



Trusteeship Council

Distr.
GENERAL

T/PV.1657
31 May 1988

ENGLISH

Fifty-fifth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIXTEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 27 May 1988, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. GAUSSOT (France)

- Report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council: report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1266) (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 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 11.05 a.m.

REPORT OF THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL; REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/L.1266) (continued)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Council will continue its consideration of the report of the Drafting Committee which was introduced yesterday by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the Drafting Committee. The annex to that document contains the draft conclusions and recommendations of the Council to be included in its report on the session to the Security Council. Does any member of the Council wish to comment on this draft?

Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do have one question. This is the first time that I have participated in the Council, but in other bodies of the United Nations where I have been present I thought drafts such as this were introduced by the co-sponsors. Is there such a practice here or do the co-sponsors feel that they have already said everything in their draft and have nothing to add?

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In response to the question posed by the representative of the Soviet Union, perhaps I could say that the report was in fact introduced yesterday by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the co-sponsors, in other words, on behalf of the members of the Drafting Committee consisting of France and the United Kingdom.

Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Yes, indeed, I do recall that this was done by the representative of the United Kingdom. Of course it was an extremely short introduction and I had thought that we might go into the report in more detail. However, if brevity is the soul of wit, then certainly we can take it that the draft was indeed introduced yesterday.

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

I should like to make a number of comments on behalf of my delegation on this draft.

First of all, since document T/L.1266 indicates that the Drafting Committee was made up of France and the United Kingdom, it is clear that the draft conclusions and recommendations were prepared by very experienced representatives. Nevertheless, the first thing that leaps to one's notice here is the fact that the draft does not even mention the course of the Trusteeship Council's discussion, in which different views were expressed; in other words, the draft contains no reflection of the different views expressed. As I said, our first impression was that the draft is extremely one-sided. This is my first point.

My second point, and I shall go into detail later, is that although reference is made here to Article 76 of the Charter, I feel that the draft does not duly take into consideration the relevant provisions of the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement.

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

Having made these rather general comments, I should like to add the following: our delegation has some understandable concern over these draft conclusions and recommendations. It seems to us that they do not reflect the actual situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and environs.

Moverover, the sponsors essentially ignore the rather detailed discussion and consideration of matters relating to Micronesia in the Trusteeship Council at this session. The draft takes no account of the views expressed by our delegation, the statements made by petitioners, and the material submitted to the Council, which is available to the Council.

One could draw the following conclusion, from the draft conclusions and recommendations, namely, that they are intended to lead the Trusteeship Council to exceed its powers, as set forth in the Charter and the mandate of the Trusteeship Council. Naturally, we can in no way agree to such an approach.

Let me go into the details of this: Paragraph 1 of the draft conclusions and recommendations recalls resolution 2183 (LIII) of 28 May 1986. In other words, it recalls a resolution - and we said this very clearly - which is improper, because it is a violation of the powers which belong exclusively to the Security Council. In other words, this is a resolution which circumvents the Security Council. Only the Security Council, and no other body, is empowered to give consideration to questions relating to the status of the strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the fate of the Trusteeship Agreement. In the draft conclusions and recommendations, unfortunately, the authors have moved along exactly the same path, namely, in violation of the Charter, for example, in their draft recommendation by the Council that the process of approval of the Compact of Free Association for Palau be completed at the earliest possible date.

As is well known - and as we emphasized - the Compact was imposed by the Administering Authority and is basically designed virtually to annex that part of

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

the Trust Territory. Hence, to recommend to the administering Power - and this is what has been done by the authors of these draft conclusions and recommendations - to approve the Compact as soon as possible, virtually means approving those actions in respect of Palau which, in fact, deprive the people of their right to genuine self-determination and independence.

If we are to take it that this proposed recommendation is directed towards the population of Palau, then this would mean, speaking frankly, direct pressure on that country by the Trusteeship Council in the interests of the administering Power. It would mean adding to the pressure brought to bear on Palau by the administering Power, which has carried out 10 referendums one after the other simply in order to get the Palauan people's approval of what the administering Power is doing. The pressure of the Trusteeship Council itself.

