



## Trusteeship Council

Distr.  
GENERAL

T/PV.1667  
30 May 1989

ENGLISH

UN DOCUMENT  
JUN 7 1989

### Fifty-sixth Session

#### VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIXTEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Monday, 22 May 1989, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. BIRCH (United Kingdom)

- Examination of petitions and communications (T/INF/37 and Add.1) (continued)
- Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Palau, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1989 (T/1935) (continued)
- Report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council

This record is subject to correction.

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS (T/INF/37 and Add.1) (continued)

The PRESIDENT: As agreed during our informal consultations on Friday, we shall now continue the examination of written petitions and communications concerning the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

At our meeting on Friday, we considered communications 1 to 11 in document T/INF/37.

Are there any further comments on those communications?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): At the last meeting we said that in order for the Council to have a normal working procedure it should receive observations from the Administering Authority concerning the written petitions that the Council must consider. The representatives of the Administering Authority, however, have refused to follow that procedure. That has caused us great disappointment. In our opinion, the procedure that the representatives of the Administering Authority intend to follow seriously undermines the approach that should be taken in the Trusteeship Council in regard to documents submitted to this United Nations body for consideration.

With regard to the documents now before the Trusteeship Council for consideration, we should like to have some clarification on another point. We note that these documents are addressed to the President of the Trusteeship Council, the Administering Authority and the Security Council. Hence, we should like to know if the members of the Security Council have received the documents, and in what form. That is my first question.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Secondly, how did the President of the Trusteeship Council react to the communications and petitions addressed to him? Were petitioners with concerns about local self-government in the Trust Territory informed that their petitions had been received and about the disposition of their petitions?

With respect to the procedure followed by the President of the Trusteeship Council upon receipt of these communications, did he contact the representative of the Administering Authority when necessary? I do not suggest that this ought to have been done for each and every communication, but only when really necessary. Did the President clarify what action was being taken by the Administering Authority with respect to a given communication or petition?

The PRESIDENT: As I believe those comments were directed to the President, I shall attempt to answer them. With respect first of all to the question of procedure, as I explained last Friday the Administering Authority told the Council that it intended to respond to the petitions in one statement at the end of our consideration, and not to comment on them individually or in groups. I am sure the Administering Authority will have taken note of the Soviet delegation's serious disappointment at that procedure, but it was one on which we agreed last week. It is not within my power to alter the manner in which delegations choose either to ask their questions or to respond to those questions.

The next concern of the Soviet delegation was about what action the President of the Council takes when petitions addressed to the Council arrive at United Nations Headquarters. What form did the documents arrive in? My understanding is that they arrived as letters addressed to the Trusteeship Council, the Secretary of the Council or the President of the Council. Did they go to members of the Security Council? Yes, indeed they did, because under the procedure we adopted last year every permanent member of the Security Council receives a photocopy of

(The President)

the petitions. The non-permanent members of the Security Council, who of course are not members of the Trusteeship Council, do not receive photocopies of each petition, but they receive the summaries of the petitions that are prepared by the Secretariat: in fact, the document we have before us. Should members of the Security Council wish to examine one of those petitions, all they have to do is ask the secretariat of the Trusteeship Council if they can see it, and a photocopy will be sent to them immediately.

What is the reaction of the President of the Trusteeship Council to the information and the petitions? Clearly, in my time and my predecessors' time as President, the President reads those petitions with interest and concern, but the formal consideration of the petitions takes place at meetings of the Council. That is what we are now about to do.

The next question was whether the writers of the petitions were informed that their petitions had arrived and were receiving attention at United Nations Headquarters. I am told by the Council secretariat that everyone who writes a letter to the Trusteeship Council is immediately sent a letter confirming that his communication has been received and will be considered at the next regular session of the Trusteeship Council.

I think the final point related to whether the President has contacted the Administering Authority at any time between the receipt of the petitions and now about their content. I speak for myself as President, but also, I believe, for my predecessors, when I say that there is a good deal of discussion throughout the year, outside the regular sessions of the Council, between the President of the Council and the Administering Authority about petitions that are received and about the sort of issues that are raised in the petitions, particularly when they are

(The President)

complaints or allegations of wrongdoing. That is not a formal activity; I think, though, that it is a normal practice between the President and the Administering Authority, which goes on throughout the year.

I hope that answers the questions and concerns of the Soviet delegation.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With respect to this group of communications, I should like clarification concerning communication 11, which contains a reference to United States House Joint Resolution 597. Could the representative of the Administering Authority tell us the content of that resolution?

