



UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

T/PV.1597
11 June 1985

JUN 19 1985

ENGLISH

Fifty-second Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND NINETY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 7 June 1985, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. MAXEY (United Kingdom)

- Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 September 1984: Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued)
- Attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territories (Trusteeship Council resolution 1369 (XVII) and General Assembly resolution 1413 (XIV)) and the situation in Trust Territories with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 39/91) (continued)
- Co-operation with the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI)) (continued)
- Arrangements for the dispatch of a periodic visiting mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1985 (continued)
- Report of the Secretary-General on credentials
- Suspension of the session

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.

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 10.50 a.m.

EXAMINATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 1984: TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (T/1871; T/L.1244, T/L.1245) (continued)

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now consider the report of the Drafting Committee on conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (T/L.1245), which was introduced by the representative of France at our meeting on Wednesday.

I understand that the representative of France wishes to introduce some minor corrections to the draft report.

Mr. ROCHER (France) (interpretation from French): There are some corrections to be made in both the English and the French versions.

I shall begin with page 4 of the English version. In the next-to-last line of paragraph 1, the adverb "entirely" should be removed since it is superfluous and has been used incorrectly.

In the first line of paragraph 2 of the English version, the word "careful" should be removed; the Council simply "takes note".

In the first sentence of paragraph 3 of the French version, the word "considérable" should be replaced by the words "très large", so that the text reads, "comporte un très large degré d'autonomie".

In the second sentence of paragraph 4, the word "croit" should be removed so that the sentence reads, "Le Conseil comprend que cela est dû à l'existence d'incompatibilités ...".

In paragraph 10 of the French version there is a repetition; the last sentence should be removed.

In paragraph 11 a word is wrongly spelled; it should be "conformément".

In paragraph 23 of the French version the word "exploration" should be replaced by the word "exportation".

In paragraph 32, the word "monde" should be replaced by the word "nombre", so that the last phrase reads, "l'inconvénient du nombre des archipels et des distances qui les séparent".

In paragraph 34, the last word should be "Babeldthuap", not "Babeldthrap".

In the first line of paragraph 55 of the English version, the word "incidents" should be replaced by the word "incidences".

In paragraph 55 of the French version, the words "Le Conseil s'inquiète des cas de lèpre apparus" should be changed to read "Le Conseil s'inquiète de la présence de la lèpre apparue dans le Territoire sous tutelle".

(Mr. Rocher, France)

In the second sentence of paragraph 56, the phrase "Il y a longtemps que le Conseil est d'avis" should be replaced by the words "Le Conseil considère depuis longtemps".

In the next-to-last sentence of paragraph 57, the words "des médecins" in the phrase "l'université d'Hawaii pour établir à Pohnpei un programme de formation des médecins d'une durée de dix ans" should be amended to read "de médecins du travail".

In the last sentence of paragraph 67, the phrase "Le Conseil espère que les choses progresseront très bientôt" should read "Le Conseil attend des progrès rapides dans ce domaine".

In the next-to-last line of paragraph 70, the word "intéressées" should be replaced by the word "concernées".

In the first line of paragraph 80 of the English text, a word is misspelled; it should be "enrolment".

In the second line of paragraph 82 of the French version, the words "a maintenant" should be replaced by the words "offre désormais".

The PRESIDENT: I should like to propose that, following the Council's practice in preceding years, we consider the draft conclusions and recommendations contained in the annex to document T/L.1245 section by section. First I would ask if there are any general comments on the report as a whole.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation would now like to give its general assessment of all the sections of the report submitted by the Drafting Committee so as to make our task simpler and easier.

The Soviet delegation has carefully studied the report produced by the representatives of the United Kingdom and France containing the so-called conclusions and recommendations on the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The Soviet delegation would be delinquent in its duties if it did not give an appropriate assessment of these recommendations and conclusions.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

I should like first to make a few general comments on the draft conclusions and recommendations of the Drafting Committee. Even less than on previous occasions do they even begin to give a genuine picture of the situation in the Trust Territory, and there is no genuine assessment or analysis of what the Administrative Authority has done to Micronesians up to 1985. In the Soviet delegation's view, the draft conclusions and recommendations are not objective, although their authors try to convince the reader uninformed of the Council's proceedings that they are based on the general debate that took place in the Council.