This would mean undermining and violating the basic purposes and principles of the trusteeship system, the Charter, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and other important decisions of the United Nations in the area of decolonization.

Lastly, this draft represents another attempt to use the two-vote majority to obtain the Council's approval for a recommendation that goes beyond the Council's competence. Naturally, we not only do not agree with this approach but object to it.

Moving now to paragraph 2 of the draft conclusions and recommendations, it is clear that like paragraph 1, it is designed to camouflage the anti-Charter activities of the administering Power in respect of the Trust Territory. An attempt is made here virtually to approve the provisions of the Compact and Covenant imposed on the population of Micronesia, to approve the situation in which the people of Micronesia and themselves, and to reduce the responsibility of the

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

administering Power for the state of the Trust Territory's economic, social and educational development.

Finally, in paragraph 3 of the draft conclusions and recommendations, basically the Trusteeship Council is being asked to hand over the people of Micronesia and its interests entirely to the administering Power. The authors here once again are pursuing a policy of approving what is being imposed on the people of Micronesia, namely, the Compact and Covenant, and they state that any difficulties over their interpretation should be resolved bilaterally in accordance with the procedures laid down in the Compact and Covenant. Thus, once again, the Micronesians are being left to manage on a one-to-one basis with the administering Power which employs its usual methods and levers to attain its own goals.

As the Council will recall, even the representatives of the local authorities of the Northern Mariana Islands came to the United Nations just a few days ago seeking assistance because, as they emphasized, on this bilateral basis - that is, on a one-to-one basis between the people and the administering Power - they were simply not able to stand up to the administering Power and its actions against the interests of the population of the Trust Territory.

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

Now, I should just like to offer a few words with regard to paragraph 4 of the report. Paragraph 4 suggests that the Council should note with satisfaction the assurances given by the Administering Authority that it will continue to fulfil its responsibilities under the Charter and under the Trusteeship Agreement. For anyone not well informed, anyone who was not at the meetings of the Council, I think that this paragraph would sound very positive and to be welcomed. However, for anybody who attended the meetings of the Trusteeship Council and is familiar with the material available to us here, it is quite easy to see that against the background of the position that was actually taken by the Administering Authority at this session of the Trusteeship Council, such a statement is simply an attempt to mislead both the Trusteeship Council and public opinion.

A similar statement was included last year in the report of the Trusteeship council. But is this really a reflection of reality? One could hardly say that it is, because these assurances given by the administering Power were not implemented. There were no actions taken to give effect to those assurances. The actions that were actually taken by the Administering Authority were such that the Trusteeship Council at this session did not even receive from the Administering Authority any information as to how it was fulfilling its responsibilities in respect of the entire Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Our delegation has frequently drawn attention to this fact.

The Administering Authority brought information only on the situation in Palau. It provided information for only one part of the Trust Territory, and the information that it did provide indicated that the Administering Authority was being guided not by the interests of the people there, not by its responsibilities under the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement, but exclusively by its own interests and aspirations in that western part of the Pacific Ocean.

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

The observations and comments that we have made lead us to the conclusion that the draft conclusions and recommendations prepared by the delegations of France and the United Kingdom can hardly be regarded as a contribution to the work of the Trusteeship Council. They can hardly be regarded as serving the interests of the people of Micronesia. The draft report contains no realistic assessment of the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Territory as it existed and continues to exist on the basis of the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement. That Territory includes the Marianas, the Carolines and the Marshall territories.

Let me come back to this idea again. The conclusions and recommendations do not reflect the true situation; they do not give an accurate assessment of the anti-Charter activities of the Administering Authority, which has split the Trust Territory into separate entities, and forced on the people of Micronesia an imposed agreement, which is contrary to the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement and the Declaration on decolonization. They do not reflect the actual situation factually or legally.

