



UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

T/PV.1589
28 May 1985

ENGLISH

JUN 4 1985

Fiftieth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 22 May 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)

Organization of work

This record is subject to correction.

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

85-60462 1606V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 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) (continued)

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I should like to start with some questions on the economic situation in the Territory. Mr. DeBrum is with us today, so perhaps I may profit from his presence by putting some questions to him.

In his opening statement Mr. DeBrum said that a statutory body, the Kwajalein Atoll Development Authority, had been established earlier this year to plan and implement the development of Kwajalein Atoll. That body will presumably be looking at improvements in conditions on Ebeye, to which a number of petitioners have referred in somewhat uncharitable terms. Is it correct that in fact the Authority will take over full responsibility for improvements there?

May we have some indication of the extent to which projects aimed at improving the conditions have already been undertaken? In the Administering Authority's report there are photographs of, I think, a fresh-water treatment plant there and details of the renovation of the existing hospital in the Marshalls. Perhaps Mr. DeBrum could comment.

Mr. DeBRUM (Special Adviser): As I reported in my opening statement, and as I shall also mention in my closing statement addressing the question of economic development, and specifically the Kwajalein Atoll Development Authority (KADA), there are leaders from Kwajalein on the Authority. In fact, the Board of KADA is made up prominently of members from Ebeye - political leaders as well as traditional leaders - and there are also representatives of the Government of the Marshall Islands. They are all working together and with the local council, led by Mayor Jacklick.

It is true that we have renovated Ebeye Hospital, as well as carrying out paving of several streets, rehabilitation of the sewerage treatment plant, and improvements of the fresh-water system and the salt-water flushing system, as Mayor Jacklick testified before the United States Congress. He verified that some of the improvements had already taken place, and that they would continue, with the participation of members of the KADA, for the benefit of the Ebeye improvement project and the Ebeye people.

We shall go into this in much more detail in our closing remarks, because this is one of the subjects we have been led to believe is in the minds of members of the Council.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I am grateful for that answer, and I look forward to Mr. DeBrum's more comprehensive closing statement on the subject. It is indeed an issue of some concern to Council members, as it has been for some years.

In connection with general economic development in the Marshall Islands, we were pleased to hear that a five-year economic development plan had been formulated. The question of development planning has been of considerable interest to my delegation and is a matter on which we have often spoken in the Council. I think that President Nakayama also mentioned that a five-year development plan was in preparation or had been completed for the Federated States.

Was the drafting of those development plans undertaken in consultation with other Micronesian entities? In other words, was there co-ordination between the various Governments in the preparation of those individual plans for the individual Territories?

I ask that question because a development plan undertaken for one part of the Territory that ran counter to, or did not take account of, developments in other parts of the Territory could well result in a rather worse situation than if there had been no development plan at all. I think in particular of setting up industries in cut-throat competition with each other. Perhaps Mr. DeBrum or the Administering Authority could comment.

The PRESIDENT: Would the representative of the United States like to answer that question?

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): I would prefer to pass it on to Secretary DeBrum and possibly comment later.

Mr. DeBRUM (Special Adviser): We are grateful for the technical assistance we received from the United Nations when those development plans were in the making - assistance received through the Fiji office of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and other offices in Fiji, and others. When we developed the five-year plan every consideration was given to the Saipan Accord, in which the three Heads of State of the freely associated States - Palau, the Marshalls and the Federated States of Micronesia - agreed that in certain development areas there was a mutuality of interest where it would be recognized that certain developments could best be undertaken by one particular freely associated State.

(Mr. DeBrum, Special Adviser)

In some areas it would be best if all States involved themselves in development. There has not yet been a comprehensive getting together because we have only just completed the five-year plan, but we certainly intend to share with each other, co-operate and pool our strength in giving effect to the decision of the three Heads of State that certain kinds of development can best be undertaken jointly and other kinds individually. We look forward to more consultation in this area.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I now turn to another hardy annual of this Council, which is the incidence of disease in the Trust Territory as a whole, but in particular, I think, in the Federated States. One or two petitioners referred to the question of cholera in Truk - a nineteenth century disease, one called it. However, Mrs. McCoy made it perfectly clear in her opening statement that the epidemic in Truk was well under control. Nevertheless, I see from page 213 of the Administering Authority's report that in reply to one of the Council's recommendations last year the Administering Authority admitted that the disease was endemic in Truk and that eradication was unlikely until adequate toilets and sewer systems had been completed.