In any case, the document does not meet the high standards laid down for the Trusteeship Council by the United Nations Charter in fulfilling its obligations, and unfortunately cannot be considered to live up to what the Security Council can and does, expect from the Trusteeship Council. These draft conclusions and recommendations have but one purpose - to cover up and justify the policy of the Administering Authority, the United States, which is aimed at the annexation of Micronesia.

I turn to section A of the draft conclusions and recommendations, dealing with the political advancement of the Territory. The first paragraph reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of Micronesia to self-determination, including the right to independence. However, it also claims that so-called free association is an "option entirely compatible with the Trusteeship Agreement, provided that the population concerned has freely accepted it".

To the inexperienced reader who has no objective information about the real situation in Micronesia, those lines seem to be all well and good. There is mention of the inalienable rights of the Micronesians and a reference to the "options" open to them in determining their future political status; and "free association" is presented as one such which can be resorted to only with the voluntary consent of the population of the Territory. All that would seem logical, but here we come to the the most important point, at which the Trusteeship Council should objectively and in an unbiased manner present a conclusion regarding the real situation of Micronesia at present: whether the Territory's people are given a genuine opportunity by the Administering Authority to exercise their inalienable right to independence and self-determination, whether the neo-colonialist invention of "free association" is compatible with the Trusteeship Agreement, how voluntary was the agreement of the people of the Territory to so-called free association,

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

and, above all, whether the Micronesians had any real choice. The report contains no such objective analysis or conclusions, since that would not meet the political interests of the Administering Authority, the United States, which is supported by the other two Western Powers on the Trusteeship Council.

An objective analysis of the situation in Micronesia shows that its people were not given an opportunity to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. The so-called free association is simply a cover-up for de facto annexation of the Territory in conditions of the complete economic and political dependence of the Micronesian people on the Administering Authority. In such conditions there can be no question of a genuine voluntary choice by the Micronesian people of their political status. A genuine opportunity to choose the status of independence - I emphasize "genuine opportunity" - was never given to the people of Micronesia. On the contrary, the Administering Authority has done everything possible to impose on the Trust Territory as the only realistic alternative an unequal agreement of "free association" and "co-operation".

These conclusions so important for the people of Micronesia are not, of course, presented in the report of the Drafting Committee. Instead, in the political section of the report an attempt is made to convince the reader that the so-called Compact of Free Association is not such a bad substitute for independence, and that even military agreements that hand Micronesia over to the Pentagon are compatible with the self-governing status of the Territory.

Such claims are made with an appearance of innocence, and above all without the authors bearing any personal responsibility, because the approval of the Trusteeship Council is backed by quotations from the statements of the Administering Authority. The Soviet delegation considers that the Council has no right to reach such conclusions, not only because they are not accurate and are not in the interest of the Micronesians, but also for legal reasons, since the so-called Compact in its final form was not submitted by the United States to the Trusteeship Council for consideration.

Instead of calling the Administering Authority to account for the policy of subjugation, blackmail and diktat to which the people of Micronesia are subjected, instead of helping the people of Micronesia, in particular the people of Palau in their struggle against the militarization of that island in the interests of the United States, the Council is being asked no more and no less than to note a certain incompatibility of the Constitution of Palau with the Compact of Free Association and to reaffirm that the "Governments of the United States and Palau"

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

must find a mutually acceptable solution so that the Compact can come into effect. Thus, the Council is being asked to put pressure on the people of Palau in the interests of the militaristic ambitions of the Administering Authority. Such conclusions are totally unacceptable to the Soviet delegation.

The attempt to convince the Micronesians that free association in some way, in spite of the military agreement, preserves their right to change their status is nothing but an attempt to deceive them. If, now, when legally Micronesia is under the aegis of the United Nations as a Trust Territory, its people are in practice denied the opportunity to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, obviously if the Territory were split up and the different parts individually bound by unequal agreements to the United States, the Micronesians would find it even more difficult to free themselves from the chains of neo-colonialism. It is no accident that even now the report completely glosses over the question of the Mariana Islands, as if that were none of the Council's business, as if those islands were no longer even part of the United Nations Trust Territory.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

In the draft conclusions and recommendations in this part of the document there is no mention of the political situation in the Trust Territory as a whole. Everything is interpreted from the point of view of breaking up Micronesia into individual entities, and the artificial breaking up of Micronesia is treated as a fait accompli. The Soviet delegation cannot agree with that approach either.