If the authors of the draft conclusions and recommendations were really inspired by the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, the Trusteeship Agreement and the decolonization Declaration, and the interests of the people of Micronesia, then the conclusions and recommendations would necessarily have indicated that under Article 83 of the Charter of the United Nations, any change in the status of the Trust Territory could be approved only by the Security Council. It should have been emphasized that before the Security Council had taken any such decision, the Administering Authority must report to the United Nations; that the United Nations continued and continues to bear full responsibility for the Trust Territory until the people of the Territory attain real self-determination and

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

independence; and that the people of Micronesia may come to the United Nations for the defence of its interests.

Let me emphasize once again that the draft conclusions and recommendations contained in document T/L.1266, since they do not reflect the actual situation in the Territory, nor the course of the discussion, nor the relevant provisions of the Charter or the Trusteeship Agreement, and since they exceed the competence of the Trusteeship Council, are basically designed to justify the annexationist aspirations of the Administering Authority vis-à-vis this Territory.

Accordingly, the Soviet delegation cannot accept this draft. We object to the provisions in the draft report. We object to their adoption here, and in the event that they are approved as they are, we shall, naturally, vote against this draft report.

Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom): As one of the members of the Drafting Committee, I feel that I would like to respond to one or two of the points which were made by the representative of the Soviet Union. If I could start at the beginning of his statement, he said that the draft report of the Drafting Committee did not reflect the varying views which were expressed in this Council. This may be because the representative of the Soviet Union is new to the work of this Council. But of course the report which we have drafted forms only part of the Council's report to the Security Council. The first part of the report - which of course we are indebted to the Secretariat for preparing - will, I am quite sure, reflect adequately the views expressed by the Soviet Union.

(Mr. Smith, United Kingdom)

To go into the substantive points which he made in his statement: he alleged that the draft conclusions and recommendations do not reflect the actual situation in the Territory. As I said in my brief statement introducing the report, we the Drafting Committee believe that the conclusions and recommendations we have drafted reflect fully the level of self-government, the level of responsibility for their own affairs, which the people of Micronesia have elected to assume. What the Soviet Union is seeking to do by the position it adopts in the Council is to deny to the people of Micronesia the exercise of that right of self-government.

That brings me to another allegation which the Soviet representative made. He alleged that we were ignoring the principles of the Charter in preparing a draft report of this nature. Again, that is not true. If we look, for example, at Article 76 (b) of the United Nations Charter we see that one of the basic objectives of the Trusteeship system is to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories and their progressive development towards self-government or independence. The people of Micronesia have developed towards self-government, self-government in a form which they have chosen, and what we have recognised in this report is the extent to which they have moved along that road.

Mr. PASCAL (France) (interpretation from French): It goes without saying that I associate myself with the comments just made by the representative of the United Kingdom as a co-sponsor of the draft conclusions and recommendations that are being submitted for the Council's approval.

I should like to make a few brief comments in the same spirit, and I shall try to avoid useless polemics, bearing in mind that my country is also dedicated to respect for the provisions of the Charter. I do not think that we can say that the draft conclusions and recommendations submitted are contrary to the fundamental

(Mr. Pascal, France)

international texts. Were that the case, my country would not associate itself with the draft and would not be submitting it for the Council's approval. The Council's 1986 resolution, which has been mentioned on several occasions during our the course of the fifty-fifth session, is a recommendation that takes into account the status of the progress achieved by the population of the Territory and, as set forth in Article 76 (b) of the Charter, of "their progressive development towards self-government or independence".

As we stated earlier in the general discussion, my country hopes that the objective set forth in that resolution can be achieved, in keeping with the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I shall be very brief, in order not to repeat a great deal that has already been said. However, with regard to certain comments made by the representative of the United Kingdom, I should like to note that one of his favourite words - "allegations" - requires an entire phrase to render its meaning into Russian. The representative of the United Kingdom may recall that in our statement we avoided that word, recognizing as we do the right of each representative to express his convictions on an equal footing. What we said did not represent "allegations," but merely our observations of existing facts.