I wonder if the Administering Authority could give us some indication of the extent of improvements in these areas and when they are likely to be completed.

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): With your permission, Mr. President, I should like High Commissioner McCoy to respond.

Mrs. MCCOY (Special Representative): Health care has historically been one of the priorities of the Administering Authority. Hospitals, clinics and dispensaries exist throughout the islands. Health delivery training has gone on and continues, frequently with the co-operation of the World Health Organization (WHO) and the South Pacific Commission. A very recent agreement with the University of Hawaii East-West Center provides for continuing training of medical personnel for the next several years. Of course, when something goes wrong - such as the cholera problem in Truk, leprosy in Pohnpei and outbreaks of different ailments from time to time - the media tends to give it more attention, probably because within the small populations concerned any health threat appears more serious than it would in a larger population. And, of course, this is just the thing to criticize if they are looking for ways to challenge the record of the Administering Authority.

(Mrs. McCoy, Special
Representative)

The facts, however, speak for themselves. Let me make a contribution to setting the record straight by referring to WHO statistics gathered last summer. Heart disease is the leading cause of death in the Trust Territory. It is also the leading cause in Hawaii and in Fiji. In fact, the 10 leading causes of death in Hawaii and the Trust Territory are surprisingly similar. In the frequency of occurrence of certain diseases, based on incidence per 100,000 population, the Trust Territory ranks as follows: measles, 12th out of 15 in the Pacific basin countries; whooping cough, 9th out of 16; tetanus, 11th out of 16. The Trust Territory is not even listed on polio, although several other South Pacific States and territories are. Tuberculosis appears to be a problem since the Trust Territory ranks third behind two other countries in the Pacific. The last two cases of cholera in Truk were reported in April 1984. Because there had been no new cases since April, Truk was declared cholera-free by the World Health Organization on 9 November 1984, and cholera-free by the Atlanta Center for Disease Control on 14 November 1984.

In conclusion, although we are experiencing some health problems, considering the context of the Pacific Islands, the health situation in the Trust Territory is way ahead of that of other countries in the area. Most childhood diseases have been eliminated, or nearly so, child mortality has dropped considerably, people are living longer and populations are increasing.

As I stated earlier, while we have problems, the basic health of the Micronesians has never been better. And, of course, now that the establishment of priorities and planning is up to the authorities of the constitutional Governments we can expect them to accept the challenge to continue to improve the health situation of their constituents.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I should like to reserve my right to ask further questions. While we are on economic and social matters, I should be happy to give way to my colleagues.

Mr. ROCHER (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to take up the question of the presentation of statistical tables.

My delegation has noted the great effort made as compared with last year, particularly in the presentation of tables, which are based on United Nations norms in its reference work World Statistics in Brief. We feel, however, that this effort must not be relaxed.

(Mr. Rocher, France)

We see that in tables 1 and 2 of the Administering Authority's report to the Council, some columns have not been completed, at least for certain Territories. I could not find data on the active population, the urban population, the gross domestic product for the Marshall Islands and Palau, the percentage annual growth of the gross domestic product, industrial production, the consumer price index or illiteracy rates.

My delegation is well aware that it is not easy to collect such data for each entity. It is also true that some of the data that do not appear in tables 1 and 2 are to be found in specific tables relating to the different territories. Nevertheless, if tables 1 and 2 were as complete as possible they would give an instantaneous picture of the facts of life in Micronesia. It would be a great help to members of the Council and would enable them better to perform their role if the Micronesian entities - and my delegation wishes to suggest this - could agree on a common framework as far as common subjects are concerned. Of course, the main responsibility for producing its own data on specific subjects should be left, as at present, to each Government, but perhaps the Administering Authority could suggest such a framework to the different Territories.

