



UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



LIBRARY

JUN 6 1983

Distr.
GENERAL

T/PV.1552
30 May 1983

ENGLISH

Fiftieth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 24 May 1983, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom)

Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 September 1982: Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued)

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

Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1982 (continued)

Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to observe the Plebiscite in Palau, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, February 1983 (continued)

Organization of work

This record is subject to correction.

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

Any corrections 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.

83-60677

45 P-

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 1982: TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (T/1853; T/L.1235 and Add.1)(continued)

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

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

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

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now continue its examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the questioning of the representatives, Special Representatives and Special Advisers of the Administering Authority.

The representative of the United States has told me informally that he now has the answer to one of the questions asked this morning by the representative of the Soviet Union and concerning which he requested time to obtain the details.

Mr. KINNEY (United States of America): I should like to apologize to the representative of the Soviet Union for my inability to provide a prompt response to his question this morning about a cut of \$28 million in the budget of the Federated States of Micronesia. The clarity and brevity of his question caught me quite by surprise, and, added to the fact that there was no budget cut at all, much less one of \$28 million out of a budget of \$35 million, this left me in some confusion. However, let me express my appreciation for the directness of the question and provide a proper response.

I assume that the representative of the Soviet Union is referring to a \$2.8 million cut, which is mentioned on page 7 of the annual report - a part of the chronology provided for the report by the authorities of the Federated States of Micronesia. If the representative of the Soviet Union will kindly turn to the next page, page 8, he will note that the same authorities noted that a few months later those funds were restored.

(Mr. Kinney, United States)

I should also like to draw the Council's attention to page 36 of the report, where a full budgetary breakdown is given indicating that the fiscal year 1983 budget is in fact \$1 million higher than the 1982 funding.

Additionally, the Administering Authority has most recently requested supplemental funding from the United States Congress for the Federated States of Micronesia in the amount of \$8.5 million - \$3.5 million for construction projects and \$5 million for supplemental funding of the cholera eradication programme, to which my delegation referred this morning.

Beyond that, for fiscal year 1984 the Administering Authority has requested an additional \$19 million for various projects in the Federated States of Micronesia.

I hope that that satisfactorily answers this morning's question. I would mention that a similar question was raised last year and our response then also clarified the fact that budgets were not being reduced but, rather, increased in the Trust Territory.

Mr. BERMAN (United Kingdom): I am, of course, aware that, as you announced a few moments ago, Mr. President, we are at present engaged in the process of posing questions to the representatives of the Administering Authority.

My problem is not really of that kind. This is really more in the nature of a request for clarification in connection with certain remarks made by my colleague from the Soviet Union this morning. My delegation is of course extremely anxious to fulfil its responsibilities as a member of the Trusteeship Council to the full and to the best of its ability, and I imagine that other delegations are too. So if there were a possibility of seeking clarification from the Soviet delegation, through you, Mr. President, I would be duly grateful.

The particular point that struck me this morning was a suggestion by the representative of the Soviet Union that the Trusteeship Council should itself have been directly involved in the negotiations between the Administering Authority and the constitutional organs in the Trust Territory on the completion of the Compact of Free Association, or at the least, if I understood him correctly, should have been present in an observer capacity. I would be grateful if it were possible for the representative of the Soviet Union to give an explanation

(Mr. Berman, United Kingdom)

of what the basis in the United Nations Charter is for that suggestion. The suggestion took me aback when I heard it this morning for the first time. I understand that similar remarks have been made in the past and perhaps it is the case that nothing said in the Trusteeship Council is ever entirely new because certain themes have come up in different forms over the years.

Be that as it may, I have studied the Charter in the interim and I have not been able to find any provisions in it which would seem to provide a basis for the suggestion. I should therefore be grateful for clarification from the representative of the Soviet Union as to where his delegation finds in the Charter a justification for that claim.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It seems to me that no particular clarification is needed here. It is perfectly clear that the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is not a possession of the Administering Authority. It is a Trust Territory of the Administering Authority. The United States was granted trusteeship of the Territory under an agreement approved by the Security Council. We note that in accordance with Article 83 of the United Nations Charter

All functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas, including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements and of their alteration or amendment, shall be exercised by the Security Council."

That article is quite clear. If the representative of the United Kingdom reads it attentively, I think he will find that additional clarification by the delegation of the Soviet Union is not necessary.

Mr. BERMAN (United Kingdom): I have asked to speak again only to have the opportunity briefly to express my thanks to the representative of the Soviet Union for having been willing to respond immediately to the request for clarification my delegation raised.

(Mr. Berman, United Kingdom)

I had of course already read with great attention the text of Article 83, as indeed, other articles of the Charter, such as Article 87 and others which bear on the functions of the Trusteeship Council.

I do not want to go further into the matter now, except to say that my delegation reserves the right to comment further on it during the general debate in this Council.

The PRESIDENT: Would the representative of the Soviet Union like now to continue with his questioning?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Before I continue putting questions to the representatives of the Administering Authority, I should like to comment on the statement that has just been made by the representative of the United Kingdom.

Naturally it is his right to interpret and reflect on any and all documents, inter alia, such fundamental documents as the Charter of the United Nations. Nevertheless, a charter is a charter, and an agreement is an agreement, and nobody can change them now, least of all the United Nations Charter, which speaks perfectly clearly of the responsibility of the Security Council, to which the Trusteeship Council is subordinate in this case, for everything taking place in the Trust Territory and, most importantly, what we are talking about now, that is, the question of the political future and status of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

In continuing our questions to the representatives of the Administering Authority, I should like to raise what is perhaps a question of a general nature. I have tried to find the figures but perhaps I have not looked for them carefully enough and, if the Administering Authority could give me an immediate answer to this question, that would help me considerably. I should like clarification as to what amounts the Administering Authority believes will be spent during the 15 years of the Compact? What expenditures are provided for financing it? Is a fixed general sum provided for by the United States? If there

is, then I should like to apologize for not having been able to find it in the documents.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): It is a very simple matter to look at the annual reports which are issued, as their name implies, annually, indicating the amount of monies that have been spent and will be spent. We do it on an annual basis, and so it is a matter of projecting into the future and hypothesizing inflation rates and so on, but we would be happy to try to do that mathematical work and come up with the figure, which may be useful to the Soviet Union. Obviously, at this point in 1983, we can only come up with a notional figure.

The PRESIDENT: I may be wrong, but I think the point was really whether there was in the Compact a figure for expenditure on the part of the United States which would be made for the duration of the Compact. Was that the intention of the question? I understand now that it was, and that is really a rather more specific question than was envisaged by the representative of the United States, which was what would be the total American expenditure in that period - a rather different point.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): Well, the answer to that is very simple. No, there is no figure in the Compact.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): I understand that some inquiries will be made by the United States delegation, but could they give a general figure as to what they foresee?

My second question is in connection with this general figure. Could the representative of the Administering Authority perhaps foresee or estimate the amounts of expenditure for 15 years without the Compact being in force? What would the general figure be for the next 15 years?