The representative of the United Kingdom also said that our delegation - and I may not have his precise words - in making certain comments regarding the draft conclusions and recommendations, had apparently done so in an attempt to reduce them to a denial of the right of the population of the Territory to self-government. I think our purpose was the opposite. What we have tried to do for many years and what we have tried to do at this session has been dictated precisely by a sincere desire for consistency, in the interests of seeing to it

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

that the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands achieve genuine self-determination and genuine self-government as provided in the United Nations Charter, the Trusteeship Agreements, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and, lastly, in the covenants and international agreements on human rights, in particular and especially in article 1 of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights.

It is precisely because of those desires and aspirations that our delegation cannot support the draft conclusions and recommendations submitted in document T/L.1266.

Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom): I too will be very brief. I apologise if the representative of the Soviet Union has an allergy to the word "allegations." Despite the fact that he said that it requires an entire phrase in Russian, he then proceeded to use the word several times in his own statement - at least in the English interpretation.

The representative of the Soviet Union spoke about the interests of the people of Micronesia, and he appears to place himself in a position to judge what those interests may or may not be. My delegation would not put itself in that position. We are concerned to defend the right of the people of Micronesia to act in accordance with their wishes. We believe they have expressed their wishes through repeated referendums on the subject of self-government, and we defend their right to have those wishes put into practice.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): If there are no further comments, I shall now put to the vote the draft conclusions and recommendations of the Trusteeship Council in document T/L.1266.

The draft conclusions and recommendations were adopted by 3 votes to 1, with no abstentions.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The draft conclusions and recommendations we have just approved will constitute the second part of our report.

The first part of the report will contain an overview of our deliberations, in accordance with customary practice.

I shall now call on members of the Council who wish to make comments.

Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I merely want to say that I did not have an opportunity to familiarize myself in detail with the part we have just been given. It is possible that we may not have comments; but should we have some I would like to reserve the right to have sufficient time to study the report attentively and to make those comments before the report is approved.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The informal paper distributed by the Secretariat at this meeting contains only a general outline of the first part of the Council's report to the Security Council which needs to be completed. As the report as a whole will be considered at the resumed session, members will have an ample opportunity to review this part of the report.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): On behalf of the Administering Authority and the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, my delegation wishes to express appreciation for the useful discussion and comments that have emerged from this fifty-fifth session of the Trusteeship Council. As in years past, the Council has adopted appropriate and constructive conclusions and recommendations to guide the administration of the Trust Territory. My delegation wishes to assure the members of the Council that the Government of the United States will continue to respect the decisions of the Trusteeship Council in carrying out its responsibilities under the Trusteeship Agreement and the United Nations Charter. Our discussions have explored many issues. My delegation would like to highlight some that it considers especially significant.

The Trusteeship Agreement is part of a larger process designed to bring the people of the Trust Territory to self-government through self-determination. That is exactly what is happening there, and it is happening in conformity with the

(Miss Byrne, United States)

Trusteeship Agreement and the United Nations Charter.

Acting in accord with its constitutional authority, the Government of Palau has, on its own initiative, organized plebiscites and a referendum to ascertain the wishes of the people of Palau with regard to their political future. These plebiscites, which were observed by United Nations visiting missions and found to be free and fair, repeatedly have made clear the desire of the large majority of Palauans to enter into a relationship of free association with the United States. The United States will welcome free association with Palau. Free association, however, can come about only after Palau has ratified the Compact of Free Association in accordance with its own constitutional procedures. The United States has not forced and will not force anything on the people of Palau.

As for self-government, the people of Palau have demonstrated time and time again their capacity to govern themselves. Palau has endured the financial difficulties and the headaches of living within a budget. All Governments, even in the richest countries, go through the same process - some with more success than others. The Government of Palau is setting its own priorities and gaining the experience necessary for Palauans to become more proficient in meeting their needs and in achieving their aspirations in a world of limited resources. I would also add, as evidence of their successful self-government, that Palauan authorities did apprehend and punish persons involved in last September's isolated instances of violence. This was Palauan justice, administered by Palauans.