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): I should like, with your permission, Sir, to ask High Commissioner McCoy, who prepares the reports, to comment on the statements we have just heard.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): As most members will recall, during the session last year the point was made several times that the annual report could be improved. We have tried our best to comply with that suggestion. We have been fortunate in having the United Nations guide us in their approved method of handling statistics and each of our local governments has followed that particular pattern. We know that the local statistical officers have really done their best and we hope that they will continue to improve this work. We are certainly quite cognizant of all the criticisms that we received last year and we hope that some of our esteemed colleagues on the other delegations have found that they could get beyond page 6 of this year's report, since some of them said that that was as far as they were able to get last year. Therefore, we hope that this year's annual report might be studied a little bit more closely.

Mr. ROCHER (France) (interpretation from French): I wish to thank Commissioner McCoy for her reply. I can assure her immediately that I went well beyond page 6; I have studied all the statistics. Of course, I did not want simply to propose constructive measures concerning those statistics. It is true that great work has already been done. I believe there is still room for improvement because, if we draw up a table inserting crosses for the different entities, we find that there are gaps.

Having said that, I should like to ask another question more directly of the representative of the Mariana Islands. The Lieutenant-Governor of the Islands said in his statement of 13 May 1984 that the clothing industry in the Mariana Islands was in danger because of the quotas imposed by the United States on the entry into United States territory of clothing manufactured in the Mariana Islands. He requested that steps should be taken to protect the industry. Is the Administering Authority in a position to comment on this?

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): Before I respond to that question, I note that a member of my delegation, Mr. Asterio Takesy of the Federated States of Micronesia, had his hand up, apparently wishing to comment on the last question. Perhaps we could hear from him first.

Mr. TAKESY (Special Adviser): We thought that the question posed by the representative of France requires elaboration, at least from our point of view. In the preparation of our national development plan, which we have adopted, we became increasingly aware of the need for statistics. Consequently, we have an office of planning and statistics within the Government and we have hired a new

(Mr. Takesy, Special Adviser)

statistician. We shall have four more. We have an assistant from the United Nations Development Programme who is at present helping us to assemble and compile statistics. Furthermore, this year we are making preparations for a census that will be carried out, and we hope concluded, before the end of the year.

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): I shall now attempt to respond to the question just asked by our colleague from France. After I conclude, perhaps the representative of the Northern Marianas might wish to comment as well.

First, I wanted to point out that the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas is treated in exactly the same way as are all United States territories, in that it receives duty-free entry into the United States for products produced within the Commonwealth. The reason for this is to provide jobs in industry for local labour. The problem referred to earlier by Lieutenant-Governor Tenorio is wholly confined to the production of knit sweaters. The point was that if the sweaters were manufactured in Northern Marianas they would be admitted into the United States Market duty free. But there is another process. Members may know that textiles is a fearsomely complicated business. There is a distinction drawn between sweaters manufactured and sweaters assembled. What are sweaters assembled? Sweaters assembled are the two halves of the bodies and the sleeves of which are actually produced in one place and then shipped to a second place to be sewn together; they are then exported from that second place to the United States as a product manufactured there. It was ruled that sweaters so produced were assembled and not manufactured, and, because assembled, were not eligible for what is called headnote 3(a) treatment, that is, to be admitted duty free.

At present the United States provides as an incentive to the Commonwealth of Northern Marianas a waiver of foreign quota for 70,000 dozen sweaters annually. The Commonwealth of Northern Marianas has imported 90 per cent of the labour necessary to make the sweaters. There are at present no United States controls over immigration into the Commonwealth of Northern Marianas. The Commonwealth itself applies its own immigration controls and the Commonwealth does not apply the United States minimum wage. In fact, members will recall that this point was made by one of the petitioners earlier. Therefore, by establishing the quota of which the United States administration had previously spoken, we were attempting to establish a fair rule which would be applicable there. However, I also want to say that legislation has been introduced into the United States House of Representatives that would eliminate the duty on those knit sweaters. The United

(Mr. Feldman, United States)

States administration is supporting that legislation in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress.