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): I am just not prepared to go into that kind of hypothetical mathematics. I do not know.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I am very sorry that the representative of the United States does not have some idea about this, because the third question I wanted to ask in this connection was who would benefit in respect of those two figures: the amounts to be spent by the Administering Authority without the Compact and those with the Compact. The representative of the United States said that that was purely hypothetical, but I do not quite agree that this is so hypothetical for the simple reason that the so-called hypothetical figures were in fact discussed. If I am not mistaken, they were discussed by the United States Congress. Those figures were discussed and they have led us to some rather interesting thoughts. I regret that Mr. Zeder, who is well acquainted with them, is not here.

However, since he is not here, and since other members of the United States delegation cannot now speak to this point, we shall have to turn to the next question.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

At the last session of the Trusteeship Council, we took note of the very high level of unemployment in the Trust Territory. I should like now to find out from the representative of the Administering Authority what the position has been in the past year. Has there been any change in the unemployment situation as compared with the previous year?

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): I am informed that the unemployment rate today is approximately 9 per cent, but perhaps more precise figures could be obtained from the representatives of the Trust Territory entities who are with us today.

The PRESIDENT: Is there any one of your advisers in particular whom you would like me to call on?

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): No. Since the situation differs slightly in each of the entities, perhaps each of them might make a brief comment. We have with us Mr. Uherbelau of Palau, Mr. Takesy of the Federated States of Micronesia and Mr. Guerrero, who is representing the Northern Marianas. There is no representative of the Marshall Islands here today.

Mr. UHERBELAU (Adviser): I do not have the accurate figure on unemployment with me. I shall be glad to supply it to the representative of the Soviet Union by the end of the week.

Mr. TAKESY (Special Representative): I regret that I do not have the relevant figure to hand either, but I seem to recall that it ranges from 14 to 24 per cent. I too will submit the actual figures by the end of the week.

Mr. GUERRERO (Adviser): I am not quite sure of the figure, but I believe unemployment in the Northern Mariana Islands is running between 7 per cent and 9 per cent.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): Generally, I would say that the figure may vary depending on the methodology by which the unemployment figure is arrived at. This differs in various statistical matrixes. In any case, I think that as a generic statement applying to the whole Territory we can say definitively that the employment position in all of the areas has improved over last year's unemployment rate of 19 per cent.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I understand that the situation has been such that unemployment is a very serious social phenomenon. It is a particularly complex social phenomenon in a Trust Territory. We know that there is unemployment throughout the world; and we know why it exists. For all that, we should like clarification from the Administering Authority as to what measures it is taking in order at least to reduce unemployment, although of course it would be best for unemployment to be eradicated altogether. What is being done by the Administering Authority to reduce the level of unemployment in the Trust Territory?

The PRESIDENT: Perhaps I might just draw attention to the report of the Visiting Mission which went to the Territory last year. In its report it addressed this important problem which has been raised by the representative of the Soviet Union. One bit of the report I find quite helpful is that contained on pages 74 and 75. I mention that only because I have found that in this report and some of the other reports that have been submitted to the Council there is an immense number of helpful facts which doubtless we should all bear in mind.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): Certainly the United States agrees that unemployment is a serious problem; it is a serious problem for us on the mainland of the United States as well as in the Trust Territory; it is a serious problem in many, many countries of the world. It is one that we are trying to address in a variety of ways. There are a number of training projects now going on. There are 18 trainees from the Federated States of Micronesia involved in the Micronesia trades apprenticeship programme. There are 8 trainees from the Republic of Palau and Ponape State in a short-term trades programme. In the Federated States of Micronesia - Yap, Truk, Kosrae and Ponape - a total of 167 individuals are involved in a variety of work experiences on projects, including work with marine resources, shipping, cargo-line work, handicrafts and so on, piggery development, sales, boat-building, small-engine repair and heavy equipment operation training. In the Marshalls there are also some 57 trainees involved in a variety of work experience projects and another 42 who will be involved in on-the-job training programmes in the private sector.

I shall not go into the details of the kinds of work being done, but suffice it to say that in the Federated States of Micronesia, the Marshall Islands and Palau there are people being trained and getting their work qualifications upgraded. Efforts are being made by the Administering Authority and the respective Governments to deal with this problem, with some success.

Mr. BEREZVOSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Sir, I should like to assure you that the Soviet delegation has studied the report of the Visiting Mission of the Trusteeship Council to the Trust Territory with just as much attention as other delegations in the Trusteeship Council. That is why we raised that question directly with the Administering Authority regarding those results of the Visiting Mission.

Having ended with that, I should like to turn to my next question. The Administering Authority in its report to the Council points out the fact that it is continuing to make further efforts to transfer the remaining public lands, in particular to the Government of Palau. I should like to have some details concerning the nature of these efforts and, secondly, as to how much land has so far not been returned to the Micronesians - not only in Palau but also in the other territories.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): Mr. President, if you will give me just a few minutes, I shall obtain some information from the vast amount we have here.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, in the light of the fact that some time will be required by the delegation of the Administering Authority, perhaps we could have a five-minute suspension. Other delegations could also make good use of that break for themselves. Could we have a five-minute suspension of the meeting?

The PRESIDENT: On the proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union and with the consent of the other members, I shall suspend the meeting for five minutes.

The meeting was suspended at 3.55 p.m. and resumed at 4.05 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States in connection with the question which was asked by the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): All public land has been returned to the owners, except for those relatively small parcels which are needed for Trust Territory Government administration and United States Federal Government utilization. Of the public land in Palau only the airport and quay areas are still outstanding. For the other public lands quick claim deeds, I believe, were signed last November and went into effect in January.

If I may quote from another not always well-read report, entitled "Conclusions and Recommendations of the United Nations Trusteeship Council", dated May 1982, which is reproduced in our annual report and starts on page 153, paragraph 7 states that:

"The Council notes with satisfaction that nearly all of the public land in the Trust Territory has now been turned over to the respective constitutional governments.

"The Administering Authority is continuing its efforts to return the balance of public land held in Palau pending the development of homesteading procedures. All other public land has been returned." (T/1853, part IX, para. 7)

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It is precisely because I had read the paragraphs just quoted by the representative of the United States that I asked that question.

We do not quite understand what the homesteading procedures are, what lies behind them, what they really mean, and what difficulties confront the Micronesians in getting back their own lands. That is precisely why the Soviet Union asks the question.

I am not going to quote the paragraph just quoted by the representative of the Administering Authority, but that was exactly what I was interested in. What are those so-called homesteading procedures which are being worked on now and when will they be terminated? What exactly is the nature of those procedures.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): Let me, if I may, ask Acting Attorney General Uherbelau to explain to the representative of the Soviet Union just what is involved in the homesteading procedures he refers to.

