



UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL
T/PV.1557
8 June 1983
ENGLISH

Fiftieth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 27 May 1983, at 10.30 a.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)

This record is subject to correction.

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

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

83-60724

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.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 continue hearing the closing statements by the representatives and advisers of the Administering Authority. I call on Mr. Marehalau of the Federated States of Micronesia.

Mr. MAREHALAU (Adviser): I wish to express our Government's thanks to the Council for the hard and dedicated work of all its members during this year's session, and in particular for the careful attention paid by all members to matters pertaining to the Federated States of Micronesia. This session of the Council has particular significance for us since only a few weeks from now, on 21 June, our people will vote in a plebiscite on the choice of a future political status which may bring us to the end of the trusteeship by this time next year.

As we indicated in our opening statement, the plebiscite information programme for the people of the Federated States of Micronesia is continuing in an orderly fashion at a very high level of effectiveness. Even as our meetings have progressed here, we have received reports to the effect that our plebiscite commissioners remain confident that their work will be completed on schedule and that the people will be in a position to make an informed choice as to their future political status on 21 June. In that connection, it is important to note that negotiations on the proposed Compact of Free Association with the United States have taken place over a number of years and, as the various provisions of

(Mr. Marehalau, Adviser)

that Compact and its related agreements have evolved, our status negotiators have taken pains to remain in close contact with the elected leaders of the Federated States of Micronesia State, national and local Governments on the various issues related to the Compact. Thus the education programme has reached out towards a voting public which already had a basic familiarity with the nature of the proposed relationship with the United States as well as many of its detailed aspects.

We are also pleased to point out that, concurrently with the programme conducted by our State and national Governments through their plebiscite commissions, the process of public information and debate has been aided by the participation of various private parties who have served to stimulate discussion and to broaden the public appreciation of the issues. Prominent among such parties are church leaders, who deserve special thanks for presenting to our people objective viewpoints, thus further assuring that our people will truly be in a position to make an informed choice on 21 June.

It is particularly in light of the fact that forthcoming events may bring an early termination of the trusteeship that I wish to leave on the record of this session a reference to the critical importance of the completion by the Administering Authority of the Capital Improvement Programme (CIP) projects it has undertaken. These projects are designed to address our most fundamental needs for infrastructure, to make possible our advancement in social welfare and to set in motion our economic development.

At this point in our history we have no desire to make undue demands upon the people of the United States, who have already been so generous to us, particularly in such difficult economic times. Nor do we take any part in debates over the ultimate dollar costs of completing the so-called CIP. It is our firm belief, however, that the various elements of this Programme go to the heart of the trusteeship responsibility and that there must be an absolute commitment on the part of the United States to see this Programme through to its completion without regard to price and without regard to any subsequent arrangements that may be made under a Compact of Free Association.

(Mr. Marehalau, Adviser)

Another matter of great importance to the people of the Federated States of Micronesia in the waning days of the trusteeship has to do with maintaining control over the resources in and beneath the waters under our jurisdiction. As we have pointed out, the resources of the sea are our principal hope for the future. Our lands are scarce and offer little opportunity for commercial use, as they are needed to provide a comfortable living environment for our people.

With the support of the United States Government and pursuant to our Constitution, we plan to take immediate steps to proclaim our 200-mile economic zone. It seems to us appropriate that we should do so as a full signatory party to the Convention on the Law of the Sea. While we are aware of the United States' own position in respect of that Convention, we see no connection between the United States' policy in that regard and our own. Thus we again solicit the recognition and support of this Council of our intention to take timely measures to protect our dominion over the resources of our ocean without delay and without regard to the continuance or termination of the trusteeship.

Finally, I should like to close by thanking the President and all members of the Council for their deep concern for our well-being once again, as reflected in the records of this Council. We look forward to welcoming the observer mission on the occasion of the Federated States of Micronesia plebiscite and we would also extend a very sincere invitation to other members who may not have found the opportunity to observe conditions in the Federated States of Micronesia first-hand. In the Federated States of Micronesia members will find that the last of all the trusteeships is a shining example of the soundness of the goals of those who originally conceived the Trusteeship System.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on Mr. Willter of Palau.

Mr. WILLTER (Adviser): It is a privilege for me to deliver my delegation's closing remarks, but first of all, Mr. President, I wish to apologize to you and members of this Council for my delegation's marked absence the past two days. Other pressing government business required us to be out of town.

(Mr. Willter, Adviser)

My Government associates itself with the clarification made by the representative of the United Kingdom concerning the role the Export Credit Guarantee Department of Her Majesty's Government plays in the International Power Systems Company (IPSECO) power project. We are currently negotiating with British bankers. As a member of the Presidential Task Force on Power, let me add my own assurances to you, Mr. President, that this matter has been dealt with in good faith by all the parties concerned. The Olbiil Era Kelulau (OEK) and the Office of the President and, indeed, Ambassador Zeder and Interior Department Assistant Secretary Sanjuan, fully support the IPSECO power project. Petitions to the contrary notwithstanding, that is the official position of the elected Government of the Republic of Palau on this all-important development project.

As we pointed out in our opening statement, the 10 February 1983 plebiscite on the Compact of Free Association is the single most significant political achievement in Palau during the year under review. Irrespective of the many self-serving allegations propounded by some petitioners, the fact remains that the people of Palau have indeed exercised their birthright of self-determination on the issue of their political destiny. Palauans in the plebiscite observed by members of this Council have freely and democratically chosen free association over any other political alternatives available to them. The people have spoken and it is therefore incumbent upon the National Government they elected into office to carry out their mandate. This is precisely what the Special Task Force and Ambassador Salii will attempt to do upon the resumption of status talks with representatives of the Administration at the latter part of next month. Not to presume what the outcome of these talks will be, we are quite confident that the issue of Section 314 regarding nuclear and harmful substances will be mutually and satisfactorily resolved.

(Mr. Willter, Palau)

Lest there be lingering misunderstanding with respect to the alleged inconsistencies between the Constitution of the Republic of Palau and the Compact of Free Association, permit me to close my remarks on this subject. The inconsistent provisions of these two documents existed only when both were still in draft form back in 1979. The conflicts were in the areas of the 200-mile jurisdiction, or law of the sea; land-use and operating rights; and nuclear and harmful substances. But I submit these three issues had already been mutually and satisfactorily resolved as of 1980 through long, if not arduous, negotiations. They are embodied in the following respective subsidiary agreements:

First, the Agreement regarding the Jurisdiction and Sovereignty of the Republic of Palau over its Territory and the Living and Non-living Resources of the Sea;

Secondly, the Agreement regarding the Military Use and Operating Rights of the Government of the United States in Palau;

Thirdly, the Agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of Palau regarding Radioactive, Chemical and Biological Substances.

The first two, together with eight other subsidiary agreements, were approved along with the Compact of Free Association as a package. It is the third, along with Section 314 of the Compact, pursuant to which it was negotiated, that failed to be approved by the constitutionally required 75 per cent vote, and this is the only remaining issue to be discussed.

In closing, let it be made clear that it is not the intention of the Republic of Palau to seek amendment to its Constitution, the supreme law of the land, for reconciliation or any other purposes.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on Mr. Guerrero of the Northern Marianas.