Mr. GUERRERO (Adviser): I do agree with Ambassador Feldman's description of what is happening. I merely want to state that the Northern Marianas Government is negotiating with the United States Government, or with the appropriate Federal Agencies, with a view to increasing the quota from 70,000 dozen to a somewhat higher figure. When the regulation was issued, some of the factories in the garment industry in the Northern Marianas had just started; apart from probably one factory, they had not been in existence more than a year. But we very much hope that something will develop between the Northern Marianas and the United States Government. We are also working closely with the United States Congress with a view to finding a solution that will assist in furthering the economic development of the Northern Marianas.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I should like to follow up on that particular topic, and ask where the immigrant labour comes from. I think Ambassador Feldman said that there was some immigrant labour in the Marianas. I think he said 90 per cent of the workers in that particular area came from outside the Northern Marianas. Could he explain further?

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): It would not be proper to call them immigrants because they are not settling in the Northern Marianas, but they are brought in as temporary labour. The figure is approximately 90 per cent, and I believe that the bulk of the labour comes from the People's Republic of China.

Mr. GUERRERO (Adviser): That is true. Most of the labour came from the People's Republic of China. Under our immigration laws, we have made an arrangement with the garment industry to continue to replace those people. As members know, we do not have the skilled labour to operate the equipment. It is true that most of the labour has come from the People's Republic of China.

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): I just want to add that indeed I did not mean to leave the impression that the Marianas Government is indifferent to the question of training local people to take over these jobs - far from it. In fact the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas has just recently instituted a vocational training programme for textile workers, which I believe involves several years of courses on learning to run various types of textile machinery, with the intention of being able ultimately to fill all of these positions with locally hired labour.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): During this session, as in earlier sessions of the Trusteeship Council, references have been made, in particular by petitioners, to a Solomon Report on a mission to Micronesia at the request of the President of the United States and on its instructions. References to this can be found in the press as well.

We should like to put the following question to the representative of the Administering Authority: Can he tell the Trusteeship Council what was the directive given by the President of the United States in this regard in National Security Memorandum 145, signed by the President of the United States on 8 April 1962, vis-à-vis the tasks facing the Administering Authority with respect to its policy in the Trust Territory of Micronesia?

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): The report referred to was commissioned, as our learned friend has already informed us, in 1962. It is of course quite out of date and I think it has absolutely no relevance to an inquiry as to the administration of the Trust Territory during the year 1983-1984.

Further, I see no reason to consider it appropriate to provide an internal working paper of the United States Government which is more than 20 years out of date. The report that was produced was never made official. The recommendations it contained were never adopted by the United States Government and in fact the policy that has been followed in the approximately 20 years since that report was prepared took quite a different course - one would almost say it was diametrically opposed to the recommendations of that report.

In short, the answer would have to be: first, the report is more than 20 years out of date; secondly, its recommendations were not adopted; and, thirdly, it had no official standing. Therefore I see no reason to provide the Council with either the report or the terms of reference which led to its drafting.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like this answer of the representative of the United States to be particularly carefully reflected in the records of our meeting today, because the information we have received - not only from the petitioners - allows us to conclude just the opposite of what has just been said by the representative of the Administering Authority. But we are ready to take note of this answer by the representative of the Administering Authority and we would like to have it set down.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Our next question is addressed both to the Administering Authority and, to a certain degree, to the special advisers to the United States delegation from Micronesia. How well known to the inhabitants of the Trust Territory, the local leaders and chiefs, are the provisions of the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, in particular the important provision that inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence?

Secondly, to what extent do the Micronesians know that the General Assembly, when considering the question of the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization on the twentieth anniversary of its adoption, in December 1980, categorically rejected

"any agreement, arrangement or unilateral action by colonial and racist Powers which ignores, violates, denies or conflicts with the inalienable right of peoples under colonial domination to self-determination and independence".

(General Assembly resolution 35/118, para. 5)

Thirdly, how and by what provisions of the so-called compact are the Micronesian people guaranteed the opportunity to exercise their inalienable right to the full eradication of their status of subjection to foreign rule in their own territory and their right to genuine self-determination and independence, in conformity with the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples?

Incidentally, in all the statements made here by the representatives of the United States references are made to General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV), whereas no reference was made by him to the principal document adopted by the United Nations, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the twenty-fifth anniversary of which we are celebrating this year.

