

# UNITED NATIONS TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL



Distr.  
GENERAL

T/PV.1608  
21 May 1986

ENGLISH

## Fifty-third Session

### VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIXTEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTH MEETING

Held at United Nations Headquarters, New York,  
on Thursday, 15 May 1986, at 3.00 p.m.

President: Mr. RAPIN (France)

- Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 September 1985: Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands  
(continued)

UN LIBRARY  
MAY 27 1986  
UN/SA COLLECTION

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

EXAMINATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 1985: TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (T/1888) (continued)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Council will now continue questioning the representatives of the Administering Authority.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I have a general question - to which I attach some importance - on a matter which I think, was raised by at least one petitioner, if not more. It relates to the post-trusteeship management of free association. At the moment, of course, the responsibilities are divided amongst a number of agencies. I wonder whether the United States delegation could give us an indication of what is envisaged for post-trusteeship as far as the management of the free association relationship is concerned.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): In response to the question of the representative of the United Kingdom, I can say that, yes, indeed, the United States Government has considered very carefully its relationship and the management of that relationship with the four new Micronesian States. We intend to institute organizational arrangements that are fully reflective of both the sovereignty and the political status of the freely associated States. The United States Congress specifically mandated this by stipulating that the United States Secretary of State shall conduct the governmental and official relations of the United States with the freely associated States and shall manage the inter-agency policy process in our Executive Branch.

(Miss Byrne, United States)

We are now completing an administrative order that will set forth the organizational lines consistent with this approach.

Thus it is my Government's intention to conduct its relations with the freely associated States through diplomatic channels and on a Government-to-Government basis.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I am grateful for that answer. I should like now to turn to general economic matters. I think that what came out very clearly in the opening statements by the United States delegation was its satisfaction at the increase in the amount of private-sector activity in the Territory. I think Mr. DeBrum of the Marshall Islands went into some detail about this. Of course, this is something to which my delegation has always attached importance in this Chamber, namely, the encouragement of inward investment and the generation of commercial activity this brings with it.

I wonder whether either the other leaders, or Mrs. McCoy, could give us further examples of the sort of private infrastructure development that has taken place in the Trust Territory over the last year?

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): May I suggest that the representatives of the four Governments be asked to comment on that point before the High Commissioner?

Mr. DeBrum (Special Representative): Since I was the one who went into details on the importance of economic development towards economic self-sufficiency, I will be the first to address that question. May we please have the question rephrased so that we can answer it specifically?

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I was not actually looking at Mr. DeBrum so much to give the answer, since he had already provided us with copious detail in his opening statement. But I think it is true that Ambassador Byrne, and indeed Mrs. McCoy, did speak of the expansion of private-sector investment in the Territory. So I was wondering whether the representatives of the other entities might attempt to match Mr. DeBrum in giving us examples of the sort of private-sector development that has taken place.

Mr. NAKAYAMA (Special Representative): The Federated States of Micronesia has a national plan based on four State plans. Some of the areas we are emphasizing are fisheries, agriculture and tourism. In fisheries we have completed two cold storage units of 200 tons capacity, one in Truk, on Dublon, and one on Ponape. Prior to that we installed two cold storage units in the outer islands, one on Oneop in Truk and one on Vlithi in Yap.

We also installed cold storage units on our field ships so that fish caught in the outer islands can be transported into the State centres for marketing.

In conjunction with the fisheries complex on Dublon, the former Governor had a plan to put in two pole-and-line fishing boats each year, which he planned to lease to a private concern to do the fishing.

The second phase for the Dublon complex is to open some canneries once the catching aspect is accomplished so that we may can whatever excess there is beyond the local consumption level.

We are continuing to explore the possibilities of increasing tourism facilities, such as tour packages and hotel construction. A new small hotel was constructed in Ponape, which increased the number of rooms for the entire Federated States of Micronesia, and we are approaching outside investors to entice them to join local concerns to open up other businesses so that our economy may be further developed.

Mr. NGIRAKED (Special Adviser): My name is John Ngiraked, and I am Minister of State. I am sitting in for President Salii, who has other engagements.

I wish to address the same subject with regard to Palau by mentioning three areas of major economic development and endeavour - tourism, copra and fishing.

The Palau Government has recently helped a group of private businessmen to revive a fishing venture under the Van Camp Company of the United States, which had shut down several years ago because of a decline in the price of fish in our area of the Pacific and for some other business reasons. The facilities for fishing and cold storage are being put into use by a new group of businessmen and investors from the United States and some Asian countries. We foresee in the near future a revival of active tuna fishing and cold storage in Palau and possibly progress towards having a tuna canning industry in Palau.

The copra oil processing plant which shut down several years ago because of a problem in securing raw materials from the Philippines is now being re-established by new owners and with new foreign investment.

In the tourist industry, a new hotel has been completed in the past two years, with accommodation for about 200 guests. It is a joint venture of Japanese and local businessmen.

To encourage private industry the Palau legislature recently passed a new tax law giving tax benefits to our local banks to stimulate lending to small business people in Palau and to strengthen the private sector of our economy.

Mr. TENORIO (Special Representative): I wish to address the economic development programme in which we in the Northern Marianas are currently engaged.

As some of the other Territories have already indicated is the case with them, tourism is one of the largest private-sector initiatives in the Northern Marianas. The Government has been concentrating on the development of tourism and related

(Mr. Tenorio, Special  
Representative)

activities for several years. We have managed to increase the number of visitors from a low four or five years ago of about 50,000 to a figure of 150,000 today. Those visitors come from all over the world, but mostly from the Far East. Tourism is perhaps the largest private-sector economic generator in the islands.

We have just started developing a garment and textile manufacturing programme, principally on the island of Saipan, where we have encouraged foreign investors to invest in joint ventures or on their own in setting up garment manufacturing plants. We hope through those activities to generate \$2 million to \$3 million a year in taxes and several million dollars in gross receipts from wages, salaries and related income. We look forward to continuing the development of textile and garment manufacturing on the island.