Mr. UHERBELAU (Adviser): The homesteading programme was started in Palau twenty or so years ago. It was a joint effort by the Administering Authority, through the Office of the High Commissioner, together with the District Administrator of Palau District. The intention was to have the so-called public lands, or lands in the public domain, returned to individual Palauan citizens. In the course of time some of the applications for homesteads were processed and some were not processed up to the State level owing to the slowness of the surveying conducted by the Palau district land management department. As Ambassador Sherman has reported, all the public lands in Palau were quitclaimed back to the Government of Palau by the Office of the High Commissioner as of last November, effective in January or February of this year, except, as he mentioned, for a piece of land in Airai where the extension of the airport project is still going on and except for the quarry in Koror from which gravel is being taken to pave the roads and extend the airport. The quitclaim deeds were issued subject to the terms and conditions of the homestead applications. Those who had been issued homestead licenses had priority over those lands. The quitclaim deeds issued by the High Commissioner would not return those lands that had been homesteaded to individual Palauans. That is the story. But I can assure this Council that no public land or private land in Palau are still retained by the Administering Authority, except for small lots for the post office and others.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): Just for clarification, if the Council will permit me, and I thank it for the indulgence. Homesteading was part and parcel of the whole westward movement of the United States, the development of large areas of uninhabited land or of land held by the Government. In order to facilitate its development and in order to give land to the pioneers, for want of a better word, who were going out into the wilderness territory and developing land, the Government made homestead grants of land to people who could demonstrate the desire and the ability to farm, clear, develop and otherwise utilize that territory. That is what is implied in the term "homesteading", nothing more or less than that.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Thank you for the clarification given to the Soviet delegation to the questions we have asked. The next question the Soviet delegation would like to put is as follows: as everybody knows, on Kwajalein there was a rather serious expression of protest by the landowners of Kwajalein. We recall that there were some press reports about these events, and those reports also were reflected in the reports of the Visiting Mission of the Trusteeship Council. In that connection, we have one question. After the beginning of the strike, it is well known that the strikers, as they are known, were subjected to so-called retaliatory measures, and we have a question as to who was responsible for introducing those measures against the Micronesians. Was it the military authorities on Kwajalein, or were these measures carried out on instructions from the High Commissioner or from the civilian authorities on the Trust Territory?

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): I believe that High Commissioner McCoy has already addressed this subject to some extent and I too made some references to it in an earlier statement. However, let me now give the Council some background in somewhat more detail. A number of landowners on Kwajalein atoll undertook an unlawful but generally peaceful sit-in demonstration at the range on 18 June 1982, primarily to manifest their unhappiness with certain policies of their Government, the Republic of the Marshall Islands. Their complaints included, among other things, their Government's failure to execute a financial agreement with the Kwajalein Atoll Corporation for fiscal year 1982, whereas there had been such agreements in the two preceding fiscal years, and their Government's signature of an agreement subsidiary to the compact of Free Association, which would have allowed continued United States use of the range for up to fifty years. They also reportedly considered the amount of compensation for that use to be too low and objected to the manner in which the compensation was set forth and characterized. The landowners also expressed their dissatisfaction with living conditions on Ebeye and their alleged mistreatment on Kwajalein. As the demonstration continued, the landowners and their supporters complained about lack of direct access to their American legal counsel and about an alleged shut-off of water for sanitary facilities at their encampment. Various legal actions were filed both by the landowners and by their Government. The United States became peripherally involved in some of this litigation, which was, I would emphasize, principally between the

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

landowners and the Marshallese Government. The demonstration was finally resolved through negotiations in Washington between the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Kwajalein Atoll Corporation, resulting in a new agreement between them signed on 19 October, and simultaneous negotiations between the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the United States, resulting in a new Kwajalein Interim Use Agreement, the fourth in a series of such agreements, which was signed 20 October. The latter agreement covers the fiscal year ending 30 September 1983, so-called fiscal year 1983, and beyond until the Compact of Free Association comes into effect or until 30 September 1985, whichever is sooner. At the same time, negotiators for the Marshall Islands and the United States initialled changes to the subsidiary agreement which include a reduction of its term, that is the term of use of the base by the United States, from fifty years to thirty years and a corresponding reduction in United States compensation for use of the range.

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

The new interim-use agreement provides additional funding for the economic development of Ebeye Island, where most of the landowners live, in fiscal years 1983 through 1985, and includes a provision that for the first time the landowners themselves will contribute to the improvement of living conditions on Ebeye from the compensation they receive through their Government from the United States. The agreement also increases from 2 to 3 the number of six-week periods each year when landowners and others may visit and use their islands in Kwajalein Atoll and has other provisions beneficial to the landowners. The United States is satisfied with these arrangements and is pleased that agreements were finally reached in this essentially intra-Marshallese dispute.

The landowners' encampments on Kwajalein Island and other islands of the atoll leased by the United States were promptly and peaceably dismantled soon after the signature of the agreement.

During the demonstration the Kwajalein Atoll Corporation announced plans for the holding of a referendum among Kwajalein residents on the propriety of continued missile testing at the range. The referendum was variously announced for 13 and 17 August but it was never held. The Administering Authority was never consulted about the referendum, had only hearsay information about its purposes and motivation and was dubious with respect to the legal standing or effect such an event would have had under Marshallese law.

Any further questions on this subject would, of course, have to be directed to the Government of the Marshall Islands. However, the specific situation of the workers, as this Council has already heard from Minister Domnick of the Marshall Islands Government only days ago, has been satisfactorily and completely resolved.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): If I correctly understood what was just said by the representative of the United States, for practical purposes this amounts to saying that there were differences of opinion between landowners on Kwajalein and the local Government.

But my question to the Administering Authority was: who undertook retaliatory measures directed against the demonstrators during the demonstration? Who was it who froze bank accounts? Who blocked deliveries of foodstuffs? Who gave instructions regarding other measures which were taken against the demonstrators?

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Should we understand that all of this was carried out by the local governmental authorities? If that is so, then naturally we shall ask questions of the representative of the local authorities who are here with the United States delegation. If that is not so, then we should like an answer from the Administering Authority.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): There was, I am informed, a temporary cut-off of sanitary facilities to the encampments, but the Federal Court immediately issued an injunction ordering restitution of sanitary facilities for use by the "sail in" demonstrators.

In essence, therefore, this was simply a temporary problem that was resolved promptly by the legislative authority of the Federal Court.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I still do not know who introduced the measures which were taken against the demonstrators. I asked a somewhat different question. I did not ask who repealed them. I asked who introduced them and so far I still have not had an answer to that question. By whom were those measures introduced. I was not asking about the period of time they were in effect.

Were they introduced by the High Commissioner, that is, by the civilian authorities of the Administering Authority in the Trust Territory, or were they introduced by somebody else? That is the question the Soviet delegation would like to have answered: who introduced them?

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): I believe that the measures were instituted by the local administration of the base, that is the immediate base authorities who were there as an initial response to the illegal occupation.

As I say, the measures were rapidly overridden by our concern as Administering Authority and the earnest concern for the welfare of the demonstrators. In other words, this was a relatively low-level and immediate response to a situation which was rapidly changed and corrected.

The PRESIDENT: Perhaps I could just refer again to this very useful report which was made by the Visiting Mission last year. On pages 114 and 115 there is a short account of this incident which, I think, puts it in very good proportion. I am sure the representative of the Soviet Union has read it and he will say that it is because he has read it that he was asking the question.