Perhaps in this connection we should ask yet another question. To what extent have the representatives of the Administering Authority and the Micronesian representatives, in their negotiations on the possible future political status of the Trust Territory, been guided by the fundamental documents of contemporary international law, and, in particular, by the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the United Nations Declaration on decolonization and the principles by which States should be guided in carrying out their policies?

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): We have been given quite a lot to comment on. I am happy to respond, and perhaps some other members of my delegation will wish to join in.

I was very pleased to note that our friend from the Soviet Union, who yesterday seemed to be taking the line that economic independence and self-reliance were necessary qualities for sovereign existence, has today taken a different line, quoting from resolution 1514 (XV), which, of course, says something quite contrary to what he was saying yesterday, as I believe I pointed out.

I am glad that he does agree that even States which require external assistance may nevertheless move into independence or free association. Note that I say "independence or free association". I delivered a very lengthy statement yesterday, citing, among many other documents, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, which describes free association, along with independence and integration into an independent State, as the normal, permissible, acceptable means of self-determination.

As to the question of the degree to which leaders, traditional and elected, and the people throughout the Trust Territory are aware of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and other relevant United Nations documents, statements and resolutions, we have, of course, the verification of the Visiting Missions to observe the plebiscites to the effect that those who voted in the plebiscites in Micronesia did so in full knowledge not only of the specific matters on which they were voting but of what their rights in the matter were. I will ask members of the delegations from the respective States of Micronesia to comment further on the degree to which those within their territories are aware of declarations such as that on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples - which, by the way, has been widely distributed throughout the Territory, along with all other relevant United Nations materials.

I also want to comment - indeed, I must comment - on the question of the degree to which we are guided by international law in our administration of the Territory. Our learned friend from the Soviet Union cited the Declaration just referred to and the Charter.

(Mr. Feldman, United States)

He did not, surprisingly, cite the most basic document for administration of the Trust, and that of course is the Trusteeship Agreement for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands article 6 of which reads:

"In discharging its obligations under Article 76 b. of the Charter, the administering authority shall:

"1. foster the development of such political institutions as are suited to the trust territory and shall promote the development of the inhabitants of the trust territory toward self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of the trust territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;"

I should appreciate being allowed to call first on Ms. Selby and thereafter on the representatives of the Micronesian States.

Ms. SELBY (Adviser): I think I have little to add to what has been said. It does bear emphasizing that there is a great deal of relevant material to look at here. And I think the conclusion that we set forth yesterday - that the paramount fundamental criterion which must be regarded is the people's right to self-determination - still stands.

Mr. TAKESY (Special Adviser): The whole approach to free association and self-determination in the Federated States of Micronesia was taken as a deliberate act. We should not like to see educational, economic and social development used as a pretext for holding up free association, which our people have freely chosen after careful studies of the choices available to them.

That decision was made after considerable analysis and evaluation of the principles of international law and of the relevant documents cited by the representative of the Soviet Union, and we ourselves educated the public before the decision was made.

As to the question of full independence, the decision is ours to make. It will be made by future generations of the Federated States. Let me underscore that that decision is ours and no one else's.

Mr. GUERRERO (Adviser): As far as the Northern Marianas is concerned, we have chosen to be in closer union with the United States and we have stated our wishes, going back to the early days of the Northern Marianas as part of the Trust Territory in the early 1950s. The United Nations report on the visiting mission to observe the plebiscite in the Northern Marianas states, basically, that the Northern Mariana Islands can be quoted as asking the United States for a closer

(Mr. Guerrero, Adviser)

relationship. I honestly feel that this is the choice the people made. We are aware of other options, even that of independence, but the people freely expressed their choice when they voted for commonwealth status with the United States.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): For my part, I should like to express my full satisfaction at the fact that we have finally, for the first time, heard from a representative of the Administering Authority a certain degree of approval of the provisions of the Declaration on decolonization.

As for the comments that he addressed to the Soviet delegation in this respect, I think that the representative of the United States is vainly trying to find contradictions between what was said by the Soviet delegation at the last meeting yesterday and what has been said today. There are no contradictions here. We regret that we cannot satisfy the wish of the Administering Authority to confirm such a contradiction.