We have also just started encouraging our people to look into commercial agriculture, but we are having problems because of the lack of an outside market in which to sell our produce. We shall be exploring the possibilities of exporting agricultural produce to the island of Guam and our neighbouring Territories.

In fisheries, we have advanced only to the stage of a subsistence fishing programme. Some companies are interested in coming to our islands to invest in fisheries, but we have a small problem with respect to the applicability of Federal laws, in that commercial boats need a special permit to operate in the waters around the Northern Marianas. That requirement in United States law is somewhat impeding commercial fisheries development in the Commonwealth.

Another development that is contributing to overall Government revenue is the transshipment of tuna and other fish products, using a harbour on one of the islands. The activity brings ships and people to the island, where the fish products are transshipped from small fishing vessels into mother ships that will

(Mr. Tenorio, Special  
Representative)

carry them to other parts of the world. The activity, which is just beginning, benefits us through the purchases of foodstuffs and other necessary supplies for the fishing fleet.

Those are the four general areas of private development, which we believe are very viable activities. We hope to continue them in the future.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): The Administering Authority has always encouraged foreign private investment, and United States Government has provided tours and information to potential investors in the Trust Territory. We have also conducted and are constantly conducting a search for American investors, too. I am glad to say there seems to be an increasing interest in this.

Some other things ought to be mentioned as industries. The Department of the Interior has funded a study on the potential for shrimp aquaculture in Truk, which is now under way. Yap, for instance, also in the Federated States of Micronesia, has been exporting bananas to Guam for the past couple of years.

Work continues to get clearance for citrus products out of Kosrae, where there is some of the finest citrus in the world. We have been working on this project for some time in an effort to get clearance so that it can go into all the ports.

There is the clam mariculture project in Palau, which has been very successful. They are now exporting some of the clams to other countries which need them to reseed their beds. It is becoming an extremely viable industry, with many other nations trying to get ahead of us. But we think we have an edge on them. It is an extremely fine project and we are very proud of it.

There is a seaweed project in Kosrae.

The thing to remember is that we are not trying to be a General Motors, Ford or any kind of huge industry. In many ways our strength is based on small industries. Our handcrafts are becoming much better known. Take the coconut-oil soap, for instance. In both Truk and Ponape it is fun to watch the Air Micronesia flights come in and the crew all hop off the aircraft and run into the gift shop to pick up some coconut soap because it is so good. We hope that one of these days we shall be able to export it - perhaps on the same aircraft whose crews are so keen to buy it. I am not doing a commercial, but it is excellent soap.



(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

Then, of course, we have Ponape pepper. This is a small family-type operation, but I assure the Council that Ponape pepper is renowned in the gourmet world. One of the most exclusive and expensive shops in Texas features it, in a little bamboo-type container, at an enormous price for about half an ounce. So, we think there are great possibilities on that score also.

Palau also has a dried fish industry.

Saipan has a growing honey industry. I have been astounded by the huge business value of honey, and this is becoming one of the leading industries. Of course, we have the marvellous flowers, the correct climate and everything needed for it. That is another little industry we have going.

The Housing and Urban Development in the United States (HUD) has funded three fishing boats based in Truk. The Marshall Islands has received a grant, also from HUD, to rehabilitate the women's handcraft outlet factory. Some beautiful things are done there.

As I say, these are not enormous industries; they are private industries and they are going forward and, I think, we are making slow and steady progress.

I call the Council's attention to our annual report - that famous annual report about which we hear so much every year - and specifically to part V, "Economic advancement", beginning on page 51. If members of the Council have time to read it they will find a wealth of information as far as economic development is concerned.

I should like to add just one more thing about tourism. Recently officials from the Exploration Holiday Cruise Line, based in Seattle, have travelled all through Micronesia. I have just received a report from them. They have smaller cruise ships and they felt that certainly the islands of Micronesia would lend themselves to that type of trip. Their letter has just come to hand - I have not

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

even had the time to distribute it to my companions from Micronesia - and they say that they have very high hopes of a great addition to the tourism industry out there. They already have a new ship, one of a fleet of 10 or 12, on the seaways being designed particularly for our kind of trips throughout Micronesia. So I say that we have a good future and are truly the sleeper of the Pacific.

Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Today we have heard much that is general from the representative of the United Kingdom, but we are very interested to see what has been done in Micronesia. He is quite rightly interested and for the right reasons in questions of investment, particularly in industry and commerce, but we should like to get back to political themes.

Specifically, we wish to ask the following questions of the United States delegation. Were funds for the holding of the referendum allocated by the United States? Was this carried out by means of allocations from the Administering Authority or from the local authorities? Did the local authorities distribute the funds for the referendum themselves? We know that in the political campaign in Palau future status other than that of free association was not considered. We should like some clarification on these points.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): The United States provided \$250,000 for the expenses of the recent plebiscite in Palau, the one held on 21 February 1986. The money was given to the Government of Palau. It administered the funds and ran the plebiscite.

With regard to the questions on the ballot, it is true that this most recent plebiscite concerned only the citizens' views on the Compact of Free Association. That was because in two previous plebiscites the same voters - that is, the same people of Palau - had opted overwhelmingly for the status of free association. It was therefore not considered necessary to go through all the possible options once again.

Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We have listened carefully to the statements made by the United States delegation today. We have learned many things. Unfortunately, however, not all of our questions have been answered satisfactorily.

Furthermore, in the statement we received from one of the petitioners yesterday, our attention was drawn to a letter dated 21 February 1986, which I shall now read out:

(spoke in English)

"Governor Moses Uludong

Ngchesar State

Republic of Palau

"Dear Governor Uludong:

"It has been reported to me that during your trip to Guam and the FSM States as a member of the Political Education Committee you campaigned against the Compact. This surprised me since I had understood you to be now a supporter and it was on this basis that the governors nominated you for the Committee. It was certainly on the basis of my conviction that you would

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

abide by the legislative mandate for the Committee that I accepted the nomination of the governors.

"I bring this matter up simply to give you an opportunity to set the record straight if you care to do so.