But quite apart from that I think it is quite a useful summary for us all of the incident of the "sail in" and the part that the Visiting Mission was able to play in helping to bring about a return to normality.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): You guessed in advance, Mr. President, what my response was going to be to your statement: the Soviet delegation is familiar with paragraph 25 of the Secretariat working paper (T/L.1235). That paragraph states that the Mission met with the Commander of the range on Kwajalein to settle the question of the measures which were taken against Micronesians.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Incidentally, the interpretation offered by the representative of the United States, namely, that those actions on the part of representatives of the Micronesians were illegal, seems to me to be in conflict with the obligations of the Administering Authority to the peoples of the Trust Territory.

I should like to ask another question regarding the answer to a previous question. We do not quite understand the place within the trusteeship as administered by the United States of those military authorities in Kwajalein. We must conclude that the military command determines its own policies in the Trust Territory, has its own prerogatives in the Territory, and, as is clear from the events in Kwajalein, also has the physical means of applying measures against the Micronesian population. We would still like clarification as to the extent to which the Administering Authority co-ordinates its actions in that Territory and how it does so. What is the role in the Administering Authority's actions of the military authorities in the Trust Territory and how much autonomy are they given? From what we have seen and judging by what the representative of the Administering Authority has said here, it would seem to follow that, although this has been described as a middle-level or low-level reaction to actions by the Micronesian population in its own territory, there has in fact been a reaction, a reaction not in keeping with the mandate entrusted to the Administering Authority under the Trusteeship Agreement.

In sum, what we wish to understand is the relationship between the various sub-divisions of the administration - between the civilian representatives of the High Commissioner and the representatives of the military authorities.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): The action of the military authorities was simply an initial response, for the protection of territory which we lease and for whose integrity we are therefore responsible. The military authorities - who, I think I mentioned before, are extremely limited in number - were not making policy; they were simply responding to an immediate situation. That response was subsequently judged by the court to have been an over-reaction, and it was promptly corrected. During the whole time the situation was not controlled or managed or handled in any way by the military authorities; it was handled by the Marshallese police, who controlled the situation on our leased territory under an injunction from a Marshallese court.

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

As to interpretations of what happened, I think I will stand on my previous answer and on the report of the Visiting Mission, which, as you so admirably stated, Mr. President, sums up the situation quite well. I do not think there were any nefarious motives or dark intentions. It was simply a question of an immediate over-reaction by some people who were acting in what they thought was the interest of controlling the safety and integrity of the base.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I am interested in one paragraph of the Administering Authority's 1982 report. It states that 26 police officers from the Federated States of Micronesia attended a two-week training programme in connection with setting up a special division to deal with civil disorders. The programme was attended by members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Why did the need suddenly arise to train officers for such a special division?

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): I would submit that the maintenance of public order is part of democratic government all over the world - part of all kinds of government, as a matter of fact. I would point out that the Marshall Islands did not participate in this training programme; it was only the Federated States of Micronesia, I believe at their own suggestion and initiative, in the interest of the development of the professional capabilities of their police force. Beyond that I have no information.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): My delegation would like to ask a question concerning the dumping of radioactive materials near the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. At last year's session of this Council this question was rather widely discussed and the Council received a letter from, as I recall, the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations. However, the situation remains unclear.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

We know that there was a statement made by the Administering Authority to the effect that - both as Administering Authority and as the United States - it did not intend to dump radioactive wastes within the boundaries of Micronesia. At the same time it is not quite clear what measures are being taken by the Administering Authority to ensure that the concern of the Micronesians over the situation are fully satisfied and to give them guarantees that their territories and populations will not be subjected to dangers resulting from the dumping, in the area around Micronesia, of radioactive and other materials dangerous to health and life and to the environment. We should like to receive, since a year has gone by already, further clarification from the Administering Authority about what the measures finally are, as an addition to the statement that the United States itself is not planning to dump radioactive materials in the area. What measures is it taking as the Administering Authority to ensure the security of the peoples of the Trust Territory and of the environment of the Trust Territory? We should like to know what measures were taken during the year, what intentions does the Administering Authority have in this regard and what is the state of affairs at the present time.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): The question was indeed raised last year and, because we are speaking here of the intentions of another country that is not a member of the Trusteeship Council, Japan, I hesitate to make much comment. If my memory serves me correctly - the Secretariat can perhaps confirm my impression - last year the President was in touch with the Permanent Representative of Japan with respect to this question and I believe an answer to it was forthcoming from the Government of Japan and circulated as a Council document.

In any case, another part of the conclusions and recommendations of the Trusteeship Council has now been called to my attention. It is dated May 1982 and is reproduced in our annual report, in paragraph 3, according to which the Council took note of the letter dated 2 June 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Trusteeship Council (T/1941) and in particular it noted the assurances of the Japanese Government that it would continue its efforts to obtain the understanding of the countries and

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

territories concerned and would take fully into account their sentiments and sensitivities on the matter. To give further background, in 1980, as the Council knows, the Japanese Government announced plans to begin ocean disposal of low-level radioactive waste in 1981. The proposed disposal site is not in the Trust Territory proper; it is some 350 miles north-west of the Ogasawara Islands, owned by Japan and approximately equidistant - 560 miles - between the Northern Marianas and Tokyo. The Japanese announced at the same time that they would become a party to the London dumping Convention, otherwise known as the Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter. The Japanese offered assurances that any radioactive waste disposal would be in accordance with the terms of that agreement and other relevant international standards. Japan has since become a party to the London dumping Convention; Japan is also a party to the consultations on surveillance mechanism of the Nuclear Energy Agency, which monitors ocean disposal activities in accordance with international standards. Japan has also entered into consultations with representatives of the Pacific island States, including the Trust Territory Governments, regarding their intentions. It is also our understanding that Japan does not intend to proceed with its plans until those consultations are complete and satisfactory to all parties. That is the extent of my knowledge on this. Again the Soviet delegation is perfectly correct in saying that the United States does not dump radioactive waste at sea.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I am quite familiar with the letter which was submitted by the representative of Japan last year to the Trusteeship Council. At that time too we noted that the tone of that letter and its content give no guarantee that the waters adjacent to Micronesia will not be used for the continued implementation of the programme of dumping radioactive elements. It is precisely for that reason that we ask the Administering Authority this question again today with regard to what has occurred during the past year. Have there been any changes or any progress at all in the interesting state of affairs? To judge from the Administering Authority's answer so far, no shifts or changes have occurred, except for the fact that the representative of Japan will hold consultations, and generally speaking that seems to be as far as things go.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

We should like, however, to have from the Administering Authority some clarification of its position in this respect. How does the Administering Authority intend to guarantee that the interests of the population of the Trust Territory will be defended?