The clear orientation of the report towards reaffirming the political and military interests of the United States at the expense of the interests of the people of Micronesia shows that it is proposed that the Council simply assume the role of rubber stamping agreements which favour the United States, agreements that violate the Trusteeship Agreement, the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. That is unacceptable to the Soviet delegation.

The draft conclusions and recommendations contained in section B of the Drafting Committee's document, regarding the economic advancement of the Territory cannot but give rise to serious concern. In this section, as in the previous one, the same policy of emphasizing individual details is adopted. Although they may be important details, they do not answer the basic questions concerning the real situation in the Territory. Does the section answer the direct question "What was Micronesia's economic situation at the approach of 1985?" That question is not answered in the draft conclusions submitted by the Drafting Committee, although everyone here knows quite well that the economy and agriculture of Micronesia are in a deplorable condition, and that Micronesia is economically, and therefore socially, completely dependent on the Administering Authority and is virtually living in poverty, deprived of its own means of existence, supported by the handouts of a rich but by no means generous trustee. That has been said at every session of the Council, including the present session, not only by the Soviet delegation but by Micronesians who were part of the United States delegation and by petitioners. It is also said openly in the United States Congress. Only in the draft conclusions presented to the Council does there continue to be a demure silence on the matter.

The draft conclusions also fail to say who is responsible for the existing situation and why it was created; they do not expose the truth and show the whole world that the Administering Authority adopted in Micronesia a policy such that for almost four decades there has been almost no economic progress in the Territory, and that, on the contrary, everything has been done to bind the economy of

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

Micronesia to the Administering Authority and subordinate it to the United States, all for the benefit of the selfish political and military strategic goals of the Administering Authority.

Instead of saying that the United States as Administering Authority has not fulfilled its obligations under the Trusteeship Agreement and the Declaration on decolonization, instead of demanding that the Administering Authority correct the situation, the Drafting Committee proposes a quite different and strange approach. At the prompting of the United States, it is said that the responsibility for economic development rests on the shoulders of the local authorities of Micronesia. Moreover, there is no logic in the fact that what is being considered is the report of the Administering Authority on the results of its rule in Micronesia, while recommendations are made to the Micronesians.

The draft conclusions and recommendations on economic and social advancement present statistics on the millions of dollars allocated by the United States under the so-called Compact. There is a list of programmes which the Administering Authority has promised to implement if the Micronesians are obedient. However, the Administering Authority is not asked what it has done so far and how it has developed the Territory between the beginning of the Trusteeship and the present. No explanation is required for the deplorable state to which the United States has brought Micronesia. Thus, in this section of the report, too, the Council is invited to cover up the disreputable policy and violations of the Charter by the United States in the Territory.

The Soviet delegation finds that totally unacceptable. The Soviet delegation also has several serious comments on, and objections to, section C. First, as with other sections of the document, the draft conclusions and recommendations on questions of social advancement and environmental issues do not show the real situation in the Territory and are not in keeping with what the Council should say about this. The document gives practically no answer to the question of Micronesia's level of social development. For many years we have heard in the Council about the intolerable social conditions of the Micronesians, with shortcomings in health care, abject housing conditions, shortages of water and electricity and a lack of schools. We have also heard about unemployment and the delapidated infrastructure. Does the report come to any conclusions about who is responsible for that situation? Does it analyse the existing situation? Does it

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

make any really serious recommendations to correct it? Unfortunately it does not. The authors of the draft conclusions and recommendations are like people who cannot see the wood for the trees, or do not want to. The Council is presented with draft conclusions and recommendations concerning individual, particular questions, which, however, do not help solve the whole range of social problems of the Territory.