What the Soviet delegation spoke about yesterday and what it has spoken about today are organically linked. Yesterday, we said that the policy of the Administering Authority with respect to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands has led to the complete dependence of the people of that Territory on the United States and has forced the people to follow up a path chosen for them by the Administering Authority. Today, we are speaking about the inseparable and inalienable rights possessed by the people of Micronesia.

What we are discussing today is the extent to which those rights are clearly understood by the people of Micronesia and the extent to which they can be ensured. For this reason, there is no contradiction and there are no dramatic admissions in our statements today.

There is a clear consistency in the questioning by the Soviet Union. Furthermore, with regard to the dependence of the Trust Territory on the Administering Authority, this was shown very clearly by the Special Representative of the President of the United States, Ambassador Zeder, who spoke about this on 27 May 1984 during the hearings in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee of the United States Senate.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

He said that the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands suffered from the "classical problems" of an underdeveloped region. He said that almost 90 per cent of the national economy of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands was directly or indirectly dependent on assistance from the United States. He said that the cost of programmes carried out by the United States in Micronesia had reached a level of more than \$33 million and that the result of those programmes was the increased dependency, on an unprecedented scale, of the Micronesians on the United States.

That is in answer to the comment of the representative of the United States.

Now I should like once again to return to the statement made yesterday by the representative of the Administering Authority on behalf of the United States Government. He said that military agreements - as we all know, they are also called subsidiary military agreements to the Compact - are considered not to relate to the question of status or agreements on the status of the Trust Territory. That appears on page 7 of the press release containing the text of yesterday's statement by the representative of the United States.

In this respect we should like to have some additional clarifications from the representative of the Administering Authority. As far as we know, additional agreements, particularly military agreements, are clearly and unambiguously linked with the so-called Compact and refer to the relevant articles of the Compact.

Finally, in a message to the Congress, on 20 February 1985, when he submitted to the Congress the so-called Compact, the President of the United States made definite references to the additional military agreements. He said:

(spoke in English)

"The full text of the Compact is part of the draft joint resolution which I request be introduced, referred to the appropriate Committees and enacted. I also request that the Congress note the agreements subsidiary to the Compact."

(continued in Russian)

Further on in the message, there was a broad reference to the provisions of the Compact having to do with the military use of the territory of Micronesia and the strategic interests of the United States in that area.

I repeat, we should like the Administering Authority to provide us with additional explanations about the statement made yesterday.

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): I have listened with great interest, but I am not sure what the question is. "Additional explanations about the statement made yesterday" - additional explanations on which statement?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to explain. I shall read out from the press release issued by the United States Mission to the United Nations - press release USUN 49 (85) - entitled
(spoke in English)

"Statement by Ambassador Harvey J. Feldman, United States representative to the Trusteeship Council, in response to petitioners on Micronesia, May 21, 1985".

(continued in Russian)

My question is this. In that statement, on page 7 of that press release, the representative of the Administering Authority said that additional military agreements "are not related to the question of status or to the status agreements" - that is, the status of Micronesia.

The Soviet delegation would like an explanation. It seems here that these agreements supposedly have nothing to do with the question of the future status of the Trust Territory, while at the same time, as far as we know, these agreements have been added to the so-called Compact and do refer to it, and when the Compact was submitted to the United States Congress the United States President fully linked those documents with it.

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): I really do not see what the problem is. On the face of it the statement is true. The status of the Micronesian States as freely associated States is in no way linked to any military relationship that they may have with the United States. They are not freely associated because they have a military relationship. They will, one hopes, in the fullness of time, given the approval of the Trusteeship Council and of the Security Council, become freely associated States. They may enter into military relationships, or defence relationships, with the United States; that will not alter their status as freely associated States were they to do so. That is the meaning of the statement that I made yesterday.

Now, I also wish to point out that, as Mr. Berezovsky - since he used my name, I should be happy to repay the compliment - told us yesterday, complaining to be sure, the Compacts have not been formally introduced to the Trusteeship Council. Indeed, we had thought that the purpose of the oversight hearing that we are now conducting was to inquire into the administration of these territories during the year 1983-1984, not to inquire what their status might be after the trusteeship is dissolved; because we have not requested the dissolution of the trusteeship.