It must also be clear to all that Palau's self-determination and self-government are taking place in an atmosphere of democracy and constitutional order. The refiling of a legal challenge to the constitutional amendment adopted in August 1987 demonstrates the strength of the rule of law in Palau. The Palau Supreme Court ruling that the amendment procedure was defective reflects the independence of the Palauan judiciary. The respect shown for the Court's decision

(Miss Byrne, United States)

by the executive branch of the Government of Palau reaffirms the vitality of Palau's constitutional process.

Finally, contrary to the assertions of a few, the United States has not turned the Trust Territory into a military base. The United States has not done so and has no intention of doing so. Those who condemn the "militarization" of Micronesia seek to mislead the world in order to advance their own agenda in the region.

Self-determination, respect for human rights and recognition of the fact that Governments derive their legitimacy from the consent of the governed are fundamental values held by the United States. They are what have guided us and will continue to guide us in the fulfilment of our responsibilities as trustee.

Mr. President, on behalf of my delegation, I should like to express our appreciation for your skilful guidance of the proceedings of the Council during this session. We look forward to co-operating with you in the coming year.

Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Once again I should like to apologize, as a new representative in the Trusteeship Council, but I do not wish to be too late to express to you, Sir, our delegation's gratitude for those efforts that you have made as President of this session to ensure that the Council carried out its work.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of the Soviet Union. The session is not really completed; it will only be suspended and members will have a further opportunity to speak when the Council resumes the session to finalize its report to the Security Council.

In accordance with the customary procedure, if there are no other comments, we shall suspend the session and, as I have said, for now I should like to thank delegations for the courteous, co-operative, patient and understanding attitude that they have demonstrated throughout our meetings during this part of our session.

(The President)

I should also like to express our warm gratitude, on behalf of delegations and speaking personally, to all the members of the Secretariat present here for their dedication and competence, which have been extremely valuable to us. In addition, I should like to thank the press officers, the conference officers, the verbatim reporters, the precis writers and the documents officers, all of whom very efficiently discharged their work, which is so indispensable for the good conduct of our work. I should like also, of course, to thank the interpreters, who have been able to make the statements made by all sides intelligible to everyone, despite the complex nature of the subjects with which we dealt.

As I state earlier, the resumption of the session will allow us in due time to consider the draft report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council. That meeting will take place as soon as the draft report is prepared. The members of the Council will be informed of the precise date of that meeting in due time.

The fifty-fifth session of the Trusteeship Council is suspended.

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.



Press Release

Department of Public Information • Press Section • New York

Trusteeship Council
Fifty-fifth session
1657th Meeting (AM)

TR/2362
27 May 1988

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL RECOMMENDS EARLY APPROVAL OF COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN PALAU AND UNITED STATES

Adopts Conclusions, Recommendations on Pacific Islands
Trust Territory, Soviet Union Votes against; Council Suspends Session

The Trusteeship Council this morning recommended that the process of approval of the Compact of Free Association for Palau be completed at the earliest possible date.

It took that action by adopting the conclusions and recommendations of its report to the Security Council, by a show-of-hands vote of 3 in favour (France, United Kingdom, United States) to 1 against (Soviet Union). China, the fifth member of the Council, does not take part in its deliberations.

By its action, the Council also noted that the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, in exercise of their right to self-government, had elected to assume full responsibility for administration in the economic, social and educational fields. It considered that any difficulties over the interpretation of the new status agreements should be resolved bilaterally by the parties concerned. In addition, it noted with satisfaction the assurances given by the Administering Authority that it would continue to fulfil its responsibilities under the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement.

Statements on the conclusions and recommendations were made by the representatives of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and France.

The representative of the United States, as the Administering Authority, made a closing statement.