Moreover, this part of the document, like all the other parts, reads rather like a commendation of the Administering Authority, since almost every paragraph starts with some such words as "The Council notes with satisfaction that". In some cases the report even praises the Administering Authority - for example, in passages where we read of teams from the United States Defense Department resident in the Territory of Micronesia, whose activities, in the view of the authors, can promote a desire for self-reliance on the part of the local population. This seems to reflect the ideas of the military authorities rather than concern for the welfare of the people of Micronesia.

It is very instructive and revealing that questions that especially concern the Micronesians and that the Council should put with all seriousness to the Administering Authority, demanding a solution, ended up under the subheading "Other matters".

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

These are precisely the questions that have a direct relationship to social conditions and environmental problems, but above all to political questions that concern the maintenance of international peace and security. The United States use of the Trust Territory as a firing range for nuclear missiles has led to suffering among the Micronesian people. The consequences of such use are now being felt, and it is difficult to predict what the future will bring in that regard. The people of the atolls that have been subjected to nuclear testing are even now suffering from deprivations and hardship.

The Administering Authority's responsibility is no secret to anyone, yet the draft conclusions and recommendations contain no appropriate assessment of such activities by the United States. The draft merely notes the Council is "extremely pleased" at hearing of the out-of-court settlement in respect of the clean-up of Bikini. The draft then notes the sum the United States has pledged to allocate to "compensation" for the Micronesians. Here too, the Council is being asked to ignore the fact that this is no more than a promise, again conditional upon the entry into force of the so-called Compact. There is no mention in the draft conclusions and recommendations of what the Council should say, namely, that the United States has not so far fulfilled its obligations under the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement with regard to protecting the land, health and welfare of the population; nor is there a demand that that responsibility be fulfilled without conditions, particularly conditions designed to bring about the political subjugation of the people of Micronesia. It is unworthy of this Council, from either the moral or the ethical point of view, to state that the financial settlement promised by the United States is "generous", when it is clear to all that no amount of money can compensate for the damage to the health of generations of people.

The draft conclusions and recommendations appear to regard the question of United States military activities in Micronesia as a minor problem in the context of the maintenance of international peace and security under the United Nations Charter, and to consider such activities only from the point of view of land use. An attempt is made to mislead the Micronesians and the rest of the world by mentioning that the United States purportedly has no immediate need for the Micronesian territory it has leased for military purposes and that, therefore, there is no need to be concerned about this. The Council is supposedly satisfied by the fact that the United States has no immediate need to use the Micronesians' land. This reminds us of words used to soothe a child. The Drafting Committee's

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

report does not mention the fact that the United States is attempting to get Palau to go along with its requirement that it permit the transit, deployment and storage of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction on its territory. Nor are any conclusions drawn with regard to the other aspects of the military agreements imposed by Washington on the Micronesians that turn Micronesia into a military and nuclear hostage of the United States. Yet those are the conclusions the Trusteeship Council should be drawing. In view of the foregoing, this section of the draft conclusions and recommendations also is unacceptable to the Soviet delegation.

The last section of the Drafting Committee's report concerns educational advancement and cultural affairs. To our great regret, this section, too, fails to reflect the true situation in Micronesia and we cannot support it.

Once again the Soviet delegation would like to emphasize the fact that the draft conclusions and recommendations, as a whole, are not in keeping with the assessment that should, in our view, be reflected in the Trusteeship Council's report or with the recommendations that should be submitted to the Security Council and the Administering Authority. The Soviet delegation cannot participate in this operation designed to cover up and justify violations of the Charter by the United States in the Trust Territory. We shall therefore vote against the report submitted by the Drafting Committee and the draft conclusions and recommendations contained therein.

Mr. RAPIN (France) (interpretation from French): Since I did not personally participate in the work of the Drafting Committee and since, unfortunately, I was unable to attend the last meeting of the Council, it is quite in order for me to extend my thanks and appreciation to my colleagues who worked on the preparation of the draft conclusions and recommendations on which we are now to take a decision. On behalf of the French delegation, I should like to say that positive and important work has been accomplished and that, in my delegation's view, it has been in keeping with the responsibilities incumbent upon the Trusteeship Council.