However, to repeat, I think that on the face of it the answer is plain: the status of the Micronesian States as freely associated States after the trusteeship is dissolved is not affected by any agreements that they may enter into with the United States as to their defence.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We have listened to the statement of the representative of the Administering Authority, which has far-reaching consequences. This statement, however, has many aspects, at many different levels, concerning the situation in Micronesia and the actions undertaken by the Administering Authority in the territory.

As to the first part, or aspect, the representative of the Administering Authority has just stated again that military agreements are in no way linked to the so-called Compact. To a certain extent, this contradicts statements made at previous sessions of the Trusteeship Council. This should be noted.

The second part of today's statement, as we understand it, is that in general it is not a matter for the Trusteeship Council, it is not the business of the Trusteeship Council, to ask what agreements are being elaborated or signed between the Administering Authority and the Micronesians. I must state categorically that

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

everything taking place now in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is the business of the Trusteeship Council and is relevant to the Trusteeship Council because the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is part of the trusteeship system of the United Nations. I repeat, it is part of the United Nations system and it is not purely a colony of the United States of America.

For that reason, here in the Trusteeship Council, any delegation, and the Council as a whole, has every right to ask questions about any actions which are being carried out by the Administering Authority in the Trust Territory.

The very act of posing questions to the Administering Authority at this session of the Council underlines the authority of the Council. The answers of the representative of the Administering Authority, however, are rather symptomatic. Unfortunately, we must note again, and this is even more patent today, that the United States, as the Administering Authority, taking advantage of its position, is imposing on the Micronesian people agreements which are advantageous to it, agreements in which it has a stake. It is trying to keep the United Nations on the sidelines, or in the dark, about what is going on.

I should like to ask another question. In his statement, Mr. Balos, a petitioner, said more than once that, and I quote, "sentiment has been expressed", end of quote, in Washington for moving towards a closer relationship between the Federated States of Micronesia and the United States (T/PV.1583). In another part of his statement, which I should like to mention in this connection, Mr. Balos said that in Washington there was a movement towards subjecting the missile range on Kwajalein to the internal laws of the United States.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

We should like to hear a clarification from the representative of the Administering Authority as to whether these statements by the petitioner, Mr. Balos, are well founded. We should also like to know how this movement in Washington has been manifested.

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): I was wondering when we were going to get to the question. I am glad that we finally did get to it.

I would begin by commenting on the interesting statement that preceded the question. It seems clear to me that our friend from the Soviet Union has been attempting to rewrite history or to invent a new history - I do not know which of the two terms I should use. Apparently he would have us forget that a Trusteeship Council Visiting Mission was present in the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of Marshall Islands and the Republic of Palau; that this Visiting Mission, made up of members of the Trusteeship Council and representatives of independent States of the South Pacific, observed the political education campaign, observed the vote, reported fully about the knowledge that the peoples of those territories had in regard to what they were voting about.

Now, what were they voting about? They were voting about two things. They were making a choice, in self-determination, as to the future form of organization they wished for themselves. The choice they were given was precisely the choice that is enumerated in the Declaration on friendly relations and many other documents - that is, a choice between integration, free association and independence. They were making a further choice: if they chose free association, was it to be in terms of a particular agreement negotiated between their representatives and representatives of the United States? And that agreement is called the Compact of Free Association.

Somehow our friend from the Soviet Union would have us believe that these things never occurred, that a United Nations Visiting Mission did not observe them, that a United Nations Visiting Mission did not come back and certify that this was a legitimate exercise of self-determination, in full knowledge of what the choices and alternatives were.

We seem to be witnessing the creation of a new mythology: that this was all done behind closed doors, pulled curtains, by some act of legerdemain. But I believe that the reports of the Trusteeship Council do exist, for I have seen them; in fact I quoted from them yesterday. So I think that all this is - well, I prefer not to characterize it.

(Mr. Feldman, United States)

I turn now to the statement of Senator Balos, who represents Kwajalein Atoll. I too listened to his statement. Perhaps I had the advantage of listening to it in English and not through the interpretation - although we all know that our learned friend from the Soviet Union is fully bilingual in English, and possibly he too listened to the statement by Senator Balos in English. But what Senator Balos said was not that Washington wanted closer integration of Kwajalein but that he himself - Senator Balos - wanted closer integration. Washington, the United States, the Administering Authority, respects the wishes of the people of the Marshall Islands, who voted for free association - not for a closer association - with the United States.