Mr. RUSSEL (United States of America): A moment ago, Mr. President, in response to the statement by the representative of the Soviet Union, you very clearly and accurately outlined the practice in previous years of the United States as Administering Authority, and I am grateful for that.

I should like to reiterate what Ambassador Byrne has already made quite explicit: The United States as Administering Authority has given serious and thorough consideration to both the oral and written petitions that were submitted to the Council, and we will make a comprehensive statement with respect to the entire body of petitions at an appropriate juncture in the session. I take note of the specific inquiry of one of the details of one of the petitions, and I will see to it that that is properly addressed at that time.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY: (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): As I understood what the representative of the United States just said, he has repeated again the approach of the Administering Authority to the consideration of written petitions. However, I did not understand that that would be the case with respect to the very specific matter we are dealing with now, namely, United States House Joint Resolution 597 and the actions of the United States in regard to this resolution. I do not know whether there will be a separate answer given to this question in the context of the written petitions; perhaps the representative of the United States did not understand the specific thrust of our question or thought that the answer would be given together with the answer on the substance of the written petitions. I simply want to understand this; I do not want to drag things out but to get clarity in our work here.

The PRESIDENT: Neither I nor other members of the Council would wish our work to be dragged out unnecessarily. My understanding of both the questions by the representative of the Soviet Union and the responses of the representative of the United States is that the delegation of the Administering Authority has now on a

(The President)

number of occasions made clear that it will comment on all the petitions at the end of our consideration of them; in other words, it will give one single considered response to the whole group of communications and petitions at a time when it wishes to do so, which I assume will be when we have reached the end of our consideration of the individual items.

Therefore, I should like now to continue with our work.

May I assume that there are no further comments by members of the Council on the communications contained in document T/INF/37? Since that is the case, I propose that the Council take note of those communications.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now turn to the petitions contained in document T/INF/37. These are petitions that are addressed directly to the Trusteeship Council.

As is our normal practice, I propose to consider these petitions in groups of about 10 petitions at a time. In order that the names of the senders of the petitions appear in the formal record of our proceedings, I shall read out their names: Arne Ostring, Organisational Secretary, Norwegian Section, War Resisters International; Hilary Forrest; Ros Ward; Ms. Sian; S. Chant; Hanne Norup Carlsen, Chairwoman, Danish Section, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; Susan J. Griffiths; Richard Carabine; Else Houmoller-Jorgensen; and Vilhelmo Vanlenho.

Does any member wish to comment on those 10 petitions?

Mr. BEREZOWSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): All the documents we have received which are now before the Trusteeship Council for consideration are such that each one in and of itself is important for the simple reason that it expresses the concern of individuals and organizations with a situation that is developing in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

It seems to us that this concern should be duly reflected in the work of the Council. Indeed, if we look very briefly at what these petitions address, we can see that they speak to very important questions for the people of Micronesia and, of course, to important issues that are before the Council for its consideration.



(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

A clear example is the protest against the pressure the United States is putting on Palau to bring it to give up the nuclear-free aspect of the Constitution and its demand that the United States comply with the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreement.

Another petition requests the Trusteeship Council to ensure freedom of speech for all opponents of the Compact, unbiased and comprehensive political education, equal access to the media for both sides and prevention of a breach of the Trusteeship Agreement.

Finally, a very important principle is involved here: that the Council should honour the nuclear-free Constitution of Palau. All its provisions are extremely important, and it seems to us that they should be reflected in the report the secretariat of the Trusteeship Council is to prepare for the Security Council.

In this connection, at this stage I should like clarification as to how all the petitions and information received by the Trusteeship Council will be reflected in the report.

We have just concluded a so-called examination. I say "so-called" because in practical terms there has been no examination; members have looked at the petitions and communications from the Trust Territory, but so far the Administering Authority has hardly reacted to them, promising to do so at a later stage. It has been decided that the Council will take into account the information given in the communications, but if the report to the Security Council contains just a line to the effect that the information and petitions - there are more than 100 of them all told - have been noted by the Trusteeship Council, that will, we feel, clearly be insufficient.

The report should contain a summary of the information, indicating what sort of documents were considered by the Trusteeship Council, and their content. I understand it would not be a simple job for the secretariat of the Trusteeship

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Council to prepare such a summary, but we think the interests of the Micronesian people are the paramount consideration here and the Trusteeship Council should base its approach precisely on the importance of those interests.

