Declaration] has not been fully implemented with regard to a given Territory, the General Assembly shall continue to bear responsibility for that Territory" (General Assembly resolution 2621 (XXV), para. 3 (9)) until all power has been transferred to the people of the Territory without conditions or reservations of any kind - I emphasize that: without conditions or reservations of any kind - and until

"the people concerned has had an opportunity to exercise freely its right to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Declaration."

(General Assembly resolution 2621 (XXV), para. 3 (9))

In this connection, the familiar claim of the Administering Authority that it is accountable to the Trusteeship Council and the Security Council alone is incorrect, because, notwithstanding its special status as a strategic Trust Territory, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands still falls within the framework of the Declaration on decolonization, inasmuch as the people of Micronesia has not yet attained freedom, self-determination and independence.

While refusing to apply the provisions of the Declaration on decolonization to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and refusing to include in their annual report to this Council information about implementation of the Declaration as regards the Micronesian people, the representatives of the United States have been invoking Article 83 of the Charter of the United Nations. But that Article cannot serve as a basis for denying to the people of Micronesia its inalienable right to genuine self-determination and independence. Implementation of the Declaration in Micronesia in no way contravenes Article 83; it is, in fact, fully consonant with it.

Article 83 of the Charter contains no provisions that would impede United Nations bodies - particularly the General Assembly - from closely monitoring the situation in the Territory or from carrying out their functions in accordance with the Charter. Paragraph 2 of that Article states:

"The basic objectives set forth in Article 76 shall be applicable to the people of each strategic area."

The objectives set forth in Article 76 are thus directly related to the questions we are now discussing.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

In the light of what I have said, it is perfectly clear why the item on co-operation with the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI)) has been a constant feature of the Council's agenda.

Such co-operation between the Trusteeship Council and the Special Committee on decolonization is necessary not only because of the long-established practice of the Trusteeship Council, but also because of the requirements of the Declaration on decolonization, which is fully applicable to all Trust Territories. Paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Declaration on decolonization are directly applicable to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Paragraph 5 states:

"Immediate steps shall be taken, in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed or colour, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom." (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV))

The Special Committee on decolonization plays a constructive role in the preparation of recommendations to the General Assembly relating to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. In its report to the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, the Special Committee set forth recommendations and conclusions which, in particular, reaffirmed the inalienable right of the Micronesian people to self-determination and independence in conformity with the Charter and the Declaration on decolonization. The Special Committee reiterated its view that such factors as territorial size, geographical location, size of population and limited natural resources should in no way delay the speedy implementation of the Declaration, which fully applies to the Trust Territory. In that same recommendation of the Special Committee there is an appeal to the Administering Authority not to take any action which might impede the guarantee of the unity of the Trust Territory or the rights of its peoples in accordance with the United Nations Declaration until these rights are fully implemented.

The Committee of 24, referring to United Nations resolutions concerning military bases and facilities in colonial or Non-Self-Governing Territories, reaffirmed its conviction that the Administering Authority must ensure that such

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

installations and activities in the Trust Territory do not hinder the exercise by the population of Micronesia of its right to self-determination and independence, in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

Mindful of the principles contained in the Charter and the Declaration, in its decision the Committee reiterated that it was the obligation of the Administering Authority to create such conditions in the Trust Territory as would enable its people to exercise freely and without interference their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. The Committee urged the Administering Authority to take effective measures to safeguard and guarantee, in co-operation with the local authorities of the Trust Territory, the right of the people of Micronesia to own and to dispose freely of the natural resources of the Trust Territory and to establish and maintain control of their further use.

The Soviet delegation would be failing in its duty were it not to draw the attention of the Trusteeship Council to the fact that the Committee expressed regret at the repeated refusal of the Administering Authority to co-operate with it concerning the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the implementation in that Territory of the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The Committee called again upon the United States Government, as the Administering Authority in the Trust Territory, to ensure that a representative of the United States was present at meetings of the Committee to provide vital and up-to-date information to assist the Committee in the formulation of conclusions and recommendations concerning the future of the Trust Territory, in accordance with the obligations of the Administering Authority under the Charter.