Mr. GUERRERO (Adviser): On behalf of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, I wish to express our appreciation for the honour and opportunity given to Governor Pedro P. Tenorio, Senate President Olympio T. Borja and House Speaker Benigno R. Fitial to present to the Council a description of progress and development and continuing concerns in the areas of the political, economic and social well-being of the Northern Mariana Islands in 1982.

Our relationship with the United States has been and still is very good. There are differences of opinion and ideas relative to the Northern Mariana Islands that arise from time to time, but we have worked diligently and demonstrated that solutions can be reached for the mutual interest and benefit of both Governments.

As our Commonwealth leaders pointed out in their opening statements, there were several significant developments which have taken place during the past year, 1982. These are: implementation of the Nutrition Assistance Programme, commencement of construction of a new and modern health care centre on Saipan and others.

The Commonwealth Government is continuing to strive for viable economic development. In this regard, the United States has been assisting us in building and improving the necessary infrastructure, such as roads, power, harbour, waste-water, on which a sound economic system can be developed. Of course, we are making every effort to do our part.

I wish to reiterate the continuing concern of the Commonwealth to discourage the use of the Pacific Ocean as a dumping ground for nuclear waste materials. The Government of the Northern Mariana Islands is totally opposed to any nation's storing or dumping any kind of nuclear waste in the Pacific.

Governor Tenorio pointed out in his opening statement the two issues seriously affecting the Commonwealth which remain unresolved. These are payment of awards made pursuant to the Micronesian Claims Act of 1971 and termination of the Trusteeship Agreement. The Northern Marianas, as well as the other Micronesian Governments, respectfully request the Council's assistance in encouraging the Governments of Japan and the United States to find an equitable solution to the payment of outstanding adjudicated war claims. We encourage early termination of the Trusteeship Agreement so that our people's wish to become full-fledged members of the American family may be realized.

(Mr. Guerrero, Adviser)

The Government of the Northern Mariana Islands continues to look to the Trusteeship Council as a forum for discussion and guidance in our concerns and needs. We are grateful to the Council for the opportunity to participate in this year's session and wish to acknowledge the fine assistance and co-operation of the United States Mission and the Administering Authority for their generous help during these past weeks of our presence at the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): As we again come to the close of another session of this Council in its annual review of conditions in the Trust Territory, I want to express my appreciation and that of my delegation for the genuine expressions of concern and interest shown over the past two weeks.

I believe that this year's presentations have amply demonstrated that there has been marked progress in the Territory since our visit here last year. We have seen a plebiscite in Palau, extensive movement in the Capital Improvement Programme (CIP), preparations for another plebiscite in the Federated States of Micronesia, two very thorough and extensive reports of Visiting Missions of the Council, and statements by our representatives from the constitutional Governments outlining their progress on the road to self-government and termination of the Trusteeship Agreement.

Of course, I do not want to imply by this that we do not recognize the problems that still exist and in some cases will continue to exist for some time to come. However, I believe that at this juncture it is most important to express the confidence of the Administering Authority in the abilities and desires of the citizens of the Trust Territory for the formulation of their own political, economic and social futures.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of the fact that it is now very much in the hands of the leaders of Micronesia to formulate and carry out plans that meet their own felt and real needs. To this end, I would like to take note of several items which came up during this session that merit further comment or observations. I do this by way of clarification of questions or statements made by various members of the Council during the discussions here.

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

First, it is true that this year's annual report was spotty and somewhat uneven. As was explained to the Council, the statistical offices of the various Governments are still being trained, with the assistance of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and getting organized. We hope that next year's report will reflect a significant improvement in this, not only for what it will mean in the annual report but also, by extension, what it will indicate in terms of the capability of each of the Governments to gather statistics and to interpret them to their own benefit. And since the report is almost totally dependent upon the input of the various Governments, next year's report, we hope, will be an even more accurate reflection of advancement in all sectors.

(Mrs. McCoy Special Representative)

As a corollary to that statement, a question came up concerning the separation of the census reports on the Trust Territory from those on the Northern Mariana Islands. I would like to inform the Council that the reason for this is that the census in the Northern Mariana Islands was conducted by the United States Census Bureau in conjunction with the national census in anticipation of eventual termination of the Trusteeship Agreement and full implementation of the Commonwealth Covenant. The balance of the Trust Territory was enumerated, also with the guidance of the Bureau of the Census, as a separate activity under the supervision of the High Commissioner's Office.

In another context, there were questions raised about the transfer of functions from my Office to the new Governments, with the suggestion that funding for these new activities was not forthcoming. The Council should understand that each of the Governments has organized itself according to its own Constitution and formulates its budget according to the needs and the resources available. As was indicated during this session, instead of reducing appropriations for the Constitutional Governments, the record shows that, in fact, the Administering Authority has significantly increased its allocation of funds to the new Governments. It is, of course, a truism to state that one never has enough money. I am informed that even the United Nations organizations suffer from this malady. I wish to assure the Council, however, that the funding made available to the new Governments, exclusive of revenues generated locally, is based on requests made by the Governments themselves. I might also note that, as my Office in Saipan continues its reduction with the transfer of functions, the funding formerly set aside for the Trust Territory headquarters has, to a very large degree, been made available for the use of these Governments, either to meet emergency needs or for other projects.

I also recall that the question of economic planning for development was raised. In this regard, I would like to draw your attention to two items.

Each of the Governments has its own plan, either already completed or in various stages of preparation. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has been most helpful in this regard. Also, pending approval of the Compact of Free Association, each of the Governments will prepare an extensive development plan for the use of the funding made available under the Compact. We are seeing, after years of studies and drafts, some very positive movement in this area. It is very heartening to note how seriously the new Governments take their plans now that they know it is they who must carry them out and not some nebulous Administering Authority.

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

I fully agree that there is much work to be done in this area. I sincerely hope, however, that the Governments whose responsibility it now is to plan for development will pursue these plans with vigour and imagination.

It is our feeling that, with the completion of the Infrastructure Programme under the Capital Improvement Programme, the climate for accelerated development will continue to improve.

In my opening statement, you will recall, I said that we had seen considerable increase in interest in the area of investment from foreign Governments and American business. We are confident that, with the stability promised by the structures of these new Governments, these investors will have the assurances they require to place their resources into viable, profitable and culturally acceptable enterprises within the islands.

Development of the outer islands is a perennial problem. This situation cannot be addressed with simplicity or just good intentions. Most of these islands are incredibly small and simply cannot be developed in the accepted sense of the word.

There are, however, many improvements which can be made and which are now being made. I call to mind the solar energy projects making refrigeration available for the dispensaries and power for radios. In the Federated States of Micronesia, cold-storage projects are being implemented to encourage fishing for profit in some of the islands. In fact, some of the field-trip ships servicing these islands have been fitted with refrigerators to transport large quantities of fish to the markets in the main islands. Some of these projects are funded by the Administering Authority and some are being assisted by the Japanese Government. My point is that work is going on and, although they may seem like small projects, on a small island it is the small projects that are the most effective.

A question was raised during the session concerning the names of international companies doing business in the Trust Territory. Since each of the Governments now controls its own foreign investment activities, the Trust Territory headquarters cannot give a detailed response. However, it can point out that there are Japanese companies investing in tourism, especially hotels. Japan Airlines is flying into the Northern Marianas and Continental/Air Micronesia is providing inter-island air and cargo service. Air Nauru provides additional international service. Several maritime freight companies are serving the islands. Mobil Oil is servicing the energy needs. We have had investments from Hong Kong, Nauru and Great Britain, all in the private sector.