In his statement today, as in his statement last year, the representative of the Soviet Union made an overall assessment of the work of the Drafting Committee. His assessment seems to me inappropriate and, indeed, distorted. The representative of the Soviet Union went so far as to say that he considered the draft conclusions and recommendations submitted to have been drawn up

(Mr. Rapin, France)

"to cover up and justify the policy of the Administering Authority, the United States, which is aimed at the annexation of Micronesia". (supra)

That position is not acceptable to the French delegation, because, first, it calls into question the probity of the members of the Drafting Committee and challenges the quality of their work; and, secondly, it also calls into question the political choices that were freely made by the peoples of the Trust Territory - indeed, expressed under the supervision of the Trusteeship Council.

Indeed, listening to the representative of the Soviet Union condemn a policy of annexation through the status of free association, it might have been concluded that it was the responsibility of the members of the Trusteeship Council to determine the political future of the islands in the Trust Territory. However, it is quite clear that the peoples themselves must choose their own future within the context of Article 76 of the Charter. That is in fact what took place - need I recall - in the plebiscites and referendums held over the past few years. These were all carried out in accordance with Article 76 of the Charter - that is, by offering political choices fully in keeping with self-determination, since they ranged from independence to free association, and were monitored by Observer Missions of the Council, which submitted upon their return reports which were later discussed in the Council.

It does not seem to me appropriate, therefore, to reproach the draft presented to us today with not containing any analysis of the conditions in which the choice of the status of free association was made, since that analysis was made earlier in the reports of the Missions sent to observe the plebiscites.

(Mr. Rapin, France)

There is little need to recall that under the terms of the commitments made the inhabitants of the Trust Territory will have every opportunity to change their minds; they have not definitely abandoned the status of independence; they could later, if at any time they felt it necessary or desirable to do so, decide on independence.

I want to emphasize that it is not for the members of the Trusteeship Council, as they carry out their responsibilities here, to act for the peoples of the Trust Territory or to take decisions on their behalf. Our task is to monitor and to advise, and my delegation feels that this task is reflected quite responsibly in the draft recommendations and conclusions that have been submitted to us.

It does not seem to me that the members of the Drafting Committee have sided with anybody - I need not be more explicit - but rather, in doing their work, have acted as guardians of the lawful position of the Council and of the free expression of the will of the peoples of the Territory.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I cannot speak with the same degree of approbation as my colleague from France, since, in the case of the United Kingdom, the British member of the Drafting Committee, indeed the United Kingdom representative on the Trusteeship Council, has undergone a certain metamorphosis for the purpose of this meeting. But the Council will not be surprised to hear that there is a certain coincidence of view between my position here in the Council and that expressed by the representative of the United Kingdom on the Drafting Committee.

It must be marvellous to criticize in this Council from a position of total non-responsibility. I am sorry that the Soviet Union did not like our draft conclusions and recommendations. The Soviet representatives, of course, joined in the consensus - at least, they supported the President's decision - to set up a drafting group composed of the United Kingdom and France. The fact that they acquiesced in that decision I took to be a sign of confidence in our ability to draft conclusions that reflected the views of the majority of the Council. Had they wished to challenge the composition of the Drafting Committee and propose themselves, or add themselves to the two delegations, of France and the United Kingdom, I am sure we should have been only too happy to welcome them. This was an onerous task, which we did within a certain time constraint, believing that we had to finish by a certain time in order that the Council could expedite its work and conclude its session. I think we worked diligently. I think we have reflected here in very large measure what was discussed in this Council.

(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

I think that it would have been preferable for our Soviet colleagues, instead of sniping from the sidelines, to have joined us in an attempt to produce a comprehensive piece of work that could meet the needs of all the delegations in the Council.

The central thesis of the statement we heard from the representative of the Soviet Union was that the report of the Drafting Committee does not reflect the true situation in Micronesia. But the point is that we did not make up what is in this report; it reflects, by and large, what was said in this Council by freely elected representatives of the Micronesian people. Were we simply to ignore what they said and dismiss their views as being of absolutely no consequence? Of course not; we should have been failing in our duty had we done so.

The representative of the Soviet Union referred at one stage to the fact that we "applauded" something, and that we were "extremely pleased" that something had happened. We did indeed applaud, and what we applauded was the work of the civic action teams in Micronesia. What we were extremely pleased about was the amicable out-of-court settlement in respect of the Bikini Islanders. It seems to me that these are major events which deserve our support, which deserve our encouragement.