Our delegation does not intend to outline the entire decision of the Special Committee, which is set forth in the Committee's report to the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly and was approved by the Assembly, although many provisions of the Committee's decisions echo the concerns that have been expressed at this and past sessions of the Trusteeship Council. In this respect, the Trusteeship Council would be acting correctly, in our opinion, if it included the arguments and recommendations of the Committee of 24 as contained in its report or the text of the Committee's recommendation in its report to the Security Council.

The Soviet delegation adheres unswervingly to the view that the Administering Authority's refusal to co-operate with the General Assembly and the Special Committee, like the Trusteeship Council's refusal to co-operate with the Committee

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

on decolonization, is not only regrettable but constitutes defiance of the General Assembly and the Special Committee on decolonization and generally runs counter to the whole task of ensuring decolonization.

The Administering Authority's position is all the more contradictory in that until 1975 the United States submitted reports on the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to the General Assembly. The General Assembly, which included the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in the list of Territories to which the Declaration on decolonization relates, has considered the report of the Special Committee on that Territory on a regular basis since 1964. Moreover, from 1964 to 1971 the United States, as Administering Authority, took part in the work of the Special Committee when it was considering the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; it took part in the discussions and submitted information on the situation in Micronesia to the Committee. However, when it left the Special Committee in 1974 the United States changed its position; it stopped supplying that Committee with information on the situation in the Trust Territory and refused to co-operate with it and allow visiting missions of the Special Committee on decolonization into the Trust Territory.

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands has from the outset been a strategic area. None the less, the Trusteeship Council adopted various recommendations on co-operation with the Special Committee on questions relating to the Trust Territory, and such co-operation has taken place. For example, the President of the Trusteeship Council, in a letter of 2 September 1975, informed the Chairman of the Special Committee on decolonization of measures adopted by the Trusteeship Council at its last session.

In the opinion of my delegation it would be helpful if the President of the Trusteeship Council at this fifty-first session would send the same kind of letter to the Chairman of the Special Committee on decolonization.

Having set about the illegal annexation of the Trust Territory of Micronesia, which is temporarily under its administration, thereby acting in a manner contrary to the Declaration on decolonization, the United States, in pursuit of its own policies, chose to bring this matter before a single organ, the Trusteeship Council, the membership of which makes it possible for it to camouflage its anti-Charter actions in dismembering that Territory and its people and to consolidate its virtual seizure of the Trust Territory under neo-colonialist

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

labels, such as free association or commonwealth. These actions run counter to the Charter, and in the case of Micronesia are now being camouflaged by the Administering Authority in the form of Visiting Missions of the Trusteeship Council, while at the same time the United States refuses to co-operate with organs of the United Nations that have as their purpose the decolonization of dependent territories. However, no camouflage or attempts by the United States to legalize the results of its actions in Micronesia in the Trusteeship Council should confuse the United Nations or world public opinion.

This policy of the Administering Authority in Micronesia was clearly described in a TASS statement of 13 August 1983, and in the letter of the Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union to the Secretary-General dated 29 March 1984. The Soviet Union is convinced that in the conditions which now exist, it is the direct duty of the United Nations to take all necessary measures to guarantee the implementation by the Administering Authority of its obligations pursuant to the Charter and United Nations decisions, and not to permit the United States to attempt to confront the world with the fait accompli of the full absorption of the Trust Territory, and to help the long-suffering people of that Territory exercise their legitimate right to the establishment of their own single, independent State and the right to live peacefully without any military or other neo-colonialist fetters, free from fear about the future.

Mr. BADER (United States of America): I should like briefly to set the record straight concerning the United States position with regard to the jurisdiction of the General Assembly and the Committee of 24 over the Trust Territory.

The representative of the Soviet Union said in his statement just now that the United States, and I believe he said the Council - correct me if I am wrong - were acting in defiance of the General Assembly by failing to co-operate with the Committee of 24 and the General Assembly with regard to reporting on the Trust Territory.