The PRESIDENT: In view of the comment made at the end of the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union, perhaps I should point out that the report the Trusteeship Council makes to the Security Council has in the past always contained a section covering the question of petitions and, indeed, summarizing what is in them. All of the petitions themselves are listed at the back of that document and the details are therefore available to the members of the Security Council. I am quite sure that our practice in previous years will be repeated this year when the drafting committee prepares its report on our proceedings for the Security Council.

If there are no further comments on these petitions, I propose that the Council decide to draw the attention of the petitioners to the observations made by the representatives of the Administering Authority and other members of the Council at the current session, as appropriate.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the petitions numbered 11 to 20, from Mrs. J. Combe; Mr. Gordon Maycock; Mrs. Else Pickvance, a member of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom of Birmingham and a member of the United Nations Association of Birmingham; Bent Sunesen; Joanna Ripley; Julia Wilkins; Lise Lauritzen; Oddlang S. Andersen and 11 others; Madeline P. Haigh, Secretary of the Sutton Coldfield Peace Group, in England; and Enid Johnson, Secretary of the Sutton Coldfield United Nations Association of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Does any member wish to comment on those petitions?

Mr. GAUSSOT (France) (interpretation from French): I do not want to comment on every one of these petitions; I wish to make a general comment on the group as a whole. What characterizes most of these petitions is an extremely negative description of the situation in Palau, which is presented in an very bad light. One of the petitioners speaks of "the farcical situation"; another speaks of "terrorism" being used against Palauan citizens.

This is an extremely negative vision which, I must say, does not correspond with what I was able to see when I went to Palau.

Another thing these petitions have in common is that a great many of them - seven out of ten, I think - come from the United Kingdom and the others from Scandinavian countries. These are, then, persons very far from Palau who have perhaps not had an opportunity to go there, whose information may not be very precise and, it seems to us, may be more the product of propaganda than of objectivity. I do not want in the least to doubt the sincerity of the petitioners, but that is my feeling, having gone to Palau.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not want to enter into a polemic with the representative of France, but I am disturbed that he described this group of petitions as consisting not so much of information as of expressions of positions on the situation in the Trust Territory by people who he says are far away from the Territory and do not know the true situation there. He says that the petitions are more the result of propaganda than of real concern.

What worries us about the statement by the representative of France is the fact that when we received the petitions he was the President of the Council and he is now its Vice-President.

Of course, every delegation is free to express its position and feelings on any document coming before the Council, but I cannot see why there is this negativism - why the tone of the petitions is characterized as being negative. I do not see any reason for doubting the petitions, because everything to which they refer has indeed happened. If we go back to the very first group of petitions, information received from Palau, from people who are not so far away, we see that everything in the petitions we are now considering - which have been described as manifestations of a propagandistic approach - is reflected in the information received direct from the Territory: information to the effect that the United States, as the Administering Authority, has not carried out its obligations under the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement; information showing that the situation in the Territory is not as tranquil and good as it was during the visit of the Council's Visiting Mission to the Territory, which concluded that everything was fine and normal there.

The first group of petitions also speak of pressure put on the inhabitants - and not only the inhabitants, but even members of the Palauan Administration. They

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

speaking of the local authorities' not being able to cope with the problems facing them. We read of cases of violence and corruption and the scandal, which we understand is still going on, relating to the electrical power plant.

Therefore, it seems to us that every document presented to the Council for consideration deserves serious attention. It would not be wrong for the Council to evaluate the information it receives with concern - even several times more than it deserves. It would thus be demonstrating a responsible approach and - this is the most important thing - interest in the concerns of the Micronesians. Such an approach would do honour to the Council.

The PRESIDENT: I agree that there does perhaps appear to be a conflict of information about the situation in the Trust Territory. That was the reason we sent a Visiting Mission to Palau, despite the opposition of the Soviet delegation, to discover what the true situation was. I believe that the comments just made by the representative of France, particularly as he was the Chairman of that Visiting Mission, will have been of value in enlightening both members of the Council and the petitioners whose petitions we were just considering.

Mr. GAUSSOT (France) (interpretation from French): At the beginning of his statement I believe that the representative of the Soviet Union questioned the manner in which I had performed my duties as President of the Trusteeship Council. I would like to state that, as President, I did fulfil my obligations in regard to all the petitions - as, indeed, all my predecessors had done - and I did so in the manner in which the President has just described.