There is very little I can add to what my colleague from France has already said in this Chamber. I would say that what we have here in these draft conclusions and recommendations represents a balanced analysis of discussion in this Council and an accurate reflection of what Micronesian delegations have told us: in short, an analysis based on the facts of the real situation in Micronesia, not on an ideological blueprint of very little relevance to the Territory.

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): On behalf of the Administering Authority, I should like to express our thanks and appreciation for the work of the Drafting Committee. We take note of its recommendations. We note particularly that a number of these call for action on the part of the Administering Authority, and I should like to pledge to the Drafting Committee and to the Council that we will treat with the utmost seriousness and as matters of great importance the recommendations that have been made. There are criticisms at some points in the report; we do not always agree with those criticisms but we shall take them very much into account. We have, after all, as I have said previously in this Council, never claimed that we were perfect, divinely guided or, indeed, divinely appointed.

(Mr. Feldman, United States)

With regard to some of the statements we have heard from the representative of the Soviet Union, it seems necessary to point out once again that, although he takes the point of view that self-determination must lead to independence, that is not what is stated in resolutions, such as General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV), or the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

We have said these things before. Apparently, they have little effect, and since they have little effect I see no particular reason to say them again.

I am very glad that other representatives have already responded to the charge made by the Soviet Union that somehow the free and fair plebiscites which took place in the Micronesian Territories, as certified by the Trusteeship Council and by the United Nations, were a sham and that the Trusteeship Council and, indeed, the United Nations participated in some grand confidence trick. That charge has been most eloquently rebutted.

(Mr. Feldman, United States)

In conclusion I should like to say a few words about the history of the region.

I think all of us recall that in the course of the Second World War there was intensive fighting throughout the Pacific region, that the islands which were separately administered by Japan and which now form the Trust Territory were seized by United States forces. So were a number of other islands seized from Japan during the Second World War. Okinawa was taken by the United States marines after exceedingly bloody battles, as were Iwo Jima and certain others. As the phrase goes, much blood and treasure was expended to take those islands as part of the allied war effort in the Second World War.

They have long since been returned to Japan. The non-Japanese islands of Micronesia were turned over to the United Nations as a Trust Territory; the United States is the Administering Authority. We hope that soon the process of decolonization will be completed for them through action by this Council.

But there are certain islands that were seized from Japan, islands heavily fortified with military bases, where many of the original inhabitants, who were Japanese, were forced off the land into exile or into refugee status; those islands were not taken during the Second World War by the United States; those were islands taken during the last four days of the war by the Soviet Union. Their names are Habomai, Shikotan, Etorofu and Kunashiri. They are heavily fortified; there are military bases.

It would be interesting if the Soviet Union were willing to allow plebiscites to be conducted on those islands.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The representatives of France and the United Kingdom have said that the draft conclusions and recommendations represent and reflect the whole discussion of the question of Micronesia in the Trusteeship Council. The Soviet delegation can of course not agree with that.

The report reflects only one side of the debate held in the Trusteeship Council: the side that coincides with the position of the Administering Authority and two other Western members, France and the United Kingdom. The statement made by the Soviet delegation and the viewpoint of the Soviet delegation - and of many of the petitioners who spoke here - were not reflected in the draft conclusions and recommendations. What is more, incidentally, if we were to reflect the entire

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

debate held in the Trusteeship Council on the conclusions and recommendations, the Soviet delegation would be willing to submit its own view as a part of the report of the Drafting Committee together with the draft conclusions and recommendations.

The representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the United States did not like the comments made by the Soviet delegation. They did not like the viewpoint we expressed on the report. I must say that we are not questioning the professionalism of the work done by those who wrote the report. We are not questioning the professionalism of the report, but rather the political position which that professionalism serves, the political position taken by the authors of the report, which is designed to support the annexionist actions of the Administering Authority in respect of Micronesia.