In point of fact, last year, under the chairmanship of Ambassador Treiki of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Fourth Committee decided not to consider the Committee of 24 resolution on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. They chose to defer consideration. In 1982, under the chairmanship of Ambassador Roa-Kouri of Cuba, the Fourth Committee also chose not to consider the resolution of the Committee of 24 on the Trust Territory. In 1981 the Fourth

(Mr. Bader, United States)

Committee voted on whether or not to defer consideration of the Committee of 24 resolution on the Trust Territory. I do not recall the exact vote. It was somewhere in the neighbourhood of 70 in favour of deferring to 30 or 35 against. I am sure that the record will reflect the exact vote.

The representative of the Soviet Union referred in his remarks to the basis for the United States position with regard to co-operation with the Committee of 24, although he disagreed with that position. I think that Article 83 of the Charter, which reserves jurisdiction to the Security Council rather than to the General Assembly, is quite definitive in this regard.

In the 1960s the United States did co-operate briefly with the Committee of 24 on the question of the Trust Territory. We did make a statement, purely as a courtesy to the members of the Committee and at the specific request of the Committee, and it was an express restatement of our position that the Committee of 24 and the General Assembly had no jurisdiction over this matter. This remains our position.

Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom): The debate on items 13 and 14 of the agenda, in which we are now engaged, takes a totally predictable form each year. That is to say, the Soviet delegation maintains that these General Assembly resolutions are relevant to our work, and the delegations of the United States and my country, and I think probably also of France - I am not sure what they said on the subject last year - take the opposite view. We, therefore, as it were, agree to differ, and that is the end of the matter.

What adds a particular Alice in Wonderland character to this discussion is that, in fact, we have for the last few days been discussing the attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territories. That is what I have been talking about in introducing my reports of the Visiting Missions. That is what we have been hearing about from Mr. Andon Amaraich, and various other people. This is the meat of our work in this Trusteeship Council. Why, therefore, do we have this item on the agenda as something quite separate? It appears to me that the only answer to this question must be so that the Soviet Union can once more repeat its well known themes of United States illegal annexation, which we just heard a few seconds ago, and to try probably to gain a few more debating points.

(Mr. Margetson, United Kingdom)

I am sorry to have to tell my Soviet colleague, and indeed all my colleagues, that I will not allow them even to get away with a debating point, because I am going to answer their constitutional point. Yet again I know it will have no effect on my Soviet colleague, but he has taken 25 minutes to tell us why he thinks these resolutions are relevant, so I am going to take five minutes to tell him why I think these resolutions are not relevant.

Article 85 of the United Nations Charter is quite explicit as to where responsibility lies for Trust Territories that are not designated as strategic. That Article, in paragraph 1, states that the functions of the United Nations with regard to such Territories, "including the approval of the terms of the Trusteeship Agreements and of their alteration or amendment", shall be exercised by the General Assembly. Paragraph 2 of Article 85 is equally explicit:

"The Trusteeship Council, operating under the authority of the General Assembly, shall assist the General Assembly in carrying out these functions".

I imagine that there are few, if any, who would argue that the Trusteeship Council did not in the past co-operate fully with the General Assembly in the case of those Trust Territories that were not strategic. But of course, as we all know, Micronesia is a strategic Trust Territory, and there is therefore a considerable difference; it is not something that I have invented or that anyone else in this chamber has invented: it is recognized in the Charter. Under Article 83 of the Charter:

"All functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas ... shall be exercised by the Security Council".

In short, our obligation in the Trusteeship Council vis-à-vis a strategic Trust Territory is clear: we report to the Security Council and not to the General Assembly.

As for co-operation with the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the same distinction of course applies, because the Special Committee was established as a subsidiary body not of the Security Council but of the General Assembly. It is certainly true that in resolution 1654 (XVI) the Trusteeship Council was requested to assist the Special Committee in its work. We did so in relation to the former non-strategic Trust Territories. But all those Territories have now ceased to exist as Trust Territories. As we all know, we have only one Territory left and it is a strategic one.

(Mr. Margetson, United Kingdom)

In conclusion, therefore, in my delegation's view the Trusteeship Council is no longer required to render assistance to the Special Committee in its work. The representative of the Soviet Union sought to defend the continued inclusion of these items on the agenda on the ground - partly at least - that it was a long-established practice, as he put it. Well, I can only say that in my delegation's view it is now a bad practice. It may be that the representative of the Soviet Union does not like Article 83 of the Charter. I cannot do anything about that. It is in the Charter and I can only suggest that it is time he decided to live with it, and also that the agenda of this Council should reflect the fact that we must not only live with it but implement it.