The fact that I have performed the duties of President and that now I am performing the duties of Vice-President does not mean that I cannot now speak as the representative of my country. Speaking in that capacity, I must say that I was surprised at the content of some of the petitions. I did not challenge the accuracy of the information they contained, but I did point out that, by and large, they give a picture of the situation in Palau that does not seem to reflect the facts as I saw them myself a few weeks ago when I was present there.

The PRESIDENT: If there are no further comments, I propose that the Council decide to draw the attention of the petitioners to the observations made by the representatives of the Administering Authority and other members of the Council at the current session, as appropriate.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the petitions numbered 21 to 30 in document T/INF/37. This group includes petitions from Michael Schaumburg of the

(The President)

Denmark-Palau Friendship Association; from Vera Wellington; from Phyllis and Allan Redgrave; from Birgit Dybdal and 136 others of the Nordic Forum in Oslo; from Sian Rowell and Neil Weightman, Secretaries of the Peckham Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament; from Mr. Santos Olikong, Speaker of the Palau National Congress; from Na Hinewirangi of the Maori Women's Centre, Hamilton, New Zealand; from Kirsten Dahl and 33 others; from Else Houmoller-Jorgensen, and from Leif Kragh.

Does any member wish to comment on the petitions listed 21 to 30?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I believe that the most serious questions raised by this group of petitions and that require further consideration, are in petitions Nos. 24 and 26. Petition No. 24, which is signed by 136 persons, is from the Nordic Forum, and it raises some very important and very basic questions about the need to provide the people of Palau with options in addition to, and other than, the Compact of Free Association and to ensure that debate and discussion take place on them without any coercion. We can understand that Palau, given its total economic dependence, might find it difficult to discuss any option other than the Compact, but the question remains very important and one to which the Trusteeship Council should give very serious attention.

Petition No. 26 is a communication signed by Mr. Santos Olikong, Speaker of the House of Delegates of the Palau National Congress. It contains information about the situation in Palau and the conditions under which preparatory work took place for the elections there. It mentions armed persons camped outside the Palau National Congress and numerous acts of violence. The communication ends with a request for assistance in the maintenance of law and order and goes so far as to request that security personnel be provided. That is very important information, and it should have been verified immediately upon its receipt by the Trusteeship Council.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

I think that the President of the Trusteeship Council should have contacted the Administering Authority, and some urgent steps should have been taken before the present session of the Council to settle these issues.

The PRESIDENT: As there are no further comments on petitions 21 to 30, I propose that the Council decide to draw the attention of the petitioners to the observations made by the representatives of the Administering Authority and other members of the Council at the current session, as appropriate.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: We turn now to petitions 31 to 40. These petitions are from Inger Bjorn Andersen; Lise Lauritzen; Bent Sunesen; Inge Petersen; Annika Hjelm, International Secretary, Central Organization of Swedish Workers; Erik Alfsen and 17 others; Niels Hass, General Secretary, No to Nuclear Weapons, Denmark; the Chairman, Gladsaxe Teachers Association, Denmark; Lisbeth Andersen and Tine Forchhammer; and David Stodolsky.

As there are no comments on this group of petitions, I propose that the Council decide to draw the attention of the petitioners to the observations made by the representatives of the Administering Authority and other members of the Council at the current session, as appropriate.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: We turn now to petitions 41 to 50. These petitions are from Lise Dybvad, Women for Peace; Jimmy Mosland and 19 others; Johnny Baltzersen, Co-Chairman, Liaison Committee for Peace and Security, Copenhagen, Denmark; Else Hammerich and 39 others, Members of the European Parliament; Hanne Nørup Carlsen, Chairwoman, Danish Section, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; Socorro I. Diokno, Secretary General, Free Legal Assistance Group, the Philippines; Inger Bjorn Andersen and 120 others; Peter D. Jones, Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific Co-ordinating Committee, Sydney, Australia;



(The President)

Claire Hanna; and the Reverend Andrew Williams, Secretary, Board of Church and Community, The Uniting Church in Australia, Northern Synod.

Does any member wish to comment on those petitions?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I would draw the Council's attention to the fact that practically the same ideas are expressed in this group of petitions - and, indeed, in the preceding group, on which we did not comment - as in petition 24, on which we spoke in some detail.