"It has been recommended to me that one basis for distribution of Compact funds should be the stand of each state or governors on the Compact" - and I stress that last sentence.

"If you care to comment on this, I would appreciate hearing from you.

"Sincerely yours,

Lazarus E. Salii

President."

(continued in Russian)

As we understand it, the person who wrote that letter is a Special Adviser to the United States delegation.

The Soviet delegation would request that this letter be included in the official record of our meeting today.

I do not wish to place the representatives of the United States delegation in a difficult situation, but I should like to hear their comments on the letter that I have just read out, because certain other questions flow from it which our delegation will raise somewhat later.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): In response to the comments and questions by the representative of the Soviet Union, it is my understanding that both supporters and opponents of the Compact of Free Association were represented on the Political Education Committee. It was deemed that having people of various persuasions represented would lead to a fairer information programme for the people of Palau.

(Miss Byrne, United States)

I believe that representatives of Palau are in a much better position than I to answer the questions and comments of the representative of the Soviet Union. I would suggest that the Honourable John Ngiraked, who spoke a bit earlier in this meeting, comment on this matter. Perhaps further comments will be made by President Lazarus Salii when he comes to this session of the Council.

Mr. NGIRAKED (Special Adviser): I appreciate the opportunity to respond to the concerns expressed and questions put by the representative of the Soviet Union.

Palau is an open and free society. Therefore, individual freedom of expression is one of the basic tenets of our laws, including that on human rights.

I would reply to the last question of the Soviet representative by merely saying this: The letter that he read out may have been taken out of context. It may have to be read in the context of a long history of political education and the role of Moses Uludong, the addressee, as one of the five members of the Political Education Committee. But, as a Minister of State and a member of the Cabinet of the President, I can state for the records of the Trusteeship Council that the Republic of Palau, its national legislature - the Olbiil Era Kelulua - and its President have never at any time distributed Palauan public funds from the United States or any other sources on the basis of political considerations.

Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I read out the complete letter; it was not taken out of context. If there are any doubts, we can ask the Secretariat to distribute it in facsimile.

Secondly, the composition of the Committee is not important to us. We want to know whether the funds for Micronesia were used for political purposes.

Finally, the last paragraph of this letter reads:

(spoke in English)

"It has been recommended to me that one basis for the distribution of

Compact funds should be the stand of each state or governors on the Compact."

(continued in Russian)

We should be grateful to the representative of the United States if Mr. Salii could tell us who recommended to him that funds be allocated on such a basis.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I do not wish to get in the way of the answer Mr. Kutovoy is seeking, but, unless I am missing something here, the answer to the problem is surely very simple. Members of the Political Education Committee were supposed to be neutral. If one of them was found to be campaigning either against or for the Compact, surely he was stepping out of line, and therefore President Salii was entitled to reprimand him.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): I share the view just expressed by the representative of the United Kingdom. The line of questioning seems to me to be off the mark - to use an unparliamentary expression. In any case, I wish to reject formally any implication that the United States Government ever recommended that funds be distributed on the basis of the stand of a particular Government or organization concerning the plebiscites, referendums and other consultations of the people that have taken place in recent years.

(Miss Byrne, United States)

I believe that further comment could come be made by the representatives of Palau - in particular, the author of the letter.

Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The representative of the United States is obviously quite right but I do not think that we shall be able to get any further explanation of this.

I have other questions to ask in development of one of the answers given to our delegation's comments on the problems of the future of Micronesia. Will there be nuclear testing there? Will nuclear weapons be stored there? Will aircraft carrying nuclear weapons appear in the skies above Micronesia? Will there be nuclear weapons on board vessels on or under the water? Will there be radioactive fall-out there in the future?

Our attention has been drawn to the fact that this is no provision for this in the relevant agreement. However, one important question arises and we should like to have an answer to it now from the United States delegation. What guarantees are there that this will not be the case and how will the so-called verification system be ensured? Will there be international verification and how will this matter be dealt with in general?

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): The representative of the Soviet Union's questions remind me that I did leave one of his questions hanging this morning. I had already answered at some length, I think, about the nuclear issue, but he asked about the future of the Trust Territory and how it would be protected.

First, with regard to that part of his question, it is my complete understanding that what we are discussing at this session of the Trusteeship Council is precisely the future of the Trust Territory, and the comments that I

(Mr. Byrne, United States)

made with respect to section 314 of the Compact for the Federated States of Micronesia and the Marshall Islands and section 324 of the Compact for Palau precisely addressed the future of the Trust Territory as far as the whole nuclear issue is concerned.

Turning to the representative of the Soviet Union's present question, I can state categorically that there is no intention on the part of the United States to conduct any nuclear detonations in Micronesia. We honour the ban that has been signed on nuclear explosions in the atmosphere; we are a signatory to that Treaty. The last such atomic test in Micronesia was in 1958.

I shall again read out part of section 314 of the Compact for the Marshalls and the Federated States of Micronesia because I think that that section makes United States intentions in this regard quite clear. Section 314 reads:

"Unless otherwise agreed, the Government of the United States shall not, in the Marshall Islands or the Federated States of Micronesia: (1) test by detonation or dispose of any nuclear weapon, nor test, dispose of, or discharge any toxic chemical or biological weapon ..."

Similarly, section 324 of the Compact with Palau provides that

"the Government of the United States shall not use, test, store or dispose of nuclear, toxic chemical, gas or biological weapons intended for use in warfare...."



(Miss Byrne, United States)

The representative of the Soviet Union has asked what guarantee there will be that the United States will not do these things. My answer is that it is normal United States policy to respect and follow in letter and spirit all agreements which it signs or to which it adheres.

Further, the representative of the Soviet Union asked how this will all be verified. Of course, we are very pleased to note this enthusiasm on the part of the USSR for verification of any kind. The question of international verification in the nuclear sphere is a major element of the negotiations currently under way between our two Governments; it is one of the key issues in those negotiations. Whatever agreements are eventually arrived at will apply to the Trust Territory - which will no longer, of course, be the Trust Territory.

Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In the first passage read out by the representative of the United States the words "unless otherwise agreed" appeared. Could we have some clarification of the thrust of those words?

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): I can assure the representative of the Soviet Union that there is nothing underhand, no ulterior motive, in the use of the words "unless otherwise agreed". I am not a lawyer, but it seems to me that it is standard language in agreements between two or more parties to international negotiations. It simply means that the future is not in cement. It has no sinister or ulterior meaning. It simply says "unless otherwise agreed". The current agreement says "the United States shall not", and I believe that that will remain the position.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): Could I ask Mrs. McCoy, in order to demonstrate to her that I have indeed looked at the 1985 report, a question that is in a sense both military and economic, and thus follows on the military and

(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

political line of questioning of the Soviet Union. My question concerns the Civic Action Teams. What they do is spelt out in some detail on pages 56 and 57 of the report, particularly as regards their activities in the Federated States of Micronesia. I believe there are also one or two teams in Palau, possibly, or elsewhere in the Trust Territory.

It says here that there are 13-man construction teams in the Federated States of Micronesia. How many members, approximately, make up each team and how many teams are there throughout the Trust Territory?

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): There are five Civic Action Teams in Micronesia: one in Palau, one in Yap, one in Truk, one in Kosrai and one in Ponape. They are made up of 13 members; they are construction specialists and they are one of the biggest helps to all of our countries. They are extremely helpful in everything that they do. We have 12 construction people and one medical person on each team. They are drawn from different branches of the services. In Yap and Palau we have teams of Seabees. In Truk, we have a team made up of Air Force personnel.

The teams in Ponape and Kosrai are Army teams. However, I wish to make the point that they are military only because of the service branches they come from. They are construction people. They help to build and to take care of the communities. That is their primary concern.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I should like to ask the High Commissioner whether, apart from the Civic Action Teams, there are any other American servicemen in Micronesia?

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): Yes, there are two other places in Micronesia where there are some military personnel. One, of course, is the Kwajalein Missile Range. That is run by a civilian contractor, but there are some

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

military personnel on the base. The only other military action that we have is a Coast Guard LORAN weather station on Yap, and my understanding is that that will be closed, probably within a year. Those are the only military people that we have. The military persons on Kwajalein number about 30, which is not even a unit.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): Am I therefore right in thinking that in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands there are 45 American soldiers plus a small unit on Kwajalein, that that is the total United States military presence in the whole of the Trust Territory?

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): No, it is 65 - five teams of 13 people each.

Mr. ROCHER (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to turn to economic matters. My delegation has noted with interest the progress made in economic development in the Micronesian islands. We believe that the Territory can only benefit from increased trade with the outside world, and not only with Guam and Hawaii. We welcome the beginning of exports to those regions.

(Mr. Rocher, France)

On this subject, I should like to address a specific question to the Administering Authority concerning the Micronesian Marine Resources Institute in Palau. We note that interesting experiments are being conducted there that could result in the production or export of turtle shells. When we visited Palau in July last, we learned that export problems existed because turtle products could not be sent to Japan directly since trans-shipment through Guam was denied. Have problems in that connection been resolved yet?

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): In the United States, turtles are an endangered species, and therefore turtle shells are not allowed to pass through Guam. I would refer to Palau the question as to whether they have other sources for export. As long as turtles remain an endangered species in the United States, their transit through Guam will be prohibited.

Mr. NGIRAKED (Special Adviser): As far as Palau is concerned, at the moment we wish to improve and enlarge the scope of the present study, and we are not concerning ourselves with export. We have not reached that point. We are going through the process of establishing facilities and funding for the study and the culturing of certain species of turtles.

I understand that there is a market for turtle meat in the Asian region, for instance in Taiwan and the Philippines and other nations of Asia, but turtle shells cannot be exported through Guam. It is a problem we have not resolved. We are not concerned about that at the moment, because at this time Palau is not capable of handling a significant quantity of exports of that kind.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to pursue the question that was asked by the representative of the United Kingdom.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

I would ask the delegation of the Administering Authority this question: When it gave the number of military personnel in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, did it include military personnel in the Northern Marianas?

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): As the High Commissioner has indicated, the United States maintains only one facility in the Trust Territory for military purposes, and that is the missile testing range at Kwajalein, in the Marshall Islands. As the High Commissioner has indicated, that facility, while under army command, is operated by civilian contractors. There is also a small Coast Guard station in Yap, and that station's mission is civil navigational assistance.

Now, the United States also leases land on the island of Tinian, in the Northern Mariana Islands, and while it occasionally uses that land for military manoeuvres, the United States has arranged to lease back a great portion of that land to the Northern Mariana Islands for civilian purposes.

There are no installations on the island of Tinian on the land leased by the United States - no installations whatsoever.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I have another question relating to the provisions of a paragraph of the Compact, which, it is being suggested to us, correspond to the Constitution of Palau. We tried to ask this question of one of the petitioners who referred directly to this question.

I should like to have some explanation as to how they understand the term "within the jurisdiction of Palau". It states that the United States will not use or place nuclear, chemical and other weapons of mass destruction on the territory within the jurisdiction of Palau.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Could the representative of the United States comment on this? What does this phrase, "within the jurisdiction of Palau", mean? We know that, pursuant to the Compact and the accompanying agreements, the United States will have the right to certain regions in the territory of Palau, including the so-called exclusive zones. We should like to have clarification: who will have jurisdiction over these exclusive zones? Will they be under Palauan jurisdiction, or is it envisaged that they will be under the jurisdiction of the United States?

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): If I understood the representative of the Soviet Union correctly, I see at least two questions in his statement. The first is: What does "within the jurisdiction of Palau" mean. As we regard the situation, the jurisdiction of Palau will be the land of Palau, its waters and the air above it, as recognized by international law. That is to say that it should be the standard definition of "within the jurisdiction". Then I understood the representative of the Soviet Union as having gone into the exclusive-use military zone, and there also I can say that the exclusive-use military zone is within the jurisdiction of Palau.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In that case, the provisions of the accompanying agreements, to the Compact which determine the prerogatives of the United States in this exclusive-use military zone should be understood in such a way that the sovereignty or jurisdiction of Palau over this zone is maintained. In that connection, I should like to ask another question: In that case, how can they explain the United States understanding of the exclusivity of these military zones?