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

It appears useful to me to refer again to some important items relating to the Ebeye/Kwajalein situation. I wish to be certain that the Council understands that the Administering Authority, in conjunction with the Government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands, is undertaking a substantial rehabilitation project for the islands, including water and sewer, power, road and hospital renovation and, at some time in the future, as was stated by the Minister of Public Works of the Marshalls, Mr. Domnick, a causeway to a neighbouring island which will provide additional living space for the inhabitants of Ebeye. It is our hope, however, that these improvements do not provide an inducement for more migration to Ebeye from other parts of the Marshall Islands. Such migration has already contributed to the overpopulation and social and economic problems of the area. We noted this last year in some detail.

In addition, I would like to reiterate the fact that there is now a Commission comprising the Government of the Marshall Islands, the Kwajalein landowners and the Kwajalein missile range personnel, which is actively working at finding ways to improve relations between the two populations without threatening the integrity of either. We sincerely hope that these community-based efforts will lead to rapid improvements in a whole variety of spheres which have historically been referred to in these chambers.

I am particularly pleased to announce that I have just been informed that the motor sailer specially constructed for the people of Enewetak has been successfully launched in Washington State.

The Enewetak captain and crew are undergoing training and will soon sail the vessel to Hawaii and then to Enewetak. This project has been under way for the past three years and its successful completion will enable the people of Enewetak to sail to Ujelang and other points in the Marshall Islands to conduct the business of farming and commerce.

Family planning was suggested as requiring greater emphasis. I would like to note that there has been and continues to be great effort expended in this area. The health services of all of the Governments, including what remains of the Trust Territory Bureau of Health Services, considers this area to be one of priority. Because of cultural and religious considerations, however, it is not something which can be implemented in a heavy-handed manner. As time goes on, however, the importance of this very necessary programme will, I am sure, become apparent to

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

everyone in the islands. It is one of those things which result from a successful programme of improved health throughout the population. The small islands will probably reach their saturation point in population in a few years. We already know that, by some standards, some of the islands are already suffering the effects of overpopulation. Economic development itself is not the answer; education **itself is** not the answer. With rising expectations in the modern world, the old traditional concepts of family size will increasingly come under scrutiny, but this is again something that only the people of Micronesia, working for their own futures, can determine.

Again, this leads us into the discussion of social problems in the Trust Territory. You have heard each of our Special Representatives describe the situations within their jurisdictions. There are problems; no one would pretend there are not. Some of this is due to what is called unemployment, some is due to cultural displacement, but what changing society has not had similar problems? There is movement towards adapting Micronesian societies to the modern world. There is also a strongly felt desire to preserve traditional ways of life. In the process of determining which direction society will take, severe dislocation does take place and this leads to a certain amount of social disruption. This said, I also want to note the statements of the Micronesian representatives that there are programmes going on in every jurisdiction to combat alcoholism and juvenile delinquency, to provide vocational training, counselling and programmes designed specifically to alleviate these problems and to ensure that the youth remain as productive members of these new societies. The Administering Authority will continue to provide assistance for these efforts as long as possible.

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

In the area of training also, I wish to reiterate my support for continued efforts on the part of our Micronesian colleagues to participate in programmes sponsored by international and regional organizations. In fact, I hope to institute a study in this area when I return to Saipan, review all of the programmes in which the Trust Territory participates and enter into discussions with the appropriate authorities of the Governments as to how we can improve and facilitate these opportunities as much as possible.

In reaching the conclusion of my statement, I would like very much to express our appreciation to the visiting missions of the Council over the past year. Their reports have been extremely thorough and stimulating. These reports will be circulated, to the extent that my small quantity affords, among my staff for their information and I assume that the Secretariat will send enough of them for use by the constitutional Governments. I mention this, because with the Mission going to the Federated States of Micronesia next month and possibly the last one to the Marshall Islands later this year, these reports will be the historical record of the moves taken in this, the last Trust Territory, towards self-government in terms fully consonant with the Trusteeship Agreements and the Charter of the United Nations. I would recommend, also, that a sufficient quantity of these and future reports be made available for the Pacific area, so that doubts as to the conduct of these plebiscites could be put to rest. I am certain that interest in these documents will be greater than any previous publications of this Council.

The manner, Sir, in which you have conducted the meetings of this Council gives me great confidence in the future. I look forward to working closely with you and the other members and I wish again to extend the invitation of the Trust Territory Administration to all members of the Council to join in the visiting missions to come. I cannot overstate the importance of having been there.

Thank you for this opportunity. I hope that we can look forward to a rapid conclusion of our work in the Trusteeship Council and the termination of the Agreement. We are all working for this and I can assure you it will be one of the happiest moments in my life when it is accomplished.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): As this Council concludes its discussion and debate for this session, I am forced to the observation that it has often been sidetracked and that its deliberations have been distorted by the concern of some with military and defence considerations. These are not the primary concerns in Micronesia of the United States Government. Thus, I find the preoccupation of one delegation and many petitioners with these questions to be detrimental to the common purposes and best functioning of this Council and that it distracts the Administering Authority from its concern for the welfare and the political wishes of the peoples of Micronesia. I shall therefore deal only briefly with security concerns and concentrate on the economic and political development of the Trust Territory, which constitutes the mandate of this Council to my Government. While we feel we have carried out that mandate to the best of our ability and in a creditable manner, we recognize that it is an ongoing mandate. Today we reiterate to the Security Council, to the Trusteeship Council and to our Micronesian partners our commitment to this task.

Mutual security arrangements under the Compact of Free Association are just that - mutual. They are part of the Compact because that is what the Constitutional, elected Governments of Micronesia have negotiated and proposed to their people in free and open plebiscites on their political future.

While a demonstration at Kwajalein missile range may be good press and read well to one delegation in the Council's provisional verbatim records, security affairs and problems are neither the focus nor the purpose of our administration of the Trust Territory. Our military presence is minimal, our military units non-existent, our sole military facility civilian-operated: what is the United States military presence in the Trust Territory? The United States maintains only one facility in the Trust Territory for military purposes, a missile-testing range at Kwajalein in the Marshall Islands. This facility, while under Army command, is operated by civilian contractors. There is also a small Coast Guard station in Yap, whose mission is civil navigational assistance.

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

The United States also leases land on the island of Tinian in the Northern Mariana Islands and occasionally uses the island for military training manoeuvres. That is not the stuff of military adventurism and exploitation as is so fancifully and colourfully depicted in our proceedings. Were our aims and purposes predominantly military in nature, we would, I would hazard a guess, want to maintain the present arrangements. Instead, we have worked assiduously with the elected representatives of Micronesia to dispense with trusteeship in favour of a status of their design and choosing. Article 5 of the Trusteeship Agreement states explicitly that the United States shall be entitled to establish military bases and station armed forces in the Trust Territory. In no meaningful sense have we done either.

Consistent with the strategic significance of the Trust Territory and the nature of the Trusteeship, article 13 of the Trusteeship Agreement grants the United States, as Administering Authority, the right to close the area for security purposes. The United States is not exercising that authority today, but we would not fail to do so should the need arise. In this as in other contingencies, our concern is with our mutual defence needs, not the militarization of Micronesia which it has been precisely our purpose in this, the only strategic trust under article 3 of the Charter to prevent.