In this request, I would merely note the concern of this group of petitioners at the same problems as those which the people of Palau are experiencing. I would also draw attention to the broad geographical and professional spectrum covered by the present group of petitions: the European Parliament, Asian countries, churches, jurists, teachers, and so forth. My point is that these petitions represent a very broad spectrum, both as regards the countries from which they come and as regards the professions of the persons concerned at the situation in the Trust Territory.

The PRESIDENT: As there are no further comments, I propose that the Council decide to draw the attention of the petitioners to the observations made by the representatives of the Administering Authority and other members of the Council at the current session, as appropriate.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: We turn now to petitions 51 to 60. These petitions are from John Ball; Bungorn Rittipagdee, Co-ordinator, The Co-ordinating Committee for Primary Health Care of Thai Non-Governmental Organizations; Peter Ferrett; Johanne Hall; G. A. Forster, Assistant Secretary, Baptist Ploughshares, Baptist Social Justice Group, Victoria, Australia; Jennifer Mitchell; Mary Johnston; Anne Naffon; Pat Finegan; and Eric Ralph.

(The President)

If there are no comments, I propose that the Council decide to draw the attention of the petitioners to the observations by the representatives of the Administering Authority and other members of the Council at the current session, as appropriate.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: We turn now to petitions 61 to 70 in document T/INF/37. These are from Fleur Finnie, President of the Victorian Branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; Augustinus Rumansara, Director of the Yayasan Pengembangan Masyarakat Desa Irian Jaya; K. Lawson; Patricia Madegan, Chaplain of the Catholic Students Society at Macquarie University, and six others; Sue Starkey, Secretary of Brunswick Valley People for Peace; Else Agnete Krabbe; Mari Holmboe Ruge, President of the Norwegian Section of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; David Blomires; Arnold Rowlands, Convenor of Burnie Christians for Peace; and Gilbert Long.

If there are no comments, I propose that the Council decide to draw the attention of the petitioners to the observations by the representatives of the Administering Authority and other members of the Council at the current session, as appropriate.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: We turn now to petitions 71 to 75 in document T/INF/37. These are from Geo Horn; Libby Radcliffe; Doreen Campbell, Secretary of the Parish Council of the Uniting Church in Australia (Altona Parish); Bjørg Berg; and Gunluld Andersen.

Does any member wish to comment on those petitions?

Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom): I should like to comment on the entire group of petitions we have been studying: petitions 1 to 75 in document T/INF/37. It seems to my delegation that most of these petitions are written from a particular and relatively narrow anti-nuclear point of view, a point of view which may well be shared by a small number of individuals in Palau but which does not seem to be the view of the majority as expressed to us, for example, on numerous occasions by elected Palauan representatives. The petitions are written mainly from countries far removed from Palau by people who in the majority, I feel sure, have never visited Palau.

The representative of the Soviet Union suggested that they came from a wide geographical spread. It is true they come from certain communities spread around the world, but I think it is more striking, in fact, how narrow the geographical spread is: only a very few countries are represented.

Many of the petitions seem to contain factual inaccuracies and many seem to reflect a level of misunderstanding as to the real situation in Palau.

I submit that we are dealing in many cases with the products of a letter-writing campaign. While no doubt sincere in its motives, such a campaign is somewhat removed from the aspirations of the majority of the people in Palau.

We in this Council, of course, have a responsibility to take into account the views expressed in these petitions, but we have a more important responsibility to take account of the views expressed by the Palauans themselves, for example to the recent Visiting Mission to Palau. As a member of that Mission, I should like to say it was clear to me that the majority of Palauans were concerned primarily about how they might progress to free association with the United States on an appropriate economic basis. The nuclear issue did occasionally arise, but not as a matter of major concern.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I had not intended to comment on the present group of petitions, but the comments just made by the representative of the United Kingdom could not fail to affect me as a member of the Trusteeship Council. Nowadays, such comments are worrying to say the least, particularly as regards the anti-nuclear atmosphere in the world at large and in Palau in particular. The opinion was expressed that this anti-nuclear mood does not exist in Palau, or that it is minimal, being espoused by only a small number of people. Is the conclusion to be drawn that it is not important?

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Yet the anti-nuclear provisions of the Constitution of Palau were adopted by the people of the islands; more than 90 per cent voted. Despite the 10 referendums that were held throughout these years in an attempt to force the people of Palau to renounce or in some way circumvent these provisions of the Constitution, that attempt has not been successful. I think that speaks for itself.