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): I believe the Council would be better served if you, Mr. President, requested Mr. James Berg, who was one of our chief negotiators, to reply to this rather technical question.

Mr. BERG (Adviser): In response to the question I think it is necessary first to call the attention of the Council and of the representative of the Soviet Union to the language of the Compact itself, because it is, in fact, in the Compact of Free Association where the essential rights and obligations of the United States and Palau are set forth.

(Mr. Berg, Adviser)

Article II of Title Three of the Compact provides that the United States may designate military-use areas or use military-use areas only in accordance with the specific terms of the separate agreements. In other words, the United States has no direct unilateral right outside of the terms of the agreements that we have with Palau to designate or use military-use areas.

With respect to the exclusive-use area that is described in the Agreement Regarding the Military Use and Operating Rights of the Government of the United States in Palau - and I believe it is article V of that Agreement that is relevant here - there are certain uses, as well as restrictions, that are set forth with respect to what the United States may and may not do within those areas.

The United States believes that the list contained in article V is, in fact, an exclusive list and the United States has no rights beyond those listed - nor does it seek rights beyond those listed - as the areas recognized by us as now being under, and remaining at all times under, the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the Republic of Palau.

"Exclusive-use area" is a term of art relating only to the level of use. No sovereignty or ownership is conveyed by Palau to the United States under the terms of this Agreement.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to hear the comments of the Administering Authority, and perhaps of the members of the delegation of the United States who have come from Palau, as to whether or not this accords with the provisions of the Compact and the Constitution.



(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

If the United States does not confirm the presence on board a ship or an aircraft of a nuclear weapon but the aircraft or ship is physically within the limits of the jurisdiction of Palau, what does that mean? Does it mean that the Constitution is being violated, or if the people of Palau do not know whether there is a nuclear weapon on board or not, does that mean the Constitution is not violated? How do these provisions relating to the physical presence accord with the Constitution which prohibits such a presence?

I should like to hear the comments of the representatives of the Administering Authority. How are we to take this? We have heard various arguments that the Constitution is being violated. It is also our opinion that it is being violated in this case, and the sections or articles of the Compact that are being considered at this time by the representatives of the Administering Authority as not contradicting the Constitution do not in actual fact accord with the Constitution. They require due approval by the people.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): I should like to read out the relevant part of article II, section 3, of the Palau Constitution, as follows:

"Major governmental powers including but not limited to defense, security, or foreign affairs may be delegated by treaty, compact, or other agreement between the sovereign Republic of Palau and another sovereign nation or international organization, provided ..."

Then this is the relevant part -

"any such agreement which authorizes use, testing, storage or disposal of nuclear, toxic chemical, gas or biological weapons intended for use in warfare shall require approval of not less than three-fourths (3/4) of the votes cast in such referendum."

As I have said earlier, at least twice, the necessary three fourths in a referendum was not achieved, and we and the Palauans considered that the Compact could not then be put into effect. The solution was compromise language, which we have described repeatedly, in our opening statements, in our rebuttal statements and in answer to some of the questions put today.

The compromise was to incorporate section 324 of the Compact between the United States and Palau, which says that

"the Government of the United States shall not use, test, store or dispose of nuclear, toxic chemical, gas or biological weapons intended for use in warfare and the Government of Palau assures the Government of the United States that in carrying out its security and defense responsibilities under this Title" - that phrase is very important -

"the Government of the United States has the right to operate nuclear capable or nuclear propelled vessels and aircraft within the jurisdiction of Palau without either confirming or denying the presence or absence of such weapons within the jurisdiction of Palau."

(Miss Byrne, United States)

The language of section 324 was drafted to conform with the Constitution of Palau. It is identical language. Therefore, there is no violation of the Constitution.

I assure the representative of the Soviet Union that both the Government of the United States and the Government of Palau consider that the Constitution of Palau is not violated by section 324 of the Compact with respect to Palau.

The "neither confirm nor deny" policy of the United States is, as I believe the representative of the Soviet Union well knows, a world-wide policy. The United States does not confirm or deny the presence of nuclear weapons on its vessels and aircraft. That language allows a compromise to come into being. The language of the Compact is identical to the language of the Constitution of Palau. There is no violation, and we do not have to violate our own policy of neither confirming nor denying.

I should also point out that the language of the Compact is significantly more restrictive than current United States rights in Palau.

I believe that the representative of Palau will also speak to this matter.

Mr. NGIRAKED (Special Adviser): With the Council's permission, I should like Mr. Victorio Uherbelau, our legal counsel, to speak on this question.

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

Mr. UHERBELAU (Adviser): I thought President Salii had answered the question on the vote required to approve the Compact - whether 50 per cent plus 1 per cent or 75 per cent - and I think his explanation also zeroed in on the possible conflict between the Compact and our Constitution. We appreciate the problem that has taken so much of the Council's time at this session as well as last year and the year before - the conflict between the nuclear provisions of the

(Mr. Uherbelau, Adviser)

Compact and our Constitution. Nevertheless, the President himself was a member of the Palau constitutional convention, and I served on it as well.

The issue is already behind us. The President of the Republic has already certified the Compact as having been approved according to our constitutional requirements, approved by the people as well as by our National Congress, and the Compact is before the United States Congress for its approval according to its constitutional process. As some of the petitioners have alleged, this issue may still have to come up for final decision by our courts.

In Palau's view - here we join the Administering Authority - there is no violation of our Constitution in all the provisions of the Compact of Free Association, especially section 324.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I have one other question. In the most recent plebiscite in Palau the voters considered the question of the so-called Compact. The time for acquainting the population with the new text of the Compact was extremely short, and in the view of jurists was simply insufficient. Even the Council's Visiting Mission commented that the people were - here I use the term used in its report - confused.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

I am interested to know if, when voting on the Compact, the population was informed that the United States could operate its ships and aircraft carrying weapons on board within the jurisdiction of Palau? Did they know about this?