Section 311 of the proposed Mutual Security Arrangements under the Compact of Free Association would give the United States:

"the obligation to defend Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia and their peoples from attack or threats thereof as the United States and citizens are defended" and "the option to foreclose access to or use of Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia by military personnel or for the military purposes of any third country."

This obligation and this option would extend for a minimum period of fifteen years in the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia and fifty years in Palau, subject in all cases to extension by mutual agreement.

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

In agreements subsidiary to the Compact, the United States undertakes to continue to defend Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia - after the expiration of the provisions described above - on a basis comparable to that which underlies the mutual defence and security arrangements between the United States and its closest allies.

The United States does not plan to construct any military facilities in the Trust Territory, although the Trusteeship Agreement gives us the authority to do so should the need arise during the trust. The Northern Mariana Islands Commonwealth Covenant provides that the United States shall have the option of leasing certain land in the Northern Mariana Islands for possible use as military facilities. The United States consummated that lease in January 1983, but plans no construction, and we will lease back substantial portions of this land to the Government of the Northern Mariana Islands for a token sum.

Under the Compact of Free Association and its subsidiary agreements, the United States would have the right to continue to use the Kwajalein missile range for a period of up to thirty years and would reserve the right to use certain areas of Palau, in a contingency, for military purposes. No such use-rights whatsoever are reserved in the Federated States of Micronesia, and the United States has no present intention to exercise the contingency use-rights in Palau.

I have reviewed yet again for the Council my Government's overview of some of the key military questions which seem to arise constantly before this Council precisely to put them definitively to rest. I noted in the section of our proceedings devoted to petitioners, and in the section devoted to questions of the Administering Authority from members of this Council, implications of bad faith, of an unwillingness to address the realities of defence, and of grandiose plans to pave Micronesia in military concrete. My Government has acted in good faith, has nothing of a military nature to hide - indeed little to show - and would like now to leave this subject behind in the second place it deserves and discuss the economic and especially the political development in the Trust Territory of which we are justly proud.

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

I shall review a few examples of the economic progress and growth which the Micronesians and Americans have in partnership generated over the past year. The Administering Authority is upgrading portions of the existing telecommunications system, that is, local telephone and outer-island radio to the operating standards for which it was designed. In this regard, all outer-island radios will be replaced with solid state modular radios operating from solar-powered batteries.

Concerning world-wide communication, Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia have signed agreements with the Communications Satellite Corporation for installation of satellite earth stations. The first station, in Palau, went into operation in November 1982. The Majuro and Ponape stations followed in February and March 1983, respectively. The remaining stations - in Truk, Yap and Kosrae, Federated States of Micronesia, and Ebeye, Marshall Islands - will come into operation later in 1983.

I have reviewed for the Council the programme of outer-island improvement projects, including some of those which might have been part of a "Second-Level Capital Improvement Programme", 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 airstrips on certain outer islands.

I have also reviewed the across-the-board conversion of Federal programmes to block grants, part of the President's economic recovery programme. The Compact of Free Association has anticipated the block-grant approach and will provide large sums of money 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 wishes of the people and Governments concerned.

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

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

The Administering Authority, in accordance with previous Trusteeship Council recommendations, is attempting to promote increased exports from the Territory through a variety of means. The Governments of Japan and Canada have granted general special preference treatment to Micronesian products and the Administering Authority would welcome grants of such treatment by other Governments as well.

I must reject completely the statement of the Soviet representative that economic conditions in the Trust Territory are "catastrophic". On the contrary, economic conditions have greatly improved over the thirty-six years of the Trusteeship, particularly when one considers what little there remained following the ravages of the Second World War. United States appropriations and programmes for the Trust Territory have rapidly increased in the last two decades and currently stand at around \$900 per capita yearly. We will continue to assist Micronesia in the post-termination period to promote its economic development and increased self-sufficiency.

The United States continues to fund and oversee the five-year Capital Improvement Programme, which was designed to encourage investment throughout the Territory through the development of local facilities which will support private enterprise. Responsibility for the promotion of investment has been transferred to the constitutional Governments, each of which has instituted programmes and activities for this purpose.

The Department of the Interior, through a co-operative effort with the Department of Defense, has provided funding to establish a centre for small business development in Guam and Micronesia. The broad objective of the centre is to assist in the establishment of new businesses.

I should like next to inform the Council on the status of the Capital Relocation Plan for the Federated States of Micronesia. The Federated States of Micronesia has contracted for a development plan for a capital at Palikir on Ponape. The estimated cost of the facility, namely, \$42 million (in 1979 dollars) was scaled down to approximately \$23 million. Representatives of the Federated States of Micronesia have been advised that the United States proposes to make a substantial contribution against the cost of capital relocation but that it is not prepared to put up the entire amount. The United States has proposed

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

to provide \$15 million to the Federated States of Micronesia as its contribution. The United States has also offered to make a contribution of \$3 million each to the Government of the Marshall Islands and the Government of Palau for capital relocation or rehabilitation costs. In the fiscal year 1982 federal budget, \$2.88 million was appropriated as an initial increment for necessary work for all three entities. An additional \$9.6 million has been requested in the fiscal year 1984 budget for capital relocation projects, to be distributed to the Federated States of Micronesia and the Marshall Islands - that is, \$7 million and \$2.6 million, respectively. Owing to delays in site selection, no capital construction funds were requested in fiscal year 1984 for Palau. We look forward to continued progress in these projects which are both valuable tools of public administration for the constitutional, elected Governments of Micronesia and symbols of the self-government and self-determination on which they are embarked.

Finally, in the economic area, I should like to review for the Council what I consider the real test of American goodwill in its administration of the Trust: the kind of economic assistance envisaged for Micronesia in the Compact and thus in the future. The overall level of grant assistance to Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia under the Compact of Free Association would be somewhat greater than that provided by the United States during the last years of the trusteeship. It is not true, as my Soviet colleague said yesterday, that the United States has promised far more assistance under the Compact than under the present arrangement. Amounts will, on the contrary, be substantially the same, since the figures are based on actual operating expenses. However, the Governments will receive the funds as a package and will have total latitude in their spending decisions. 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 United States assistance would be even more heavily directed towards generating development and economic self-reliance. In this regard, the Compact specifies that at least 40 per cent of United States assistance will be devoted to revenue-producing projects and capital development. That presages the economic future we envisage for and hope to allow the Micronesians to pursue as they plot their own

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

course - a future of self-sustaining growth and dignity consistent with and principally based upon their own resources and their considerable skills.

I should like next to review political development in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Let me turn first to the basics of the status negotiated by the Micronesian Governments and proposed to their peoples: free association is the term used to describe the relationship set forth in the Compact of Free Association signed by the United States and the Governments of Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia. The term describes a political relationship in which both the United States and the prospective freely associated States would have authorities and responsibilities. In general, the freely associated States would have full internal self-government and substantial control over their foreign affairs, while the United States would have authority and responsibility for security and defence matters. The United States would also provide economic assistance.

The Governments of Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States signed the Compact of Free Association freely and without any pressure or coercion from the United States or any other party. I am sure that the representatives from each of those Governments who are assisting this Council with its work will attest to that indisputable fact.

I am compelled by a certain line of questioning, usually either repetitive or rhetorical, and from one delegation, to reiterate that the United Nations Charter and Trusteeship Agreement call for independence or self-government and that several alternative statuses to independence are recognized in international law as viable outcomes of the full exercise of the fundamental right of self-determination. The goal of my country is fulfilling this trust has been to promote and make possible self-determination as the fruition of political development.