The representative of the United States also did not like our comments, and, in the absence of a sufficiently weighty argument, he started talking about questions absolutely unrelated to the issue under discussion here - namely, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

I must say that our delegation also does not like the viewpoint of the representatives of the United Kingdom, France and the United States of America, and we would just say the same thing to them. We have heard that our comments were not acceptable to the other members of the Trusteeship Council, and their viewpoint - that of the French representative, the British representative and the representative of the Administering Authority - is also not acceptable to the Soviet delegation.

The PRESIDENT: I suggested earlier that the Council proceed to consider the four sections of the draft report separately, but the Soviet representative has now commented in some detail on the individual sections and other members of the Council have expressed general support for the draft. If there is no objection I think we might now proceed to take action on all four sections of the draft report. There being no objection, we shall proceed accordingly. I shall therefore now put sections A, B, C and D in the annex to document T/L.1245, as revised, to the vote.

Sections A, B, C and D were adopted by 3 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now turn to paragraph 4 of the report of the Drafting Committee contained in document T/L.1245, which reads:

"The Committee recommends that the Trusteeship Council adopt the conclusions and recommendations set out in the annex and include them at the end of the report."

There being no comments, I shall now put that recommendation to the vote.

Paragraph 4 of document T/L.1245 was adopted by 3 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1245) as revised, as a whole.

The report of the Drafting Committee, as a whole, was adopted by 3 votes to 1.

ATTAINMENT OF SELF-GOVERNMENT OR INDEPENDENCE BY THE TRUST TERRITORIES (TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL RESOLUTION 1369 (XVII) AND GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 1413 (XIV)) AND THE SITUATION IN TRUST TERRITORIES WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS 1514 (XV) AND 39/91) (continued)

CO-OPERATION WITH THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 1654 (XVI)) (continued)

The PRESIDENT: As agreed at our meeting on 30 May, we are now required to take a decision on these agenda items, which we shall take up together.

On 28 May members of the Council took part in a discussion of the items and set out the respective positions of their Governments. At this juncture, therefore, the Council will proceed to take a decision on them together.

May I suggest that the Council decide to draw the attention of the Security Council to the conclusions and recommendations adopted by the Trusteeship Council at the Council's fifty-second session concerning the attainment - in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter, and in particular Article 83 - of self-government or independence by the Trust Territory, and to the statements made by the members of the Trusteeship Council on this question.

If I hear no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE DISPATCH OF A PERIODIC VISITING MISSION TO THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS, 1985 (continued)

The PRESIDENT: As agreed at our meeting on Wednesday, the Council will now take a decision on draft resolution T/L.1246, in connection with a dispatch of a periodic visiting mission to Micronesia this year.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation will not object to the adoption of this draft resolution on the understanding that the visiting mission to which it refers will be a periodic visiting mission similar to the ones that in the past were sent to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in order to assess the situation in the Trust Territory and also that the visiting mission will not have any additional competences going beyond the scope of the usual mandate of such periodic visiting missions.

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): I think that the draft resolution itself spells out the mandate of the visiting mission.

Is it not the case that what is provided for in operative paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 would be the mandate of the visiting mission and that nothing beyond that could be within the mandate of the visiting mission? That is how I understand it.

The PRESIDENT: In the circumstances, I assume that the draft resolution in document T/L.1246 is adopted by the Council without objection.

The draft resolution was adopted.

The PRESIDENT: I would suggest that approval by the Council of the persons to be appointed by their Governments as members of the visiting mission be automatically granted as soon as their names are received.

It was so decided.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON CREDENTIALS (T/1875)

The PRESIDENT: Does any member wish to comment on the report?

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): I merely wish to point out an error of gender. In the list of our advisers, there appears the name of "Mr. Jamison SELBY". I should like to point out that it should read "Ms. Jamison SELBY".

The PRESIDENT: If there are no further comments, I shall consider that the Council decides to take note of the report of the Secretary-General on credentials.

It was so decided.

SUSPENSION OF THE SESSION

The PRESIDENT: In conformity with the procedure adopted at preceding sessions of the Council, we shall now recess, and meet in resumed session to consider the draft report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council. That will take place at a date to be agreed upon after informal consultations, which I shall conduct with all members of the Council.

I declare the fifty-second session of the Trusteeship Council suspended.

The meeting rose at 12 noon.