As for the geographical spread of the anti-nuclear approach, it encompasses the entire world; and to reduce the matter to "a letter-writing campaign" would be wrong. I am saying this because the Trusteeship Council in its report to the Security Council and in considering the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands should base itself on a politically correct evaluation, one that is modern and forward-looking too. I am saying it also because the idea just expressed by the representative of the United Kingdom is prevalent in the report of the Visiting Mission dispatched to Palau by the Trusteeship Council.

Mr. President, in your comments a few minutes ago you drew attention to the fact that that Mission was dispatched over the objections of the Soviet delegation - and that is correct. It is true that the Soviet delegation did object to the dispatch of the Mission, since it believed that such a mission should be sent to the entire Territory and not just part of it, and that its task should have been to clarify the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and not to check on what progress was being made in introducing into the Territory the so-called Compact of Free Association. The Trusteeship Council should not in its work impose on the people of the Trust Territory what in this case is the opinion of the Administering Authority. In any case, the Council should be impartial in its assessment of the situation.

Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom): I should like, if I may, to add one or two comments to what has just been said by the representative of the Soviet Union.

(Mr. Smith, United Kingdom)

He spoke first about the Constitution of Palau. It is of course true that the Constitution of Palau, which contains certain provisions on nuclear substances, was adopted by a majority of the Palauan people. But that Constitution also contains provisions for those provisions concerning nuclear substances to be, as it were, overridden in the event that a 75-per-cent vote of the people is obtained - and it is that result the Palauans are currently trying to obtain.

As regards allowing the results of votes to speak for themselves, I think that the fact that in repeated votes a large majority of the people of Palau have voted in favour of the Compact of Free Association speaks for itself. The fact that several Palauan administrations have tried, and continue to try, to obtain the requisite majority to allow the Compact to come into force also speaks for itself.

As regards the geographical spread of the petitions, what I had intended to point out was that these petitions only come from a few countries, albeit spread fairly widely across the world. I had not pointed out, but I shall do so now, that there are as usual no petitions from the Soviet Union. Perhaps the people of the Soviet Union are not concerned about this problem; from the number of petitions received, we must conclude that they are not.

Finally, as regards what I said about this being a letter-writing campaign, I would refer the representative of the Soviet Union, by way of just one example, to petitions 36 to 45, all of which come from different addresses in Denmark and all of which are identical. If that is not a letter-writing campaign, then I do not know what is.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I would answer the representative of the United Kingdom as follows.

The fact that the petitions all address the same problems shows that those problems really exist. What are we doing here, trying in some way to undermine the credibility of the petitioners who are concerned at the situation in the Trust Territory?

As for the statement that the results of the vote speak for themselves, I am happy the representative of the United Kingdom agrees with me that they do speak for themselves, and I hope that now and in the future all illegal actions will be rejected by the people of Palau.

To continue, as for the interest or lack of interest of the Soviet people in what is happening in Palau, and the fact that the list of petitions received by the Council includes none from the Soviet Union, I should like once again to note for the information of the Council and the representative of the United Kingdom that the people of the Soviet Union believe in and trust their representatives on the Trusteeship Council and know that the interests of the people of Micronesia will be appropriately defended by the Soviet representatives here. There is therefore no need for our people to prepare petitions: they know that there are no real differences between their feelings and the political and practical courses being pursued by their representatives at the United Nations.

Mr. GAUSSOT (France) (interpretation from French): I do not want to prolong the discussion of this question needlessly, but before we move on I should like to return to a comment made earlier by the representative of the Soviet Union, who once again seemed to want to cast doubt on the way in which I carried out my obligations as President.

(Mr. Gaussot, France)

It seemed to me he was reproaching me for not having sufficiently drawn the attention of the Administering Authority to certain petitions. In this regard I should like to make it clear that the Administering Authority was acquainted with all the petitions and that throughout the period of my mandate as President I adhered to the practices of my predecessors. I think I carried out my obligations properly with respect to the petitions as defined in the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council.

If the representative of the Soviet Union feels that that is not the case, I should like to know to what precise provision of the rules of procedure he is referring.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not want to take up too much of the Council's time, but the remarks of the representative of France oblige me to respond to the questions he has asked.

When I said that the President of the Trusteeship Council should react to information and petitions he receives, and when I drew attention to certain petitions that in principle required quick attention and action as appropriate, I was not referring to a specific rule of procedure or to the rules of procedure as a whole, and I was not trying to accuse the President of the Trusteeship Council of anything. I was just expressing my opinion, and in doing so my point of departure was not only the rules of procedure but the Charter and the mandate the Trusteeship Council received from the Security Council with respect to Micronesia. Finally, what I said was also based on common sense.