Secondly, it seems to me that the words of the lawyers from Palau were not very convincing. They used the argument that, on the basis of what was said by the President, provisions of the Compact do not contradict provisions of the Constitution. I have heard statements here by well-known jurists, however, that the President did not have the right to change the Constitution or use it at his discretion. If such a serious question arises, which affects the fate of the people of Palau, they should know about it and be able to express their views. If the legal counsel from Palau thinks that a statement by the President is sufficient, that should be made clear.

I am very grateful for the answer given by the representative of the United States. I, too, can read the text of the Constitution and the so-called Compact. Having done so, however, I want to say that I got a completely different impression from the parts she read out as to how closely the Compact corresponds to the Constitution. That again indicates that the inhabitants of Palau should express their views on this specific question. How do the people who adopted the Palau Constitution feel? They are the only ones who can change that Constitution. We have not yet received any proof that this is what has happened. We had no facts on this.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): I should have taken notes because there were so many questions in what should have been a single question, I think, by the representative of the Soviet Union. So I may perhaps miss some of the points in my response.

(Miss Byrne, United States)

As I recall, his first argument was that the people of Palau did not have enough time to consider the question before taking part in the plebiscite. We have answered that question several times. I believe that when the report of the Visiting Mission was introduced that point was covered extremely well. The people of Palau had had several plebiscites and referendums before; they knew the issues and had plenty of time. There was certainly no lack of information or education. As I think I said in my rebuttal statement this morning, the United States Government has no doubt whatsoever that the people of Palau knew what they were doing.

I must again reject the assertion by the representative of the Soviet Union that there is a conflict between the Constitution and the Compact. He said something about changing the Constitution without consulting the people. I think there is a misunderstanding there. The Constitution has not been changed; it remains as approved in 1980. What was changed was the language of the Compact so that it would conform with the Constitution, which the people of Palau did not want to amend. So the Constitution stays as it was and the Compact has been amended to conform with the Constitution. There is no violation.

I cannot do anything about the Soviet perception, but I can reiterate that certainly the Government of Palau and the Government of the United States believe that there is no conflict. That is why we have been able to sign the document, why the Palau legislature has taken the necessary action and why we have asked our Congress to take the necessary action.

On the question whether they understood section 324, we believe that they did. The same voters voted for the Constitution; the same voters had voted several times in various plebiscites; and they voted for the Compact with section 324 as now drafted.

(Miss Byrne, United States)

If I have missed any of the points of the representative of the Soviet Union, I am sure he will remind me of them.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I agree with the representative of the United States that if someone is convinced of something his mind cannot be changed by words alone, without proof. No facts have yet been put forward to confirm what has been said by the delegation of the United States. Perhaps we have used different terms and lines of thought in our statements. Obviously the United States delegation can agree with me that the Constitution prohibits the presence of nuclear weapons in the Territory within its jurisdiction. That is very clear and I do not think there is any misunderstanding over the language there. However, there is in the port of Palau a United States warship carrying missiles with nuclear warheads and it has been there a month or two. The United States does not confirm or deny the presence of nuclear weapons on board. Is that in accordance with the Constitution of Palau?

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

The United States representative has said that in this case the Constitution is not being violated, that the Constitution has not been changed and is not being changed. That is true: the Constitution has not been changed. But in the example to which we have referred, the Constitution is simply being circumvented.

Whether or not the inhabitants of Palau know whether or not there is a nuclear weapon on board, the situation is the same: the Constitution is being violated. As a result, this could constitute a threat both to the lives of the people of the Territory and to their well-being. That is what we are talking about.

We cannot just play with words here. We have asked, and we are asking again: How can this provision be said to accord with the Constitution? We are told that there is no violation of the Constitution. We ask: What about the people of Palau, who were clearly told that the United States would not be allowed to station its vessels or aircraft but would be allowed to operate vessels and to fly aircraft with nuclear weapons on board over the territory of Palau and to land on the airfields of Palau?

I do not know whether the United States delegation can say anything else in an attempt to prove that there is no violation of the Constitution of Palau. Can any member of the delegation of Palau give legal justifications for this provision or perhaps change my mind? So far it has not been possible to change my mind, because I see completely different things.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): The Constitution of Palau prohibits the use, testing, storage or disposal of nuclear, toxic chemical, gas or biological weapons, and so forth. It prohibits the use, testing, storage or disposal. It does not - I repeat: not - prohibit presence. Section 324 of the Compact of Free Association says that



(Miss Byrne, United States)

"the Government of the United States has the right to operate nuclear-capable or nuclear-propelled vessels and aircraft within the jurisdiction of Palau without either confirming or denying the presence or absence of such weapons within the jurisdiction of Palau".

As I said earlier, and as the representative of the USSR well knows, we have a world-wide policy of neither confirming nor denying. That policy cannot be violated. I do believe that the Soviet Union does not confirm or deny the presence of nuclear weapons on its vessels or aircraft. Indeed, I believe that they have not even thought of having such a policy; the idea would never occur.

We simply do not confirm or deny. If a United States ship is in the harbour of Palau, it may or may not have a nuclear weapon on board. It could stay there for two months and not have any nuclear weapons on board, or it could be not nuclear-propelled. But the fact that it did not have nuclear weapons on board would not be confirmed or denied. It would be consistent both ways - that is, presence or absence.

So it is quite clear that, for the reasons I have stated, there is no conflict between the Constitution and the Compact.

In regard to some of the other questions raised by the Soviet representative, he might not have such questions if his country had agreed to participate in the Council's Visiting Missions. As I understand it, the last time the Soviet Union designated a member of a United Nations Visiting Mission was 1973. The United States, through the Trusteeship Council, has always invited the Soviet Union to come. The Soviet Union has not since 1973 - 13 years ago - agreed to participate in a Visiting Mission. I do believe that that is one of the major causes of the Soviet Union's doubts and scepticism.