The fact that the region of that dumping is equidistant from the Northern Mariana Islands and Tokyo cannot in any way alleviate the fears of the Micronesians. They do not care how far Tokyo is from the dumping site. They are much more concerned about how far that site is from their own land and the distance between that dumping site and their territory and waters - the distance from the underwater natural resources, for example, that are used by the population of Micronesia. Another significant factor is the currents that prevail in that part of the ocean. There are all kinds of factors involved here which should also be of concern to the Administering Authority and it should in one way or another inform not only the Micronesians, who of course are concerned by the existing state of affairs, but also the Council about these matters.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

The next question which I wanted to put to the Administering Authority on behalf of the Soviet delegation is as follows - this question refers to the situation on Ebeye. At previous sessions of the Trusteeship Council it was noted many times, and it was noted in statements made this year as well, that the situation on Ebeye is very complex, but the situation on Ebeye and the conditions in which the population lives are simply inhuman, to put it frankly. In anticipation of your answers to my questions with reference to the report of the Mission of the Trusteeship Council, I should like to explain that I am asking this question after having looked at the appropriate paragraph of the report. Paragraph 697 of the report of the Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory says: (spoke in English)

"The people of Ebeye live in crowded one-room houses with substandard and inadequate community services. The sewerage system never functioned properly as a result of defective construction work. Since the visit of the 1980 Mission, the situation appears to have deteriorated instead of improving."

(continued in Russian)

I am not going to repeat all this. I think that all the members of the Trusteeship Council have it. The last sentence says: "In short, the general appearance of the island is depressing."

I should like to ask the Administering Authority a question: first of all what specific measures are being taken by that Authority to redress the situation? Secondly, I should like to anticipate the answer of the Administering Authority to the effect that measures taken on Ebeye are the responsibility of the local Government of the Marshall Islands, because at the present time it is the Administering Authority which is responsible for that Territory. It is its obligation to protect it, to provide for the interests of the population, to promote the development of that population inter alia and, naturally to promote normal human living conditions on that Territory. So once again I should like to repeat that we are interested in what measures are being taken by the Administering Authority to redress the situation in Ebeye. That is the first part of the question and, secondly, this is not the first year in which we have been talking about this: the situation is not improving and every single year we get assurances

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

from the Administering Authority that there are programmes, that money is being allocated, but, for all that, the situation remains at a standstill and, worse than that, it is deteriorating. How does the representative of the Administering Authority see this? How much more time will be needed to create normal conditions for the people on this island of Ebeye? What programmes are envisaged and how soon will such programmes be completed?

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): The United States is, of course, concerned at the conditions on Ebeye, which we find unsatisfactory. We have been and continue to be in consultation with the Government of the Marshall Islands, and I would reserve the right of the representative of the Marshall Islands who is not with us today to address this question at a further session, a subsequent session, if he should so desire. There are a number of programmes under way. The Visiting Mission saw projects getting under way during its trip, projects to rehabilitate the whole island. From my vantage point here in New York I am not in a position to say how long this is going to take or how successful they will be. I would simply say that we too are concerned and we will be doing everything within our power to make things better on Ebeye. The new interim use agreement for Kwajalein provides for additional funding for the economic development of Ebeye where most of the landowners live, as I stated just a few minutes ago. That includes a provision that the landowners, for the first time, will be contributing themselves to the improvement of living conditions on Ebeye from the compensation they receive through their Government from the United States.

During March through April of this year, a medical team from Brookhaven Labs visited Ebeye, Majuro, Rongelap, and Utirik. There was a good deal of health care given: an annual comprehensive health care survey, including diagnosis, therapy and treatment of all medical problems. In addition, the services of specialists were provided in such areas as pediatrics and parasitology. Moreover, medical personnel make six calls approximately three times a year to deal with additional medical problems. There have been at least six to eight visits within the past two years. Beyond that, I would prefer to defer to my colleague from the Marshall Islands to make any further response deemed necessary.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The next question the Soviet delegation wishes to ask is as follows: in the report of the Administering Authority it is noted that certain federal programmes in the Trust Territory were cut back. I think I will use English terminology so that we will not have any confusion here.

(spoke in English)

Federal programmes have been cut or reduced in consonance with the United States national policy or in anticipation of termination of the Trusteeship Agreement.

(T/L.1235, para. 119)

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

(continued in Russian)

We do not quite understand why there was a need to cut back on the federal programmes in anticipation of the end of the Trusteeship Agreement. Could we have clarification from the representative of the Administering Authority?

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): In 1978, a policy to curb the use of federal programmes in the Trust Territory was put into effect. It was thought that a gradual movement away from federal programmes which do not directly contribute to economic development would be a proper way to show assistance to the Micronesian Government. Additional analyses made by the Trust Territory Government and by the Micronesian Governments indicated that certain operational requirements could not allow us to make the transition away from federal programmes as quickly as anticipated.

Reconsideration of the 1978 policy was overtaken by the across-the-board conversion of federal programmes to block grants, which is part of the President's economic recovery programme.

The Compact of Free Association had anticipated the block grant approach and will provide large sums of money in that form to the Governments of Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia for the local design and delivery of programmes, particularly in the fields of health and education, in accordance with the requirements and the wishes of the Governments and peoples concerned.

The Administering Authority provides disaster relief and assistance to those areas in the Trust Territory that have suffered severe damage and loss of crops from typhoons; foodstuffs are provided for school-lunch programmes in the Territory, as well as to certain displaced persons in the Marshall Islands.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The working paper prepared by the Secretariat (T/L.1235) contains a reference to those conclusions which were made by the Visiting Mission of the Trusteeship Council to the Territory in 1982 and says that the Trust Territory is still in a position of almost total economic and financial dependence on the Administering Authority.

I should like clarification from the Administering Authority: during the year which has elapsed, what measures were taken by the Administering Authority to decrease that economic and financial dependence of the Trust Territory on the Administering Authority? What measures were taken in this area?

The PRESIDENT: May I intervene for a moment, while the representative of the United States prepares his answer, to say that this working paper which was referred to by the representative of the Soviet Union - paragraph 115 was, I believe, the one that he was concerned with - has a misprint. It says:

"The Council regretted that budget cuts had effected 'certain United States federal programmes'."

The word "effected" should have read "affected".

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): Obviously the United States would wish that that misprint were indeed fact rather than inadvertence. If budget cuts could "effect", we would all be considerably happier perhaps.

In any case, the United States is doing what it can to promote self-sufficiency. This is obviously a long-term problem. In direct response to my Soviet colleague: last year probably the principal activity that we have been carrying out has been the economic development loan fund, which has been disbursing loans for projects, funding such projects as fisheries development, poultry-raising development, car rental, piggery, hotel and restaurant development, a sawmill and such other infrastructural requirements as will lead or help to lead towards economic self-sufficiency.

Our capital improvement programme infrastructure development programme is proceeding well, and it also provides a basis for economic development.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, I was not referring to the paragraph that you read out and to which you made a correction. I also understood that that correction had to be made but that had no bearing on the question that I asked.

The next question I wanted to ask is as follows: in past years, and particularly at the last session of the Trusteeship Council, a considerable place in our discussions and in petitions was taken up by questions concerning the social situation of the population of Micronesia. Note was taken of the high level of alcoholism, in particular among young people. We have already mentioned unemployment, which to a great extent also affects young people, questions concerning the high level of suicide and other problems connected with young people in the Trust Territory.

We would like to know to what extent, as compared with last year, there has been a change in that situation and whether there has, indeed, been a change.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): Social development obviously is of concern to us. The Micronesian States administer the programmes connected with this. They keep the statistics, and perhaps the representatives with me at the table would wish to comment on this in response to the question of the representative of the Soviet Union which, I would just note in passing, is by my count number 16 of the approximately 8 that we were led to believe would be asked this morning.