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

What form or course that self-determination may take is precisely what we encourage the Micronesians to choose. We grow weary but not discouraged with the constant references to independence as the only course they may choose and the insult that implies to the autonomy, intelligence and integrity of the Micronesians. They have our guarantee that they may choose freely, as well as the guarantee of this Council, which observed the acts of self-determination in the Northern Marianas and in Palau. They will choose freely and the United Nations will make sure of it.

The free association currently being contemplated is very much in accordance with the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreement and in conformity with both the letter and the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. Contrary to the title of an oft-cited but seldom read book, we consider this aspect of political development a trust fulfilled. While resolution 1541 (XV) itself in no way applies to the strategic trusteeship of Micronesia, it nevertheless contains other recognized attributes of the political status of free association. The United States notes that the type of free association set forth in the Compact of Free Association conforms to the major benchmarks for free association generally recognized in international law and set forth in that resolution: the arrangement will be freely entered into through informed and democratic processes; the freely associated areas will have the right to adopt their own constitutions without outside interference; and the political status and relationship of free association will be terminable at any time by any party.

The United States believes that one of our main goals, the establishment of democratic institutions and principles as a means of resolving political issues, has been largely achieved. As is characteristic and desirable in a democratic system, we would not expect complete unanimity of opinion on every aspect of Trust Territory affairs or its political future. I for one would find such an outcome within or concerning the trust suspect. I should find unanimity, despite its desirability under some current socio-economic systems, inimical to the purposes of the United States and of the United Nations. Fortunately, the decisions vitally affecting the peoples of the Trust Territory, including their future constitutional and government arrangements, have been or are being freely made by the free peoples of Micronesia through democratic processes observed by United Nations representatives.

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

Where do we go from here? Let me before turning to the future repeat that that future is up to the peoples and Governments of Micronesia. Some broad if not certain directions of transition and termination of the Trust can be sketched tentatively and, I believe, usefully.

The Compact of Free Association contains provisions for its own approval process, all of which would take place prior to termination of the Trusteeship Agreement, although the free association relationship is not planned to enter into force until trusteeship termination. This approval process includes ratification by the constitutional Governments and approval by their peoples in a plebiscite, as well as approval by the United States Congress.

The Governments of Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia are now functioning under locally approved constitutions, subject to the Trusteeship Agreement, and are fully capable of governing after termination of the Trusteeship Agreement without interruption. According to their constitutions, these Governments have adequate authority to execute an agreement on free association.

Under free association the Micronesian States would not be fully independent but would be fully self-governing and would generally have authority and responsibility for foreign affairs. Many have asked how this can be. Under the Compact of Free Association, the freely associated States will generally have a broad capacity to engage in foreign affairs. This authority would, we expect, include entering into agreements with other nations, receiving assistance and participating in international conferences and organizations. In the exercise of their foreign affairs authority under the Compact of Free Association, the freely associated States will refrain from actions inconsistent with United States security and defence responsibilities.

The United States has informally consulted with Trusteeship Council members to keep them up-to-date on the progress of the negotiations and the issues involved, and has reported fully on the negotiations at the annual sessions of this Council. We intend to continue this practice. In addition, the United States has furnished to all members of this Council and to the Council secretariat the Compact of Free Association and all its subsidiary and related agreements upon their completion and signature.

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

The Personal Representative of the President of the United States for Micronesian Status Negotiations signed the Compact of Free Association and its subsidiary and related agreements with the President of the Marshall Islands on 30 May 1982 and with the chief negotiators for Palau and for the Federated States of Micronesia on 26 August and 1 October 1982 respectively. The results of the negotiations have now been committed to the approval process, as follows: in Palau, where the Compact was approved in a plebiscite on 10 February 1983; in the Federated States of Micronesia, where a plebiscite will be held on 21 June; and in the Marshall Islands, where a plebiscite will be held in the near future. Thereafter, the Compact will be submitted to the Congress of the United States for its consideration and approval.

The agreements subsidiary to the Compact are those listed in section 462 of the Compact. They cover such subjects as telecommunications, law enforcement and extradition, the status of United States military personnel in the freely associated States, and United States federal programmes and services which will continue to operate in Micronesia after termination of the trusteeship.

While I believe I have been more than clear that all political status options are open to Micronesians, let me reiterate that the United States has maintained throughout the political status negotiations its willingness to negotiate with Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia a relationship consistent with the political status of independence, if that is their desire. The United States has also informed this Council that the independence option could properly appear on a political status plebiscite ballot.

Such an option in fact appeared on the plebiscite ballot in Palau, where "independence" received 44.4 per cent of the votes cast on this question and "a relationship with the United States closer than free association" received 55.6 per cent. However, only about half of the voters who took part in the plebiscite chose to express a preference on this question. Thus, of those voting, one quarter favoured "independence", while one third preferred "a closer relationship". Since the voters of Palau overwhelmingly approved the political status of free association, the results of the "independence" and "closer relationship" questions are academic. An independence option appears on the ballot which will be used in the plebiscite of 21 June in the Federated States of Micronesia, and an independence option is expected to appear also on the plebiscite ballot used in the Marshall Islands.

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

The Security Council has been kept fully informed of developments in the Trust Territory, including the political status negotiations, through the reports of the Trusteeship Council. This practice is in accordance with Article 83 of the Charter and Security Council resolution 70 (1949) of 7 March 1949.

The United States believes - and it is certain that this Council and the Security Council would agree - that the choice of future political status by the inhabitants of any Trust Territory is ultimately a matter for their decision as reflected in free expressions of the popular will which constitute acts of self-determination. We believe that the most appropriate and profitable time for discussion of the signed Compact and related agreements before this Council will come if and when those documents have been formally approved. It is our assumption that the Council will concern itself primarily with the manner in which the signed documents have been or will be explained to the voters of Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia, and with the conduct of the acts of self-determination in which the documents have been or will be approved, inasmuch as approval in valid fully informed acts of self-determination will demonstrate acceptance of the contents by the persons most concerned, that is, the inhabitants of the Trust Territory. That assumption applies equally to the Northern Mariana Islands and its Commonwealth Covenant with the United States.

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

The United States has encouraged the Micronesian Governments to play an increasingly prominent role in all aspects of government. Let me take as an example the budget process. The United States has held budget seminars for the Micronesian budget officials, and United States officials visit the Trust Territory for the express purpose of working with Micronesian Government officials to develop each fiscal year's budget requests. The annual budgets are based in large measure on requests and justifications from the Governments of Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia.

The High Commissioner is the representative of the President of the United States in the Trust Territory. The position is necessary in order that the United States may carry out its non-delegable fundamental trusteeship obligations, and we plan to retain it until the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement. Executive branch functions hitherto located at Saipan under the direct supervision of the High Commissioner have been, for the most part, transferred to the constitutional Governments. The High Commissioner retains those functions necessary to permit her to carry out her responsibilities. Decisions as to the location of governmental agencies will be made by the constitutional Governments.

The United States, together with the Trusteeship Council, has long supported the unity of the Trust Territory. Political separation nevertheless has occurred as a result of the clearly expressed will of the people in referendums observed and judged fair by the Trusteeship Council.

We are aware of sentiment in some portions of the Trust Territory favouring further fragmentation. The United States has encouraged individuals and groups that have such views to present them to the Government of Palau, the Marshall Islands or the Federated States of Micronesia, as appropriate.