The Council suspended its present session until a date to be announced. It will resume when it has before it the first part of its report to the Security Council, containing an overview of the deliberations of the Council during its current session.

(more)

For information media — not an official record

Report of Trusteeship Council to Security Council

The Trusteeship Council met this morning to consider its report to the Security Council. The draft conclusions and recommendations of the report, prepared by the Drafting Committee, are contained in document T/L.1266.

By those conclusions and recommendations, the Trusteeship Council would note that the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, in exercise of their right to self-government, had elected to assume full responsibility for administration in the economic, social and educational fields.

Also, the Council would consider that any difficulties over the interpretation of the new status agreements should be resolved bilaterally by the parties concerned. Finally, the Council would note with satisfaction the assurances given by the Administering Authority, the United States, that it would continue to fulfil its responsibilities under the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement.

Statements

DMITRIY V. BYKOV (Soviet Union) said the conclusions and recommendations did not even reflect the discussions that had taken place during the Council's session. They were extremely one-sided, nor did they duly take into consideration the relevant provisions of the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement. The draft was intended to make the Trusteeship Council violate its powers and competence as set forth by the Charter. The Soviet Union could in no way agree to such an approach.

The draft conclusions recalled the Council's resolution 2183 of 28 May 1986 and recommended that the process of approval of the Compact of Free Association for Palau be completed at the earliest possible date, he said. That resolution was beyond the competence of the Trusteeship Council because it was only the Security Council that could make recommendations on the status of the Trust Territory and the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement. By recommending approval of the Compact, the Trusteeship Council would be depriving the people of Palau of their true right to self-determination. It would be placing pressure on the people of Palau on behalf of the Administering Authority.

With regard to the paragraphs relating to economic, social and educational advancement, he said the Trusteeship Council was being asked to make the people of Micronesia submit to the policies of the Administering Authority. It was putting pressure on the Micronesians to accept the Compact of Free Association and the Covenant for Commonwealth status.

The last paragraph suggested that the Council should note with satisfaction the assurances given by the Administering Authority that it would continue to fulfil its responsibilities under the Charter and under the Trusteeship Agreement, he said. Such a statement was simply an attempt to

(more)

mislead the Trusteeship Council itself as well as public opinion. It did not reflect any realities. In the past, the assurances coming from the Administering Authority had not been implemented.

The Council had not even received information on the entire Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands from the Administering Authority, he continued. The Administering Authority had provided information only on Palau, and not on the Marianas, the Carolinas or the Marshall Islands, which were also part of the Trust Territory. Moreover, the information that was provided indicated that the Administering Authority was acting, not in the interests of the inhabitants of the Territory or in accordance with the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement, but exclusively to fulfil its own interests and aspirations.

The draft conclusions and recommendations could hardly be regarded as a contribution to the work of the Trusteeship Council, he stated. It could hardly be regarded as serving the interests of the people of Micronesia. It contained no realistic assessment of the situation in the Trust Territory. It did not reflect the "anti-Charter activities" of the Administering Authority. The draft was designed to justify the annexationist policy of the Administering Authority. The Soviet Union accordingly could not accept the draft, and would vote against it.

J. STEPHEN SMITH (United Kingdom), a member of the Drafting Committee, said the Soviet representative had stated that the draft report did not reflect the views of the Council. Perhaps that was because he was new to the Council. Otherwise, he would know that the draft conclusions and recommendations formed only part of the Council's report to the Security Council. The first part of the report, which would be prepared by the Secretariat, would accurately reflect the views expressed by the Soviet Union.

The Soviet representative had alleged that the draft conclusions and recommendations did not accurately reflect the situation in the Trust Territory, he went on. However, the Drafting Committee believed they fully reflected the level of self-government which the people of Micronesia had elected to assume. It appeared that the Soviet representative was attempting to deny to the people of Micronesia the exercise of self-government.