(Miss Byrne, United States)

In any case, I repeat: There is no conflict between the Compact and the Constitution. There is no violation of the Constitution. We are strongly of that view. More importantly, as I said earlier, the Government of Palau is strongly of that view.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of the United States for that answer. I understood what she said, but the fact is that it is impossible to defend what cannot be defended. In this case, this position that has been defined is very vulnerable and scarcely defensible, because facts are facts. United States adherence to a certain policy does not mean that the policy will not violate the Constitution of Palau. There is no logical link here.

I assure the representative of the United States that if a visit by a Soviet representative to Micronesia would lead to the United States not using the Territory for military purposes, I of course would be willing to go there. But I am afraid that such a visit would hardly help matters. It is really not appropriate to link the question whether the Compact violates the Constitution to the question of the presence of a Soviet representative on a Trusteeship Council Visiting Mission.

I shall stop there. The picture is clear to us. We have not received any confirmation that the Compact does not violate the Constitution - at least in regard to its nuclear provisions.

The United States representative said that the Constitution does not specifically prohibit the presence of nuclear weapons on the Territory of Palau. She said that, therefore, the United States can operate vessels and aircraft with nuclear weapons on board within the jurisdiction of Palau.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

The statement made today by the representative of the United States increases our concern, because it shows that those words in the relevant articles of the Compact were put there to mislead the population of Palau. The true situation is that the United States will do everything that it feels it needs to do. That is the reality.

I have already taken too long asking questions and in a spirit of co-operation and understanding I am prepared to give way to any of my colleagues, although I still have many questions.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): I, too, shall be brief at this point. However, when the representative of the Soviet Union says that no arguments have been adduced to show that the Constitution of Palau is not violated by the language of section 324, I really have to say that he could not have been listening to me.

He commented on the use of words "denying the presence or absence" and my statement that the Constitution does not prohibit that and said that this was clearly language we had developed to fool the Palauan people. I must remind him that the Compact of Free Association between the United States and Palau is a document that has been negotiated over many years by representatives of the United States and of Palau. The Palauans were not fooled. The Palauans, as the Council has heard today, are tough negotiators and they have not been fooled.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Since no other delegation appears to wish to speak and the question-and-answer game has demanded great concentration and produced some nervous tension, perhaps delegations would like to take a break before we continue.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): If other delegations have not been very active in asking questions today, I think it is because I have been taking up their time. However, we still have some time left, so before a recess is called I should like to detain the Council a little longer in connection with the exchange of views that delegations have had with the delegation of the Administering Authority as regards the military rights of the United States in the Territory.

The United States delegation should not be offended by plain speaking. It is the Micronesians who should be offended by such a document as the Compact. I recall that in 1979 the Palauan leader Roman Tmetuchl, who was elected President of Palau, insisted that any agreement with the United States be drawn up in such a way as not to give any nation the right to carry out military activities or maintain military installations on Palau. However, that point was not developed. I recall that in 1982 - if I am mistaken I hope to be corrected - a press release was issued by the White House saying that if the United States was not granted military rights in Palau, in particular in the nuclear sphere, there could be no talk of free association. I understand the reason for that, why there was such a commotion about it and why pressure was put on the Micronesians of Palau who participated in the negotiations with the United States. Facts are facts, and I assure the representative of the United States that we have always listened very attentively to every word uttered by the Administering Authority in reporting on the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

I have here a statement by the Deputy Director of the Center for Defense Information, Admiral Eugene J. Carroll, Jr., United States Navy retired, made in the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, in which he said:

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

(spoke in English)

"During my 37 years in the United States Navy and subsequent five years as Deputy Director of the Center for Defense Information, I have carefully considered American military strategy plans, operations and requirements in the Pacific region. Two things are clear to me: one, the most important American objective in negotiating the Compact has been to ensure continued and complete freedom for the United States military in Palau and, two, Palau is militarily insignificant to the United States. In particular, there is absolutely no need for any type of United States nuclear-weapon activity in or around Palau. This is true in peacetime and will also be true in wartime."

(continued in Russian)

I did not read out the last sentence for nothing; I could have skipped it, but to be objective I also read it out. It is a judgement that Palau is militarily insignificant to the United States, but this is a subjective view. From an objective viewpoint the situation would appear to be different. Objectively, the United States has for several years been striving for what they now feel they already have.

If the delegation of the United States feels the need to comment on the statement I have read out by Admiral Carroll, their compatriot, we are ready to hear what it has to say.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): I have to confess that I might not have completely followed the argumentation of the representative of the Soviet Union, but he spoke of whether Micronesia, and specifically Palau, were militarily significant to the United States or not. I believe he had - at least from the interpretation I believe he had - two examples, one saying we thought it was militarily significant and the other that it was not. That is, if I understood correctly.

(Miss Byrne, United States)

I think it is quite clear that the international community has always considered Micronesia to be militarily significant. Micronesia is a strategic Trust Territory, the only strategic Trust Territory, and the word "strategic" implies to me that there is some military importance to the entity or the matter, whatever is being discussed. I therefore do not think that we have ever claimed that it was not militarily significant. As I say, the international community itself has so considered Micronesia, and that is why it is the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, a strategic Trust Territory.

Now, in the Compact we are given the responsibility to defend Micronesia. That is, in this particular case it says we must defend Palau, but if one has the responsibility to defend Palau one must also have the authority to do what is necessary to defend Palau. And one is therefore given the right to operate nuclear-capable nuclear-propelled vessels and aircraft within the jurisdiction without either confirming or denying.

Now, that authority, or, rather, the balance between responsibility and authority to have the means to fulfil the responsibility, is the essence of the Compact's defence provisions.