The PRESIDENT: Which member of the United States team would like to comment further on this question of alcoholism and other such matters?

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): Would Mr. Uherbelau, Mr. Takesy or Mr. Guerrero have any comments on this matter?

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Guerrero and other members of the United States team.

Mr. GUERRERO (Adviser): As far as the Northern Marianas are concerned, our legislature last year enacted a law that established a Division of Youth Services that will handle problems not only of alcoholism but also other youth problems in the Northern Marianas. So we are addressing the problems in the Northern Marianas as far as young people are concerned.

Mr. UHERBELAU (Adviser): I do not know if I can provide a satisfactory answer to the representative of the Soviet Union, but alcoholism among young people is a problem in Palau. As in the Northern Marianas, there is Division of youth services and activities within the executive branch of our Government which sponsor activities, such as baseball. As recently as a month ago a basketball league for young urban women was introduced. Prior to that we had seasonal basketball leagues for boys and young men.

So it is a problem that we are encountering and we are doing whatever we can to resolve the situation.

With respect to the issue of suicide, I have no comment.

Mr. TAKESY (Special Representative): We in the Federated States recognize that special problems occur because of cumulative factors that have long built up over the years, some of which are associated with changes in culture and others with unemployment.

As regards the suicide question raised by the representative of the Soviet Union, suicide is particularly prevalent in the State of Truk where the population is greatest in proportion to the land. In addressing this problem my Government is carrying out youth service programmes, such as the "Outward Bound" programme in Ponape, which has proved to be a success. This programme takes in students who have dropped out of school, who are unemployed, and trains them, helping them to rehabilitate themselves and become self-supporting.

We also have in our Social Services Department personnel who devote their energies to assisting the States in finding ways and means to alleviate the social problems.

In sum, we recognize this as a large problem that deserves a comprehensive approach.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): I would just point out that most of these programmes that have been mentioned are specially funded programmes, funded by the Administering Authority, which are ongoing and were not affected by budget cuts. Such programmes as the Mental Health Programme, the programme of mental health counsellors, the Alcoholics Anonymous group, the "Outward Bound" programme, vocational training and other such things, which are amply described in paragraphs 518 through 533 of the Visiting Mission's report discussing youth questions.

Obviously this is a serious problem. It is a problem that is faced I think by almost every society today and one that has been dealt with with varying degrees of success by all societies. We have been devoting as much effort as we could to dealing with it.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It seems to me that we do have definite statistics regarding this question, statistics which were given by the Administering Authority in the annual report submitted to the Trusteeship Council. The figures really are rather high and compel one to devote particular attention to this problem.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

My question to the representative of the Administering Authority did not refer to what programmes they are undertaking now. I was more interested in the general situation. How much has changed, if there has been a change, and if there has not been a change, then why not?

If we are going to look only at the external symptoms of an illness and try to cure those external symptoms without getting down to the real reasons for the illness, it is hardly likely that any kind of externally attractive programme is going to be able to help.

The question is really one of seeing to it that the situation is changed, particularly that of the youthful sector of the population in the Territory, in view of the fact that their situation deteriorates from year to year, that alcoholism is spreading, that there is an increase in juvenile crime and a whole series of other manifestations of this general ailment, which naturally derives from the economic conditions which prevail in the Trust Territory.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

The next question I should like to ask on behalf of the Soviet delegation concerns the so-called federal food stamp nutrition programme. As I understand it, this programme falls within the general area of welfare programmes - various kinds of assistance for the hungry and the unemployed. Is that correct? I am interested to know the present position in the Trust Territory regarding that programme and the extent of the means allocated for that programme by the Administering Authority.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): I confess to feeling somewhat bemused at the authoritative way in which my Soviet colleague speaks about the causes of alcoholism, suicide and so on in the Trust Territory, which he has not, to my knowledge, ever visited - nor have any of his colleagues in some three decades. I think it takes a good deal of familiarity with the local situation to be able to address such a serious problem. I, for example, would never presume to comment upon the reasons for the extensive alcoholism in the Soviet Union, which is widely noted in the world press, and which necessitates the maintenance of detoxification centres for people who find it impossible to make their way home after an evening of drinking. I just mention that in passing.

Regarding the food programme, as I have said before, the Administering Authority continues to provide disaster relief, assistance to those areas in the Trust Territories which suffer damage and loss of crops from typhoons, and foodstuffs for school lunch programmes in the Territory, as well as for displaced persons in the Marshall Islands. During the first six months of 1982 the needy-family food programme operated within its regular routine. The programme distributed United States Department of Agriculture food commodities to certified households in the Northern Marianas on a monthly basis. From January to June 1982 a total of more than \$968,000 worth of food commodities was distributed. The programme closed its operations on 30 June 1982 owing to the implementation on 1 July of the nutrition assistance programme, which is generally referred to as the food stamp programme. The implementation of this programme in the Northern Marianas began on 1 July. I will not go into the details of the way in which it is administered because they will be found on page 12 of our annual report. In sum, the federal programmes, which I discussed in an earlier question are continuing in all of the areas I mentioned.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It has always been recognized that the best defence is attack. In this case, the representative of the United States spoke about alcoholism in the Soviet Union as though he had spent some time there himself, but that is not the point. The press, and particularly the press which Ambassador Sherman reads, is one thing, and the problems which another sovereign State has - if, indeed, it has such a problem - is another. We are not speaking here about people who get tipsy in the Soviet Union or the number of alcoholics in the United States, although that might be a topic for consideration in other conditions. At the moment we are talking about the situation in the Trust Territory - and not about press reports but about United Nations documents namely, reports which are prepared here.

The PRESIDENT: May I interrupt the representative of the Soviet Union? He is absolutely right in drawing our attention to the fact that we are considering matters concerning the Trust Territory. I allow a certain leeway in our discussions in this Council which I think is reasonable. He has made a valid point and I would now ask him if he could please move on to his next question. I am rather doubtful whether we are going to go as swiftly through our agenda as I had hoped, so perhaps he could be so kind as to move on to his next question.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): You have certainly spared no effort to ensure that we get to the next question as quickly as possible, Mr. President. Well, on condition that your attitude is even-handed as between the comments made by the Soviet delegation and those made in answers, we are ready to turn to the next question. I should like to say, however, that we are considering the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the level of alcoholism, juvenile crime, and unemployment therein, and the irritation shown by the representative of the Administering Authority at the questions raised by the Soviet delegation does not seem to me to be entirely appropriate. We are asking questions which we have the right to ask of the Administering Authority and we have the right to receive appropriate and clear answers to our questions. I should like now to continue my question.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

In 1982 the Mission which visited the Trust Territory noted that it had received complaints from Micronesian representatives that the second-level capital improvement programme had been cut off. The appropriate conclusions were drawn by the Visiting Mission. We should like, nevertheless, to have some clarification. How was this matter concluded and what is the situation now regarding this programme?