When I said that in some cases it was quite apparent what was needed was swift action by the President of the Trusteeship Council, I did not think the President of the Council would take it as an accusation of some kind against him. I thought that, in response to what I had said, I would hear a statement to the effect that upon receiving the petitions to which I was referring the President of the Council



(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

would immediately get in touch with the representatives of the Administering Authority and ask exactly what was happening and that, having received the appropriate information, he would then, if necessary, report to the Trusteeship Council in that regard and take some sort of action. It is necessary to inform the members of the Council what is happening and what measures are being taken. There might sometimes even be a need for an emergency meeting of the Trusteeship Council. Incidentally the Administering Authority has said that if there were a need to take certain measures there would have to be an emergency meeting of the Trusteeship Council.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

I was not even thinking any such thing. I was simply saying how the Soviet delegation believes it would be correct for us to react to the petitions and communications received from the Trust Territory. We believe the Council has an obligation to follow up petitions and communications on what is happening in the Territory and consider them. That is what I wanted to say in my statement.

Mr. GAUSSOT (France) (interpretation from French): I am grateful to the representative of the Soviet Union for making it clear that he did not wish directly to question the way in which I carried out my mandate as President. He said that we might have had to convene a special session of the Council to consider some petitions. I must say frankly that none of the petitions we received seemed to me to justify the convening of such a session. If the Soviet representative, who received all the petitions and is knowledgeable about them, had felt it appropriate to call for such a session, he could have suggested that when he felt it appropriate.

The PRESIDENT: I hope that we can now bring to a close this interesting discussion on the role of the President of the Council. But perhaps I might add that no one would be more delighted than I if one day the Soviet Union would care to stand for the presidency. I am sure that it would be given unanimous support and be elected.

If there are no further comments on that group of petitions, numbered 71 to 75, I propose that the Council decide to draw the attention of the petitioners to the observations made by the representatives of the Administering Authority and other members of the Council at the current session, as appropriate.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now examine the written communications and petitions contained in document T/INF/37/Add.1. That is a separate document, issued on 12 May, which all members of the Council should have before them.

We shall begin by considering the communications numbered 1 to 3, received by the Trusteeship Council from Joshua Koshiba, Senate President of the Second Olbiil Era Kelulau of Palau; Russell Masayos and 24 others from Portland, Oregon; and Karen Topakian, Disarmament Campaign Co-ordinator, Greenpeace Action.

Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom): I should like to comment briefly on communication No. 3, which includes an annex described as a Palau Action Alert, in which, among other things, recipients of the annex are encouraged to address petitions and letters to the President of the Trusteeship Council and other addressees. That underlines the point I was making earlier.

The PRESIDENT: If there are no further comments, I propose that the Council take note of communications 1 to 3 contained in document T/INF/37/Add.1.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the petitions numbered 1 to 10, from Fylle Madsen; Elici Maria Checchin Bueno, Legal Adviser, Instituto Brasileiro De Defesa Do Consumidor; B. Budgaerd; Elisabeth Espersen; Siele Reede; Hanne Nielsen, Aldrig Mere Krig, Danish section of War Resisters International; Inger Bak; Dagny Riis; Anne Marie Andersen; and Karen Gylling.

If there are no comments, I propose that the Council decide to draw the attention of the petitioners to the observations made by the representatives of the Administering Authority and other members of the Council at the current session, as appropriate.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the petitions numbered 11 to 20, from Valborg Fogh Pedersen, member, Women for Peace, Denmark; Reg Tydell; Karla Lorensen; Bodil Honoré; Ulla Jorgensen; Mie Jakobsen; AWD Australia; Di Douglas; Siv Eilertsen; and Blandine Dufom.

If there are no comments, I propose that the Council decide to draw the attention of the petitioners to the observations made by the representatives of the Administering Authority and other members of the Council at the current session, as appropriate.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now turn to petitions 21 to 30 listed in document T/INF/37/Add.1, from Ulrich Delin; from Birgitta Lorenzi, Vice-President, and Karin Bratt, Board member, Swedish Section, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; from Swami Siddalinga, Vice-President of the International Union of Students, Prague, Czechoslovakia; from Anne Jones; from Bitten Forchhammer, on behalf of Aldrig Mere Krig (War Resisters International); from 21 people from Scotland; from Barbara Folkard and 13 others, Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, Auckland, New Zealand; from Maria Burns; from Kaye Stearman, and from Phil Esmonde, Executive Director, South Pacific Peoples Foundation of Canada, and 22 other people from different organizations.