How soon will our approval process begin? This Administration, having virtually concluded the political status negotiations and having seen the approval process begin, wishes to complete the process as soon as possible but has established no specific deadline. President Reagan, in a message to the peoples of the Trust Territory in October 1981, said,

"This Administration is committed to an early termination of the Trusteeship Agreement and wishes to complete the political status negotiations as expeditiously as possible."

That statement remains United States policy.

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

We intend to take up the matter of termination with the Trusteeship Council and the Security Council at the appropriate time. We contemplate simultaneous termination of the Trusteeship Agreement for all parts of the Trust Territory.

I have given this Council the firm and categorical United States response to allegations that it has failed to carry out in full its commitments, including political and infrastructure development. The Administering Authority is cognizant of its obligations and undertakings and is making every effort to meet them.

That said, let me realistically inform the Council that it is entirely possible, however, that certain undertakings, such as construction projects whose scope has altered or whose costs have exceeded expectations, will not have been completed by the time the trusteeship is terminated. In such cases the United States intends nevertheless to press for completion of the projects and is currently discussing with the individual Governments the means of doing so.

Some imply that the United States as Administering Authority pays little heed to the United Nations or this Council, and that we act as though we believe the Security Council has retained no authority over the Trust Territory by virtue of the 1949 resolution.

The United States does not believe that the Security Council has relinquished its authority under the Charter with regard to the Trust Territory. In my opinion, we go to considerable lengths to assist the Council and its Visiting and Observer Missions in fulfilling their duty of overseeing the trusteeship and reporting to the Security Council, and I feel the Micronesian Governments do the same.

I would like to take this opportunity to respond to the serious allegation by the representative of the Soviet Union yesterday that the United States had attempted to stifle the free expression of opinion by the Micronesian representatives on this delegation by refusing to invite Foreign Secretary DeBrum to this year's Council session. This is simply untrue. We were very pleased to hear the rejection of that charge by the representative of the Marshall Islands, as well as the note taken earlier by our British colleague of the obvious freedom of expression of the Micronesian delegates. We are a free society which prizes freedom of speech above all. As should be obvious to all who listen or observe, the Special Representatives of the Micronesian States included in my delegation are completely at liberty to state their views whether or not they are in consonance with those of the United States Government.

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

We have also attempted scrupulously to inform Micronesians about the political options open to them under the trust - seeing ourselves as a conduit of open and frank discussion in each direction. With the devolution of day-to-day governmental responsibility from the Trust Territory Government to the Governments of Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia, these Governments have assumed general responsibility for political information with respect to self-government.

With specific reference to the plebiscites in Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia, the United States believes it has an obligation under the Trusteeship Agreement to do what it can to ensure that any act of self-determination - particularly a plebiscite on future political status - is preceded by a fair, open and comprehensive public information programme covering the alternatives. The education campaigns are, of course, not conducted by the United States but by the elected Governments. We have fulfilled this obligation in consultation and co-operation with the Government of Palau with respect to the plebiscite conducted there on 10 February and we are fulfilling it with respect to the forthcoming plebiscites in the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia.

Those plebiscites are the culmination of the intentions and activities with regard to the trusteeship that I have reviewed today. They are a source of pride to the United States and to the peoples and Governments of Micronesia, and they should also be a source of pride to this Council.

The PRESIDENT: We have now completed the closing statements in the general debate, and I should like, therefore, on behalf of the Council, to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the delegation which has come from the Pacific to help us in our work at this session. I should like to thank all the Special Representatives, Special Advisers and Advisers of the Administering Authority for the co-operation they have given to the Council during these last two weeks. All of them have provided us with a great deal of detailed information and informed comment on conditions in the Trust Territory. The information and comments they have given us at this session will greatly help the Council in preparing its draft conclusions and recommendations for submission to the

(The President)

Security Council. On behalf of the Council, I should like to express to all of them our thanks and appreciation. Those of them who are still here have the Council's wishes for a safe trip back to their homes, and I would ask the United States representative to convey to those who have already left our appreciation and our warm thanks for their co-operation and for the contribution they have made to the Council's work.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union delegation has listened attentively to the concluding statement of the delegation of the Administering Authority of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The United States representative, Ambassador Sherman, made certain references to the discussion which has taken place, including the statement made here by the Soviet delegation, and we should like to comment on his statement.

The representative of the United States tried, in particular, to create the impression that statements made here by the Soviet delegation were unfounded or aimed at distracting the attention of the Trusteeship Council from the questions under consideration. We wish to emphasize that, regardless of how the statements of the Soviet delegation are assessed by the representative of the United States, all the data cited by the Soviet delegation were based on and confirmed by official documents and other material of the United States Congress. Those documents were not prepared by the Soviet delegation; they were prepared by the United States Congress. They were based also on official and semi-official statements of well-known American representatives and on Trusteeship Council material and statements made by the United States delegation. Finally, they were based on petitions and statements made during the hearings at this session of the Trusteeship Council and at the preceding session. The Soviet delegation made use of facts drawn from scholarly studies published in the United States. It also based its statements on material taken from the world press.

I therefore repeat that, regardless of how these facts are assessed by the delegation of the United States, they cannot be denied. Facts speak for themselves and exist regardless of the desire - or lack of it - of the Administering Authority to take them into account. These facts objectively reflect the true situation that has resulted from the policy of the United States in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The following are the most important of these facts.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

The United States, as the Administering Authority of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, has not fulfilled its obligations to that Territory under the United Nations Charter, the United Nations Trusteeship Agreement with the United States Government and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Today, instead of a unified Territory of Micronesia, we see that Territory, as a result of the policy of the Administering Authority, split up into separate entities on which is imposed a neo-colonial status under the label of a so-called community in co-operation in the context of the so-called Compact of Free Association with the United States. That is the same as transforming this Territory into an American possession. That is precisely how the situation has been described even by officials of the United States, and not so long ago.

Instead of ensuring that the Trust Territory play its part in maintaining international peace and security, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, the Administering Authority has devoted all of its efforts to using that Trust Territory in the interest of its military and strategic objectives and transforming it into a testing ground of missiles and nuclear weapons and for the deployment of its military bases, in order to make the Territory a military base and to reinforce its use as such for many decades to come. That represents a serious threat not only to the people of Micronesia but also to international peace and security as a whole.

Today Ambassador Sherman alleged that the United States military presence in Micronesia was not very extensive, but the United States is strengthening its military presence there and planning to do so for many decades to come. It is not important how many persons are at the military base at this precise time. What is important is that the base exists, and these days, with the development of technology and means of transportation, it is not very difficult to ensure the continuance of that base, as we know and as Ambassador Sherman knows. So the question is not how many military personnel are at the present time on Micronesia territory but what use is going to be made of the Trust Territory by the United States, depending on its needs, in the future.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

It is perfectly clear that the United States, in carrying out an annexationist policy as regards the Trust Territory of Micronesia, is trying to preserve and strengthen its control over enormous regions of the Pacific Ocean and to intensify its strategic and military position in that part of the globe. That is a fact.

Instead of preparing the Territory for economic self-sufficiency and promoting the social progress of the population and their enjoyment of their fundamental rights and freedoms, without any discrimination whatsoever, the Administering Authority has brought the Territory to a state of total economic dependence on the United States. Is that not a fact? It is an objective fact that cannot be denied. This is not rhetoric - although that is how the representative of the United States of trying to represent the statements of the Soviet delegation.