But, while I have indicated that certainly Micronesia - and specifically Palau - are of military importance, the United States has no present plans to build bases. There is one facility there now, and that is the extent of the intentions of the United States.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I thought that language barriers did not exist, but there would seem to be some. I would express my gratitude to the representative of the United States for disputing the Admiral, as I did. I also said that, although the Admiral concedes that the region is not a militarily important territory, the fact is that the case is different, and the representative of the United States has confirmed that, and I thank her for it.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

As for the rights of the United States, we must go back to the idea, as correctly stated by the representative of the United States, that the Territory is a strategic one and that it has a particular role in the maintenance of international peace and security. But now the United States insists that that strategic role is being transferred from the international community to the United States. True, under the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreement the United States has the right to establish military installations in the Trust Territory. However, the Trusteeship Agreement does not give the United States the right to use its power as the Administering Authority to impose its interests on the peoples of the Trust Territory in the future. This is what is happening now.

We will have more questions tomorrow.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): In response to the comments - I think they were all comments this time - of the representative of the Soviet Union, I did not think I was revealing any new doctrine or any fact that has not been long known when I said that the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is a strategic trust. I was basically only confirming what the international community knows and what the USSR itself understood 40 years ago, in 1947, when it accepted the fact that Micronesia would be a strategic trust under the trusteeship of the United States. I fail to understand why he considers my remarks so unusual.

So far as the Admiral is concerned, I was not taking issue with him; I do not know the Admiral. I do know that his analysis of the military importance of Micronesia was written when he was a private citizen, and in the United States, as we all know, private citizens can express views consonant with those of the United States Government or greatly at variance or slightly at variance with them.

I just wish to state that whatever the Admiral wrote is basically irrelevant to anything I have said in this Council.

So far as transferring the defence authority from the international community to the United States is concerned, the defence authority resides in the people of Palau. The people of Palau decide what they need for their defence. They and they alone can grant that authority to any outside entity.

I would also say, as I think I said earlier in a general way, that our rights under the Trusteeship Agreement are significantly greater than those agreed within the Compact of Free Association.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The last sentence spoken by the representative of the United States particularly interests me for the simple reason that she said that in fact the responsibility of the United States is significantly greater than is reflected in the Compact.



(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

We should really like to know about this, and we should like to have further comments in this regard from the representative of the United States when that is possible.

As for the statement that the Soviet delegation was apparently surprised by the statement of the United States that Micronesia is a strategic Territory, I can assure her that we are very well acquainted with the status of the Territory and were not caused any surprise. The United States delegation may have some kind of misunderstanding, either because of language problems or for some other reasons. I must once again state that the status of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is well known to us, and we are also well acquainted with all the documents relating to the Territory.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): I think I can answer the comments of the representative of the Soviet Union. He asked to hear more at a later date. I think I can now answer his comment concerning my statement that we have greater rights in the military field now than we would have under the Compact of Free Association.

Article 5 of the Trusteeship Agreement states:

"In discharging its obligations under Article 76 (a) and Article 84 of the Charter, the administering authority shall ensure that the trust territory shall play its part, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, in the maintenance of international peace and security. To this end the administering authority shall be entitled:

"1. to establish naval, military and air bases and to erect fortifications in the trust territory;

"2. to station and employ armed forces in the territory; and

(Miss Byrne, United States)

"3. to make use of volunteer forces, facilities and assistance from the trust territory in carrying out the obligations toward the Security Council undertaken in this regard by the administering authority as well as for the local defence and maintenance of law and order within the trust territory."

By the way, these rights apply to the entire Territory now, while the Trusteeship Agreement remains in force. But under the Compact of Free Association there will be four separate agreements, three for free association and one, as the Council is aware, for commonwealth status. Under those, the Governments have listed and limited the right of the United States to specific areas, and it is very, very restrictive. We will not be stationing and employing armed forces throughout the Territory, which we can now but do not. Specifically in section 352 of the Palau Compact, there is similar language. In the other Compacts we undertake to respect the authority and responsibility of the Government of Palau to assure the well-being of Palau and its people. Whatever rights the United States is granted are granted specifically by the Government of Palau, which has the authority to do so.

As I said earlier, the defence authority resides in the people of Palau, and it is executed by the Government of Palau.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to give the Council some information with respect to written petitions. The Secretariat is of course doing everything possible to publish and distribute written petitions addressed to the Secretariat as speedily as possible. Nevertheless, as members are aware, the translation and printing of those petitions require some time, and since we are in session I have requested that petitions that arrived yesterday or today -

(The President)

that is, in parallel with the regular process of translation and publication - be delivered as soon as they reach the Secretary-General in the form of a photocopy sent to delegations so that they can study them. But the photocopies members receive do not mean that the petitions are not being translated and published, as is required.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I understood that we had a rule at previous sessions of the Trusteeship Council that, if any of the petitioners could not be present on the day on which petitioners were being heard, but appeared at a later stage, the Trusteeship Council, in the interests of obtaining wider and more accurate information and getting at the full truth, would agree to hear them at some suitable time after their arrival in New York. Will that past practice apply at this session also, Mr. President?

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I think Mr. Berezovsky is quite right that this practice was followed in the past, but this year, in informal consultations, I understood that we agreed that we would confine petitioners to being heard on two days - the Tuesday and Wednesday of this week. I believe that Mr. Kutovoy agreed to that suggestion.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): As regards the hearing of petitioners, and quite apart from what the representative of the United Kingdom has just said, we have considered at the level of the presidency the request made yesterday by the representative of the Soviet Union, which I asked him to confirm to the Secretariat, to have an opportunity of putting further questions to petitioners who have already spoken. With regard to petitioners wishing to appear at a later date, I have not heard of any such requests. I should like us to comply as much as possible with our joint decisions, but if a formal request is submitted I shall consider it in consultation with the members of the Council.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I did not have anything specific in mind. I fear that my statement may have given rise to certain problems for my colleagues, and I should like to clarify our position. The President very rightly said that if such a situation arose we

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

would look at it with the documents in our hands. That is what I meant; that we should not close the door completely on our work but, as always, adopt a flexible procedure.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I think that that was quite clearly established at our first meeting when we adopted the tentative timetable for our work. I did not feel it was necessary to go back to the matter.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.