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): The idea of a second-level capital improvement programme was first mentioned in 1978 as a means of identifying outer island capital infrastructure needs. A project list was included in the preliminary briefing document but it was never put into final form or agreed to by the United States. The United States Government announced in January 1979 that after a review of policy regarding the Trust Territory the operating budget would have to be reduced and shaped in preparation for termination of the trusteeship and that no second-level capital improvement programme could be implemented prior to termination. Instead, a more modest programme of outer island improvement projects, including some of those which might have been part of the second-level capital improvement programme, is now being undertaken by some of the constitutional Governments with local resources. For example, the Marshalls and the Federated States of Micronesia have been implementing a programme of construction of short-range air strips on certain outer islands.

I should like to say also that I have never challenged the right of the representative of the Soviet Union to ask questions and I fully agree that we are discussing here the Trust Territories. I only challenged, on the basis of lack of information, his right to make value judgements as to the reasons for social problems which exist there. I plead my own defence in the extraneous comment which I made about the Soviet Union. I said - and I believe the verbatim record will confirm this - that I would never presume to make a statement about the causes of whatever social phenomena might exist in the Soviet Union.

The PRESIDENT: Indeed, I interrupted the United States representative's remarks as an invitation to the representative of the Soviet Union to visit Micronesia so that he might be able to inform himself even better on this and indeed on some of the other questions that he is putting.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): Interpretations can sometimes be dangerous, as everyone knows. In any case, I shall proceed with my questioning.

(spoke in Russian)

I want to ask a few more questions. I think we still have some time for that. The Soviet delegation would like clarification as to the companies that are now operating in Micronesia. How many of them are purely Micronesian; how many are American; how many are transnational corporations?

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): Let me just go back to the verbatim record (T/PV.1531) of our morning meeting on 25 May 1982, when the same questions were asked. I think that information was subsequently provided. The local Governments could answer that question better than I and we should be happy to provide the answer for the record. As far as major United States companies are concerned, there is Van Kamp, Continental Airlines, Air Micronesia and Mobil Oil. Those are the only ones that I am aware of. I shall attempt to provide additional information but I am not aware of any transnational - multinational - corporations there.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I understand that we shall be able to have the data we requested, perhaps, at a later stage. I perfectly well remember that a similar question was raised at the last session of the Trusteeship Council. We then received an answer, but a whole year has elapsed since then and it is naturally interesting to know, a year later, the areas in which life has been developing in the Trust Territory. That is why we asked the question, and we shall ask yet another question which we also asked last year, and the year before that as well.

The question deals with the number of Micronesian doctors in the Trust Territory at the present time. A year has passed and perhaps somebody else has managed to get a degree, complete his education and join the ranks of doctors in the Trust Territory. That is why this year we should like to ask the same question, just to know whether there have been any changes in this respect or if there are still only two Micronesian doctors on Micronesian territory. Also, have they remained in the Territory or have they perhaps already moved somewhere else? We still have the original data to the effect that there were two doctors there. We should like to have further information now as to the present state of affairs in that respect.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): I am informed that we believe there are two medical doctors in Palau practising privately, and all the hospitals are staffed by Micronesian medical officers. I would defer to my colleagues from Micronesia for any further information they might have on that subject.

The PRESIDENT: Would the representatives from Micronesia like to comment?

Mr. GUERRERO (Adviser): In the Northern Marianas there is one doctor who is a Northern Marianas resident. He has just graduated and is doing his internship, but we expect him back to practise on the island probably some time next year.

Mr. UHERBELAU (Adviser): What Ambassador Sherman reported is correct. There are two medical doctors in Palau. One is working in the Government-run hospital and the other is in private practice. Two additional Palauan doctors have finished medical school and elected to remain in the United States.

I am pleased to report, however, that last year a Palauan woman - the first to do so - graduated from law school and is at present in Seattle, Washington, taking her bar examination.

Mr. TAKESY (Special Representative): In the Federated States there is one medical doctor and he is working in the public hospital; and I believe we have seven medical officers who are Fiji-trained.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In the report of the Visiting Mission of 1982 to the Trusteeship Council we note that the Micronesian Government will be receiving technical assistance from the United States and from the international community even after the termination of the Trusteeship. Perhaps this question should not be directed to the Administering Authority but to the specialized agencies of the United Nations which are providing technical assistance to the population of Micronesia. Nevertheless we should like clarification from the representative

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

of the Administering Authority as to the present position with regard to such programmes of the United Nations specialized agencies in the Territory and how those programmes interact with the programmes which should be undertaken by the Administering Authority in carrying out its obligations under the Trusteeship Agreement and the United Nations Charter.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): I cannot really speak on the question of what United Nations specialized agency assistance might be proffered to Micronesia. That obviously would be something to be worked out with the specialized agencies themselves in the post-trusteeship period.

I can speak of what we envisage for the United States contribution there. The overall level of grant assistance to Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia under the Compact of Free Association would, we envisage, be somewhat greater than that provided by the United States during the last years of the trusteeship. There is essential parity among the three freely associated States in per capita levels. The major difference in the post-trusteeship period would be that our assistance would be even more heavily directed towards generating development and economic self-reliance. On this point the Compact itself specifies that at least 30 per cent of United States assistance will be devoted to revenue-producing projects and capital development.

I might suggest that in subsequent sessions perhaps Papua New Guinea or Fiji, or other countries which have provided training abroad to Micronesians, and representatives of United Nations sponsored programmes, particularly the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, the United Nations Development Programme, might provide information. Papua New Guinea has I know provided training in law, Fiji in medicine, the Philippines in a great variety of subjects. Some of these programmes are sponsored by the United Nations agency involved, some by scholarships granted by the Micronesian Governments sending the students.

The Trust Territory certainly appreciates offers of scholarships for its citizens and assures the Council that any such offers will be promptly disseminated to the education authorities in each of the Micronesian jurisdictions.

This is, I believe, a separate item on our agenda, the whole question of offers by Member States of study and training facilities, and we may be going into this in more detail later.

The PRESIDENT: That is indeed true. It is item 8 on the agenda, which we shall be tackling a little later.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I shall take the United States representative's comments into account and when we take up item 8 we shall come back to this question.

The next question I should like to ask - and let Ambassador Sherman not lose heart -- is one which I dealt with earlier but to which unfortunately I did not get a sufficiently clear answer. Perhaps this time the situation will be made somewhat more clear. The Soviet delegation does not clearly understand the system of the programmes which are being carried out by the Administering Authority in the Territory. Some programmes are being conducted under the aegis of the Ministry of the Interior, others under that of United States ministries. We are still interested in the question of those rather confusing groups called civic action teams, which for some reason, despite their allegedly civil nature, are financed and equipped by the United States Defense Department.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

We are interested in the nature of the activities of these groups during the last year.

That, I think is sufficient for our first round.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): We did, indeed, refer to this last year. I think I explained that most of the time, these civic action teams to which my Soviet colleague refers are financed by the Department of the Navy, and the Navy has operated for many years a sub-unit known as the Seabees - construction battalions - which do all kinds of engineering work. And that is primarily what they are doing in the Micronesian territories. The CATs are road builders with heavy equipment that is not locally available to the Micronesian Government. As to their welcome in Micronesia - they are welcomed by the citizens of Micronesia - I would defer to the Micronesians themselves to respond to that question. I would simply say that the fact that an activity is funded by the Department of Defense has not necessarily anything to do with military activity. These are, indeed, civic action teams which are engaged in trying to prepare a more efficient and better infrastructure for the use of the Micronesian population and at the same time to assist in training Micronesians to engage in this kind of work themselves.