The economic situation of the people of the Territory, which has been deliberately brought about by the Administering Authority, is the basic reason why they are obliged to accept the so-called option of free association imposed on it by the United States. What kind of equal negotiations can there be between Micronesia and the United States? When the United States has all the economic and political levers to apply against the people of Micronesia, what kind of equal footing in the negotiations can we talk about here? It is obvious that, if the Administering Authority had during the 36 years of its trusteeship helped to provide a self-sufficient economy, the Micronesians would have been able to determine their political status in accordance with their own national interests. Is that not a fact?

At an earlier meeting the Soviet delegation asked the following question of a representative of Micronesia on the United States delegation: If Palau had been sufficiently developed economically and had been economically independent, what status would it have chosen? The answer was totally unambiguous; it was clear that it would not have been in favour of so-called free association. And then the representative of the United States talks about the choice freely made by the Micronesian people.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Instead of protecting and respecting the fundamental rights and freedoms of the indigenous population of the Territory, the Administering Authority has clearly been trampling these under foot. The territory and the environment of the people of Micronesia have already been irrevocably damaged as a result of American testing of nuclear weapons, the pernicious consequences of which are difficult to assess fully at the present time. Is that not a fact?

The Soviet delegation could go on listing facts that attest to the failure of the Administering Authority to fulfil its obligations under the United Nations Charter, the Trusteeship Agreement and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. At this stage, there is clearly no need to do so, since it is perfectly obvious that such a policy and such actions by the United States as the Administering Authority are totally unilateral, circumvent the Security Council and violate the United Nations Charter, in particular Article 83 (1), which states:

"All functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas," -
as is the case with regard to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands -
"including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements
and of their alteration or amendment, shall be exercised by the
Security Council".

We should like to repeat that this is a fact, despite attempts by the United States to represent the matter in a different light. The fact is that the United States has brought Micronesia to the situation in which it finds itself today.

I reserve the right of the Soviet delegation to return to this question, if necessary.

The PRESIDENT: As President, I fully recognize the right of reply, so there is no particular need to reserve that right. That is understood as part of our normal method of procedure.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): A careful reading of my speech this morning would indicate that I referred specifically to the Soviet Union only twice. The first time was in rejecting the statement of my Soviet colleague yesterday that economic conditions in the Trust Territory are catastrophic, and I explained why that was incorrect. The second reference to the Soviet Union was simply to call untrue the statement that he had made that the United States had attempted to stifle the free expression of opinion by the Micronesian representative and his delegation by refusing to invite Foreign Secretary DeBrum to this year's proceedings. Indeed, Foreign Secretary DeBrum was on the delegation until, for reasons of his own, he found it impossible to attend.

Large parts of the statement just concluded by my Soviet colleague were indeed unfounded, not as assessed by me but as assessed by the Micronesian representatives here - representatives of an area and a people of which he has no direct experience - and a free press and free votes which took place under observation by the Trusteeship Council. With those two institutions he may be unfamiliar. What he alleges to be facts are his interpretations, which have frequently been contradicted by the reports of the Visiting Missions and by the testimony of others in this Council who have been to the area and observed what is taking place.

My statement stands as delivered. The United States firmly believes and categorically asserts to this Council that the statements made in my closing summary are correct. My Soviet colleague is perfectly free to make whatever interpretations he chooses, but I do not believe he can assert that they are facts.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I simply wish to state that my delegation listened to the concluding statement of Ambassador Sherman with great interest, particularly his statement that the United States intends to take up the matter of termination of the trusteeship with the Trusteeship Council and the Security Council at the appropriate time. This procedure is fully in accordance with Article 83 of the Charter. We also note that the United States delegation stressed the fact that the United States contemplated simultaneous termination of the Trusteeship Agreement for all parts of the Territory. We fully agree with this position because the Trust Territory was entrusted to the United States in 1947 as a whole.

(Mr. Poudade, France)

We speak a great deal here about the responsibilities of the Security Council. All of us abide by Article 83 and I am quite sure that, if the Trusteeship Council ever failed to fulfil its mandate and if a dangerous situation arose which threatened peace, some delegations would inform the Secretary-General and request a meeting of the Security Council. So far the submission of our report does not pose any problem and the Security Council, as far as I know, has never been convened to deal with the way in which the Trusteeship Council fulfils its functions.

Finally, I appeal to members to refrain from the sort of concluding statements - which seem to have become rather a tradition - which give rise to replies and refutations. I believe that our main concern here is the fate of the Micronesians, and, if we could avoid the subject of East-West relations and concentrate on this, refraining from discussions that have nothing to do with the population of the Trusteeship Territory, that would give my delegation great satisfaction.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In reply to the statement just made by the representative of the United States, Mr. Sherman, I should like once again to reaffirm what was stated by the Soviet delegation and draw his attention once again to the point that facts are stubborn and objective. One can hardly change the substance of facts by interpreting them. If the substance of facts could be changed by interpreting them, a great deal could be done for the people of Micronesia to achieve genuine independence and self-determination.

Regarding the statement that the facts cited by the Soviet delegation are an interpretation, I should like once again to propose to the representative of the United States that he look at the report of the Administering Authority on the Territory of the Pacific Islands, at least the first part of the report of the Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands of 1982, which reflects those statements and the factual situation in the Trust Territory at the present time.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): In the interest of brevity I shall simply say that I associate myself fully with the remarks of the representative of France.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): I too associate myself most wholeheartedly with the remarks of the representative of France and in the interest of brevity and saving the time of this Council, I shall make no further comments at this time.

The PRESIDENT: If there are no further comments to be made at the conclusion of the general debate, I should now like to move forward to the appointment of a drafting Committee.

At this stage of the Council's proceedings, I should like to suggest that the Council should appoint a drafting committee whose terms of reference will be to propose conclusions and recommendations on conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands on the basis of the discussions held by this Council at the current session. The drafting committee will also have to make draft recommendations concerning the chapter on conditions in the Trust Territory to be included in the forthcoming report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council.

(The President)

If there are no comments on that procedure, I should like, in accordance with the consultations which I have already had occasion to hold with members of the Council, to propose that a drafting committee be appointed composed of France and the United Kingdom.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: We could, if the Council agrees, move onto the items which we have not concluded, namely, the reports of the Visiting Missions to the Trust Territory. On this subject, as I recollect, after the representative of France had spoken briefly, the representative of the United Kingdom asked some questions, but there may be other representatives who would like to do the same. I think this is a very good time to do so. So may I invite members to take up this particular uncompleted piece of work and take advantage of this period to ask questions about the two reports of the Visiting Missions?

(The President)

I know that several representatives have addressed these reports in their contributions to the general debate. Perhaps this has almost exhausted the subject, but there may be one or two additional points to be made.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, I take that to mean that we are following the course which you suggested. In that case, I would be ready to ask several questions on the reports.

At the moment, I should like to deal with the report of the regular Visiting Mission which visited the Territory in 1982. I have one small question dealing with paragraph 26 of that report. Perhaps the leader of this Mission could give us a short clarification. It says: "the Mission received a background paper prepared by the Government." It does not specify whether that paper was given at the meeting or whether it was merely referred to. My question is what kind of a paper is this and what is its substance and content.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): An information paper had been prepared by President Nakayama whom we met and we then requested other documents, particularly on planning and related areas. All these documents have been kept by the Secretariat. The Secretariat may thus be able to provide any documents supplied by President Nakayama. Perhaps the Secretariat could make a photocopy for the Soviet delegation today.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation will familiarize itself with this document in the Secretariat and, if necessary, comment on it.