Mrs. COCHEME (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation shares the opinion expressed by the United Kingdom representative. As I said in my statement a few days ago, it is the Security Council that is competent in the matter before the Trusteeship Council today. The provisions of the Charter, particularly Article 83, must be implemented. As I have recalled, Article 83 is clear: it is the Security Council that exercises all the Organization's functions with regard to strategic areas. Hence, there can be no question of giving this function to the General Assembly or the Special Committee.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It has become quite clear that the Western delegations to the Trusteeship Council - the United States, the United Kingdom and France - do not want to acknowledge that the General Assembly has the right to discuss the question of Micronesia. That has just been confirmed by their statements here. They invoke Article 83 of the Charter to support their thesis.

We do not at all reject Article 83 of the Charter. We do not reject the responsibility of the Trusteeship Council and, particularly, the Security Council for the fate of the Trust Territory of Micronesia. But, unlike the three Western delegations, we believe that the General Assembly also has the right to discuss the question of Micronesia and its future political status, to discuss the question of the decolonization of Micronesia. After all, it was the General Assembly which adopted the well-known Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which reflects the most important task of mankind as a whole - that is, to put an end to colonialism, to put an end to the colonial system and all its vestiges.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

We emphasize that this view that the General Assembly is entitled to discuss the question of decolonization of the dependent Territories, including the question of the decolonization of Micronesia, is shared by the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations. It is shared by the General Assembly itself. Today the representative of the United States gave us a historical background of the question in the General Assembly, particularly the Fourth Committee. To be quite clear, it must be stated that the General Assembly and its Fourth Committee never said that the Assembly was not entitled to discuss the question of Micronesia. At a recent session of the Fourth Committee, a decision was adopted not to take action at this stage. It is true that such a decision was adopted in the Fourth Committee, but that does not at all mean that the General Assembly should be denied the right to consider the problem of the future of Micronesia, of the decolonization of Micronesia.

Moreover, the General Assembly reaffirmed that it had this right when it included the Territory of Micronesia in the list of colonial Territories to which the Declaration on decolonization applies. That is the position of the General Assembly.

Of course, the colonial Powers are not interested in having this matter discussed by the General Assembly. They want to restrict the right of the General Assembly to discuss not only the question of Micronesia but other colonial problems too.

If the colonial Powers were strong enough to do this - and we know how much pressure the United States exerted on delegations in the Fourth Committee to prevent the adoption of any decisions on Micronesia in the Fourth Committee, we know what procedural ploys it used to prevent the adoption of decisions in the Fourth Committee on the question of Micronesia - I say, if the United States and the other colonial Powers could further restrict the right of the General Assembly to discuss colonial problems, naturally they would do so. But the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations object to this neo-colonialist policy pursued by the United States and by other Western Powers.

In this respect, the representative of the United Kingdom stated that the Soviet Union did not apparently like Article 83 of the Charter. I must say, no: we like this Article, but we also like the Declaration on decolonization, which is not to the liking of the representative of the United Kingdom. Well, we cannot help him at all here. We and the overwhelming majority of the States of the world

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

find the Declaration on decolonization very palatable. We support it and we will do everything to make sure that the Declaration will be implemented.

Mr. BADER (United States of America): The representative of the Soviet Union referred to procedural ploys used by the United States in the Fourth Committee and to pressures which he said we all knew about to prevent consideration of Micronesia by the Fourth Committee.

As I said in my statement, the decision not to take action on the resolution of the Committee of 24 on Micronesia was announced by Ambassador Treiki of Libya in 1983 and by Ambassador Roa-Kouri of Cuba in 1982. These were not procedural ploys by the United States. These were procedural decisions by the Permanent Representatives of Libya and Cuba over whom, I assure the representative of the Soviet Union, the United States has minimal influence and minimal ability to exert pressure.

Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom): The representative of the Soviet Union said, if I remember correctly, that the three Western Powers maintained that the General Assembly did not have the right to discuss the Trust Territory of Micronesia.

Well, really, I do not know whether the General Assembly has that right. I am not concerned with that. What I am concerned with are the rights and duties here in the Trusteeship Council. If the General Assembly chooses to discuss Micronesia, whether or not they have such a right, I am quite sure that we in the Trusteeship Council do not have to take any notice of it. We do not have to co-operate with them on this matter under Article 83. The fact is that the Trusteeship Council cannot prevent the General Assembly from treading on our constitutional corns if the General Assembly so wishes. But the representative of the Soviet Union really must not complain in that case at my constitutional protests which follow from that.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): If the representative of the United Kingdom has any doubts as to whether or not the General Assembly is entitled to discuss the question of Micronesia, why does his delegation eagerly support all proposals not to have this question discussed in the Fourth Committee? Why is it that the United Kingdom and the United States in the Fourth Committee strive to make sure that the question of Micronesia should not be discussed there and that no decision should be taken on the question there? The actions of the representative of the United Kingdom show that the views of the United Kingdom with regard to the denial to the Fourth Committee of the right to discuss Micronesia are very clear. There are no doubts

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

at all. The position he has espoused in the Fourth Committee has been consistent for many years.

If, however, the representative of the United Kingdom has no reason to fear the discussion of the question of Micronesia in the General Assembly and in its Fourth Committee, why is it that the Administering Authority and the delegations of the United Kingdom and France which support it cannot agree now that the Trusteeship Council should co-operate with the Special Committee on decolonization and with the General Assembly on all these questions? Wherein lies the reason for this fear of co-operation with these organs that are actively engaged in working on the problems of decolonization, in particular the problem of Micronesia? What is the reason for the fear manifested by the representatives of the Western Powers? It is not any given Article of the Charter that is at issue here. Obviously, there are political considerations underlying this.

Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom): I fear the representative of the Soviet Union protests too much. On the subject of the Fourth Committee, what the representative of the United States said was, I thought, most enlightening.

I would just say one thing. No one in the British delegation in the Fourth Committee was consulted on this matter at all. We merely went along with the decision taken by the Chairman of the Committee.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Council has heard a number of statements, comments and observations with regard to items 13 and 14 of the agenda. However, it has to await the adoption of its conclusions and recommendations before taking a decision on those two items, in accordance with the procedure adopted and followed in the last few years.

If I hear no comments, and if there is no objection, we shall defer our decision on the subject.

It was so decided.

SUSPENSION OF THE SESSION

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): On the basis of the informal consultations I held with the members of the Council, I shall suspend the fifty-first session of the Council. The Council will meet in resumed session at a date to be agreed upon after informal consultation with all members of the Council. It will be either 14 June or 15 June and we shall then take a decision on the draft conclusions and recommendations submitted by the Drafting Committee. I should like to appeal to members of the Committee to try to conclude their draft

(The President)

conclusions and recommendations as soon as possible so that we can take action on the date I indicated. As I said yesterday, I shall remain in contact with members of the Council and of the Drafting Committee as well as with the Secretariat with a view to co-ordinating our efforts in the preparation of the Council's annual report and adopting it as soon as possible.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, I have listened carefully to what you have said about the Council's work and in principle I have no objection to the procedure you suggest. I wonder, however, whether the date for the resumption of the session - 15 June - is not a bit too distant. Perhaps we could speed up our work on these drafts so as to be able to hold a meeting on 8 or, say, 10 June.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): As I indicated to all delegations in the course of informal consultations yesterday, it seemed that the Drafting Committee, which will be preparing the recommendations and conclusions according to the guidelines we have approved in informal consultations, needed a few more days to complete its work. Consultations with the delegations concerned have now revealed that a minimum of five days is necessary. We should normally have ended our work on 8 June. If I add those five days, that will take us to 13 June. If the work has been completed by then, I am prepared, after the documentation has been made available to delegations, to call a meeting in the middle of the week, so that the Council can take a decision. I have said that 14 and 15 June are target dates; they are also a deadline. If the Drafting Committee can complete its work more speedily, we shall of course meet earlier.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.