Further, the representative of the Soviet Union had alleged that, in preparing the report, the Drafting Committee had ignored the principles of the Charter, he said. That was not true. Article 76 b of the Charter stated that one of the basic objectives of the Trusteeship System was to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories and their progressive development towards self-government or independence. The people of Micronesia had developed self-government in a form they had chosen, and the draft report recognized the extent to which they had moved along that road.

PATRICK PASCAL (France) said that, as one of the co-sponsors of the draft, he wished to associate himself with the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom. France had always supported the Charter; had the draft

conclusions and recommendations been contrary to the Charter, his country would not have supported them. The draft took into account the state of progress of the Trust Territory and its capacity towards self-administration.

Mr. BYKOV (Soviet Union) said the use of the word "allegations" by the representative of the United Kingdom would require an entire sentence in Russian. In his own statements, he had avoided that word, recognizing the right of each member to express his convictions on an equal basis. In fact, he had not been making allegations at all, but had simply been observing facts which existed in reality.

The representative of the United Kingdom had alleged that the Soviet delegation was attempting to deny the right of the Micronesian people to self-government. However, the opposite was true. What the Soviet delegation had said had been dictated by a sincere desire that the people of the Trust Territory achieve genuine self-government, in accordance with the Charter, the Trusteeship Agreement, the Declaration on decolonization and the International Covenants on Human Rights. Based on that interest, he could not support the draft conclusions and recommendations.

Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom) said he apologized if the Soviet representative had an allergy to the word "allegation", although he had used the word several times. That delegate appeared to be placing himself in a position to judge what the interests of the Micronesian people might or might not be. The United Kingdom would not put itself in that position, but would wish to ensure that Micronesians themselves determined their own wishes. They had, and his delegation defended their right to put that determination into practice.

Action on Draft Conclusions and Recommendations

The Council then adopted the draft conclusions and recommendations by a show-of-hands vote of 3 in favour (France, United Kingdom, United States) to 1 against (Soviet Union).

The President, JEAN-MICHEL GAUSSOT (France), said the first part of the Council's report to the Security Council would contain an overview of the Council's deliberations during this session.

Mr. BYKOV (Soviet Union) said he wished to reserve the right to comment on the entire report when it was available.

The PRESIDENT said the first part of the report was only in draft form at this stage. Consideration of the report would take place at the Council's resumed session.

Closing Statement by Administering Authority

PATRICIA M. BYRNE (United States) said her Government would continue to respect the Council's decisions in carrying out its responsibilities under the Trusteeship Agreement and the United Nations Charter.

(more)

The Trusteeship Agreement was part of a larger process designed to bring the people of the Trust Territory to self-government through self-determination, she went on. That was exactly what was happening. The Government of Palau had, on its own initiative, organized plebiscites and a referendum which had repeatedly made clear the desire of a large majority of Palauans to enter into a relationship of free association with the United States. However, free association, which the United States would welcome, could only come about after Palau had ratified the Compact of Free Association in accordance with its own constitutional procedures. The United States had not and would not force anything on the people of Palau.

As for self-government, the people of Palau had demonstrated time and again their capacity to govern themselves, she said. They had endured the financial difficulties and headaches of living within a budget, which all Governments, even the richest, experienced, to different degrees of success. They were setting their own priorities and gaining the experience necessary to become more proficient in meeting their own needs. As evidence of their success, Palauan authorities had apprehended and punished persons involved in last September's isolated instances of violence. That had been Palauan justice, administered by Palauans.

Palau's self-determination was taking place in an atmosphere of democracy and constitutional order, she continued. The refiling of a legal challenge to the constitutional amendment adopted last August demonstrated the strength of the rule of law in Palau. The Supreme Court ruling that the amendment procedure had been defective reflected the independence of the Palauan judiciary. The respect shown the Court's decision by the executive branch of its Government reaffirmed the vitality of its constitutional process.

Contrary to the assertions of a few, the United States had not turned the Trust Territory into a military base, and had no intention of doing so, she said. Those who condemned the "militarization" of Micronesia sought to mislead the world in order to advance their own agenda in the region.

* *** *