I am saying this for the simple reason that the matter is not clear. It may be such an important document that it will have to be reflected in the report. Without any second thoughts or afterthoughts, I am really just interested in knowing what is in the document.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I thank the Soviet representative. I can tell him that various documents were provided by President Nakayama, specifically the background paper. This paper covered a number of elements relating precisely to the development of the Federated States. Following receipt of this paper, which is a presentation paper, we then requested supplementary documents and were supplied at a subsequent meeting with other papers relating particularly to tourism and investment planning. I have not forgotten that the Soviet delegation is referring to an introductory paper; there was also a subsequent group of papers. They are all available to the Soviet representative if he is interested. The Secretariat has them.

The PRESIDENT: I have no doubt that Visiting Missions, as they go about their work, receive a large number of papers from governmental and non-governmental bodies and that these form some of the data on the basis of which they doubtless write their report. As the representative of France has said, I am sure that a great many of these documents - though I would be surprised if all of them - are kept by the Secretariat. I am sure that we could arrange for our Secretary, Mr. Abebe, to make such documents available to any member of this Council who wishes to look at them.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It seems to me that we have solved that problem now. If you allow me, I should like to turn to the next place in the report where there are questions from the Soviet Union. Paragraph 30 states that:

"the United States had failed to fulfil its original commitment to finance the project to upgrade the telecommunications system....The Federated States had sought Japanese assistance but that action had not been approved of by the United States."

We do not quite understand what the problem is here. Why did such a situation come about?

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): Paragraph 30 describes the situation as it was presented to us a year ago. What we had been told was that the United States had intended to establish a satellite telecommunications system, but what we were told during the meeting was that a private telephone system was to be developed. That is all we know about the situation. If the United States delegation could perhaps provide some more information, that might satisfy the Soviet representative.

The PRESIDENT: I seem to remember that the question of the telecommunication system was mentioned in one of the statements of the United States team this morning. I call on Mrs. McCoy to enlarge upon this point.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): Already the COMSAT stations are very much on line - that is their satellite communications system. The one in Ponape is already on line and working; the one on Truk went on line about a month ago; and there will also be one in each of the other States, Yap and Kosrae, within the Federated States of Micronesia. This gives them access to any place in the world on a fine telephone system. The other systems that tie into that are being worked on as funds become available. The Federated States of Micronesia has their own communication corporation which is in charge of this and working with the United States. That is one of the problems that is being addressed.

The PRESIDENT: Would it be correct to say that there has, therefore, been a delay in implementing this project but that now we have reached a situation in which a large amount of the project has been completed and the remainder is in hand?

Mrs. McCOY (Special Adviser): I think that would be a fairly accurate statement. At this moment, you can certainly call from Ponape to any place in the world on a regular communication basis, which is a far cry from what used to be, but as for people being able to do so from their own homes, at this moment, that has not been completely finished. I would say that it is well under way.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In paragraph 158, I wanted to point out an apparently technical error. Mention is made of 14 March 1983. I think it should be July 1982. Or was the Mission also in the Territory in March?

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): It goes without saying that the Soviet representative is quite right. We were in Palau on 14 July, because I remember that day very well. The Soviet delegation is perfectly correct: it was 14 July 1982. That, after all, is my national day, so I could not forget it. It is perfectly true; it is a printing error.

The PRESIDENT: I regret that printing errors do sometimes creep in to what is otherwise an extraordinarily well-printed document. That is one amendment which we might make in our own copies.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I wanted to point out a certain contradiction in the Report. I do not quite know how to approach this matter. I think we will be talking about this when we give our general assessments of the report. However, on a preliminary basis, I wanted to point out that paragraph 360 of the report is inconsistent with what is stated in paragraphs 346 to 351. Paragraph 360 discusses the positive situation and the infrastructure, improvements in the infrastructure in urban regions. It says that the Mission noticed improved airports, roads and construction projects in almost all the major centres of the Territory. At the same time, if we look at paragraph 346, it is perfectly clear that we have a totally different picture. My reason for saying this is that, when the report is prepared for the Security Council, the contradiction between the paragraphs will have to be taken into account. Since the drafting group has already been set up, I wished to point this out at the outset, for paragraphs 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351 and 352 all state the opposite. It concerns me that this contradiction may have a negative effect on the report which is being prepared.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

I have another comment - on paragraph 320 - which is a very important paragraph: it says that the Mission noted the high level of political awareness and education of the Territory's inhabitants and that it seemed to the Mission that they were well-informed and aware of all the various options offered to them under the Charter of the United Nations, whereas paragraphs 336 to 344 say the opposite. In a rather expanded form, they state that, while those options may be known to exist in general, as far as their applicability to the situation which actually exists in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is concerned, those options were not sufficiently developed, or rather, that political education had not been developed sufficiently for these purposes. Thus, it seems to me that the drafting group will have to pay attention to such contradictions between paragraphs.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

The Soviet delegation has more questions, a whole series of questions. Unfortunately, I see that we have already gone beyond the time allotted for the morning meeting, so I think that we could conclude here. At a convenient time, maybe at the next meeting or whenever it is convenient for the Council, we could complete this.

The PRESIDENT: It is actually past one o'clock now, so I would suggest that we should adjourn and call upon the representative of France when we reassemble so that he can answer the two questions put to him on the apparent inconsistencies in the report.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I know all of us have commitments today. I still think it is very easy to answer the question asked by the Soviet representative.

As regards paragraph 320 and what he calls a contradiction, we noted a high level of political awareness and education in respect of the problem of both independence and internal autonomy. The inhabitants seemed well aware of these problems. The paragraphs which follow 320 express the regret that, at the beginning, an overall political education programme for the Trust Territory should have been undertaken by the Administering Authority. Finally it was undertaken by each of the individual Governments. Ms. Harden and myself believe that it might have been useful to continue with this programme which had been started at the end of the 1970s but this did not happen and we took note of it.

Now, there was another apparent contradiction between paragraphs 346 and 347 and what is stated in paragraph 360. It is true that the investments made so far have been quite outstanding. However, they have not reduced the structural deficits of the economy. The problems of the infrastructural development of the outlying islands still exist. In each capital of the Government concerned, we told them that it is a question of developing not only the capital city but also the outlying islands. All of this came under the programme which we call the first-level Capital Improvement Programme (CIP). We regretted that the second-level investment programme had not been started, but it will be done through the Compact of Free Association. Of course, in paragraph 360, we simply state that the main

(Mr. Poudade, France)

source of investment remains United States appropriations and grants. As a result, when all these programmes - the end of the first-level investment programme and the second-level investment programme under the Compact - are carried out and when the local Governments are no longer confining their activities to developing their urban centres but are also taking into account the outlying islands, this will, of course, have a beneficial effect and not only a beneficial but also a significant effect on the development of the Territory.

I do not see any ambiguity or contradiction involved. If the delegation of the Soviet Union would like to tell us about these contradictions, then the members of the drafting group will be very happy to have it join us. It could then speak about all the contradictions which it thinks it has found in the report. I hope I have answered at least in part the questions and objections of the Soviet delegation.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.