The PRESIDENT: I must draw the attention of the Council to the fact that it is now about seven minutes to six, and as members know, at 6 o'clock, we lose the advantage of having interpreters with us, and we must therefore stop at that time. I should have liked today to finish the questioning of the Administering Authority. Perhaps I could ask the representative of the Soviet Union how he envisages the remainder of the day and tomorrow. Does he wish to continue questioning the Administering Authority further?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to use the remaining six minutes and ask one more question of the Administering Authority. Still in developing the last question, within the framework of what programmes do these civic action teams work? What programmes of the Administering Authority are involved? That is the first part.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Secondly, since the report notes that they work together with the Department of the Interior, which also participates in this work of these civic action teams, I wish to know the programmes under which this work is carried out. It is not very clear to us because suddenly, there has sprung up this sub-unit, which as we have now been told, is financed not by the Defense Department but by the Navy Department. What is the framework within which they work? What is the general picture of the Administering Authority's activities in the Territory?

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): All I can say is that these teams operate in a direct way - they provide direct assistance - at the invitation of the local legislature, which picks the projects. We have the people; we have the mechanical material available, and it is a kind of mechanized Peace Corps, which goes in and tries to help. It is money which is discretionary within the Department of Defense; it is not a specific programme, except in the wide sense that the Department of Defense of the United States - and that includes the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Army, and the Department of the Air Force - is widely engaged throughout the world in trying to work constructively and helpfully with local governments and local citizens to create a good atmosphere, to share in community problems and community operations. Our few people who are out there consider themselves part of the community in which they live and wish to make a contribution to it. I would also ask Mr. Takesy to comment, if he wishes, on the way in which these efforts are received and viewed by the Federated States of Micronesia.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to hear Mr. Takesy, but our watches tell us it is three minutes to six and we still have to continue in order to decide what our meeting tomorrow should consider. Perhaps Mr. Takesy could in 30 seconds give us a very quick reaction to that.

Mr. TAKESY (Special Representative): The CAT teams supplement the efforts of the Interior Department in the five-year development plan, as well as the small construction projects outside of the District centres.

The PRESIDENT: Perhaps you could tell us if you like them, whether they are useful, whether they are helpful. That is what we really want to know, I think.

Mr. TAKESY (Special Representative): The CAT teams were brought in at the invitation of the various States.

The PRESIDENT: Could I ask the representative of the Soviet Union in the two minutes left to us whether he feels he has perhaps exhausted his list of questions.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation could go on asking questions. Frankly, I had hoped to finish today with the Administering Authority, but in the interests of expediting our work and finishing our work promptly at 6 o'clock today, I shall defer all further questions, on the understanding that I reserve my right to question the Administering Authority at a later stage, if need be.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The PRESIDENT: I might remind everyone that all members of the Council have said they would help me to keep to our tentative timetable. Now, we are really very far behind. For tomorrow, we have various things on the tentative timetable which come after the general debate, and we have not even started the general debate. Of course, I fully understand that the representative of the Soviet Union wishes to reserve his right to ask further questions. I would, nevertheless, remind him that he has actually spent the whole of one day asking questions of the Administering Authority. That, of course, is perfectly reasonable, if he wishes to do so, but we are running rather late. So I should like, if I may, to suggest that tomorrow we quickly proceed to another part of our work, examination of the original petitions, which have been distributed as documents T/COMM.10/L.310 and 314 to 340 and T/PET.10/200, 201 and 206 to 291.

In addition to this, there are some which have not yet been published, but all members will already have received xerox copies. This is to enable us to go quickly ahead, because I know it is important to all members to have the documents in good time to study them. Now, as soon as we have dealt with these written petitions, I should like to move into the general debate, which as I say, we should, according to our timetable, have started today, Tuesday 24 May, but we have not. So may I suggest that, subject to the agreement of members, we start tomorrow by addressing ourselves to the subject of the written petitions and then move as quickly as we can on to the general debate. Does that meet the wishes of the members?

Mr. BERMAN (United Kingdom): In one short word, yes, it does indeed meet our willingness to co-operate with you. I should like to say, from the United Kingdom's side that we ourselves still have a very small list of questions relating to the report of the Visiting Mission, but are fully prepared to waive the right to pose these questions in full Council. I am sure that we will be able to find the information we require in direct contact with the delegation of the Administering Authority, if need be, and in an effort to move forward in our work, we would be prepared to waive those questions in public Council.

(Mr. Berman, United Kingdom)

For our part, we are prepared also to go on at any stage to the general debate. We would have been prepared to do so today. We would be prepared to do so tomorrow, and certainly it would be perfectly acceptable to us to do immediately after examining the written petitions.

May I briefly, in 30 seconds and no more, revert to the question of the Charter basis for the suggestions made by the Soviet Union, which was the subject of a little exchange earlier. I only go back to it because the Soviet representative himself reverted to the question and was courteous enough to warn me against trying to change the Charter because the Charter is the Charter.

I must say I entirely agree with that proposition and I think it in fact puts paid to the proposition which I was raising a question about, because as I said then, I find no basis in the Charter for that proposition. My delegation, studying the Charter with the careful eye of a lawyer, drew a distinction between articles which attribute responsibility within the United Nations for carrying out its functions in relation to Trusteeships and articles which actually confer functions on the United Nations. It is only articles of the latter type which describe what the functions of the United Nations are. But as I said at an earlier stage, we reserve the right, if necessary, to go into that subject more deeply in later stages of our debate.

The PRESIDENT: I am grateful to the representative of the United Kingdom for deferring his questions to another stage - which is, I think, the same hopeful line taken by the representative of the Soviet Union - so that we can pass on to other matters tomorrow.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): As I have already said, in the interests of expediting our work, I shall defer the several questions which we still wish to ask. I would just recall that several of the questions asked by the Soviet delegation have not yet been answered by the Administering Authority, although we have been promised answers at a later stage. Obviously, when the Administering Authority is ready to respond, we can select a time, during future meetings, for it to do so.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

In connection with the statement made today by the representative of the United Kingdom concerning that delegation's questions about the Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories, I should like to note that of course it is the sovereign right of the delegation of the United Kingdom, in private consultations and contacts with missions, to have explanations to additional questions, and the United Kingdom mission was one of the members of the Mission. We too have several questions on the report of the Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory, but so that our work can move on we would suggest that the Council move immediately to the consideration of that report and to an exchange of views on it. During that time we can address our questions to the leader and members of the mission and perhaps receive the appropriate clarification on the report.

The PRESIDENT: I am grateful to members for refraining from asking further questions in the interests of moving ahead with our work. I would, therefore, propose that tomorrow we meet in both the morning and afternoon in an effort to catch up on our programme; that we should start with an examination of written petitions and communications; and when that is completed, that we move on to the general debate. If there are no objections, we shall proceed accordingly.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.