If no member wishes to make comments on those petitions, I propose that the Council decide to draw the attention of the petitioners to the observations made by the representatives of the Administering Authority and other members of the Council at the current session, as appropriate.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: We will now turn to petitions 31 to 40 listed in document T/INF/37/Add.1. These are petitions from Else Hammerich and 51 other members of the European Parliament; from Birgit Dybdal; from the Reverend Eric and Margaret Robinson; from Dorothy S. Lyddon; from Robert and Elizabeth Tennant; from Ellen Ingerslev; from J.R. Hugh Dempster; from Anne Pask; from Inger Bjorn Andersen and from Marion Cole, Braintree International Year of Peace Group.

If there are no comments, I propose that the Council decide to draw the attention of the petitioners to the observations made by the representatives of the Administering Authority and other members of the Council at the current session, as appropriate.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: We now turn to petitions 41 to 43 listed in document T/INF/37/Add.1, from Salvador Ingereklii, Staff Director, Commission on Future Palau/United States Relations; from Frances A. Connelly, and from Maja Messner, Arbeitskreis Pazifik, Tübingen, Federal Republic of Germany.

Does any member wish to comment on those petitions?

Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom): I would just like to comment on petition number 41, which I see has also been circulated as T/PET.10/735 and which contains the copy of a resolution adopted by members of the Commission on Future Palau/United States Relations. One of the operative paragraphs of that resolution contains a request to the Trusteeship Council to secure certain commitments from the United States as Administering Authority regarding the continuation of funding to Palau. I hope that the Administering Authority will comment on that point when it makes its statement on petitions.

As regards the other petitions we have been considering in document T/INF/37/Add.1, that is, Nos. 1 to 43, my delegation has no further comments, but would like to make clear that our comments on the previous group of petitions apply equally to this group. It was suggested in earlier discussion that we might be attempting to bring into question the credibility of petitioners. That is not the case. We have no doubts about their sincerity. What we are seeking to ensure through our comments is that the Council keep in perspective the relative importance of information or views expressed by petitioners, by Palauan representatives and, indeed, by members of the Council who have had the opportunity to visit Palau.

The PRESIDENT: If there are no further comments, I propose that the Council decide to draw the attention of the petitioners to the observations made by the representatives of the Administering Authority and other members of the Council at the current session, as appropriate.

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO PALAU, TRUST TERRITORY OF THE  
PACIFIC ISLANDS, 1989 (T/1935) (continued)

The PRESIDENT: As members will recall, the report of the Visiting  
Mission was introduced by its Chairman at the Council's 1664th meeting last week.

Does any delegation wish to make comments on the report of the Visiting  
Mission?

Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom): I just wanted to point out an editorial  
error that has crept into the English version of the report. The first sentence of  
paragraph 78 of the English version states that the Palau High School is the only  
one in Palau. That, of course, is not correct, and I suggest that the sentence  
should be amended to read "the only public high school in Palau".

The PRESIDENT: I am sure that the Secretariat will take care of that  
amendment.

Mr. RUSSEL (United States of America): The Administering Authority welcomes the report of the Visiting Mission. We have found the report to be a fair and accurate assessment of conditions in the Trust Territory.

We thank the members of the Visiting Mission for their hard work and appreciate the dedication with which they approached their task. We congratulate them on their objectivity, the thoroughness with which they approached their mandate and the skill evidenced in the drafting of the report.

We recommend the report of the Visiting Mission, coupled with the annual report of the Administering Authority, to those who would wish to know the status of affairs in Palau at this particular time.

The PRESIDENT: Does any other member of the Council wish to speak at this stage on the report of the Visiting Mission?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): My delegation would like to comment on the report of the Visiting Mission at the next meeting, since it is now rather late.

The PRESIDENT: I shall be very happy to accommodate that request.

Since it appears that no other member of the Council wishes to speak on this item at this stage, we shall continue our consideration of it at the next meeting.

#### REPORT OF THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL

The PRESIDENT: I should like to suggest that the Council appoint a drafting committee to prepare draft recommendations and conclusions to be included in the forthcoming report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council. Following informal consultations, I understand that the Council has decided to appoint France and the United Kingdom to the Drafting Committee.

If I hear no comments or objections, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.