As regards the application of internal laws to the Kwajalein Missile Range, the facts of the matter are these: The regulation of Kwajalein Missile Range is done with the agreement and through the co-operation of the Republic of Marshall Islands, which maintains a resident representative at the Kwajalein Missile Range, on Kwajalein Island, for that purpose.

With regard to the wishes of the people of Kwajalein Atoll and the views of the inhabitants of the Marshall Islands, I should like to pass the baton to Secretary DeBrum. Before doing so, however, I state unequivocally that the United States has no intention of attempting to integrate, either through the application of law or in any other manner, Kwajalein Atoll, where the missile range is located. Incidentally, by "missile range" we mean a series of instruments, radars and high-speed cameras. I repeat that we have no intention of integrating either the Atoll or Kwajalein Island, into the United States - absolutely no intention.

Mr. DeBRUM (Special Adviser): I should like to add one observation to what has already been said by the representative of the United States.

We have an established agency, called the "Community Relations Council", for Kwajalein Atoll. It is composed of Senator Balos, himself, traditional and elected leaders, and representatives of the Government of the Marshall Islands. They work jointly with the Command and discuss any and all problems that arise. Kwajalein is a missile-testing site for the United States. These meetings are held monthly, and all problems and all solutions are discussed.

(Mr. DeBrum, Special Adviser)

Although I have not attended the meetings, the Government has representatives at them and I know that some of the concerns expressed by the Senator here have not been discussed with the Community Relations Council. I should be happy to have them raised for discussion.

I understand that one of Senator Balos' concerns was that he feared that the Government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands would not be able to assert our right in regard to priority employment consideration on Kwajalein. It is already a policy of the United States and of my Government that employment opportunities will be given first to the Kwajalein residents of Ebeye. That policy has been followed since its establishment several years ago.

Senator Balos has also said in the past that he supports the independence of the Republic of the Marshall Islands. He is also among those who participated in engineering the concept of free association for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, including the Marshall Islands. He has also gone on record as supporting the closer commonwealth with the United States. He has gone on record as supporting these three different concepts for the Marshall Islands. I do not know what he will support next time he addresses the Council or the United States Congressional Committee. That is why it has been difficult for us to understand what he is advocating, so that we may participate sincerely and genuinely in his pursuance of what he believes in.

We have made this statement in our closing remarks, because we know the Council was interested in the matter, and we shall discuss it in further detail when we present our closing argument.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): A serious accusation has been made against the Soviet delegation - that it is trying to rewrite history or to invent history anew.

References are made to the fact that the Trust Territory has been visited by not one but several Trusteeship Council missions. Unfortunately, we must note with regret that history is being rewritten now, not by us but by the Administering Authority. That is a fact. Both yesterday and today, when we were discussing the so-called Compact, statements were made from which it would appear that it is virtually non-existent and that it will be presented to the Council only when the Administering Authority considers it necessary to do so. How can we reconcile all this? If the Missions went to the Territory and simply observed so-called

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

superficial - final - results of the activities carried out by the United States for decades, that is one thing. The other thing is that yesterday we asked the Administering Authority where the Compact was and why it was not presented for consideration by the Council, so that the Council could express its views on it. The Administering Authority told us "It is not in existence. It is not available for the Council."

Moreover, in 1984 a plebiscite was held on Palau. Yesterday we asked where was the document voted upon during the plebiscite and we were told that there was none, that there was not even such a plebiscite, but, rather, some kind of a referendum. That is a rewriting of history, too. I hope I shall be pardoned for saying it, but it is true with respect to the comments made by the representative of the United States, the Administering Authority.

Although we tried very hard to get answers to our questions yesterday, we have not received very clear answers, and we regret that.

Now I should like to ask a more general question: For purposes of clarification, may we have an explanation, or clear definition from the Administering Authority, at any rate, of the general goals pursued by the Administering Authority, beginning 15 years ago, in its negotiations with the various territorial entities in Micronesia - from the point of view of the United States, of course?

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): I am very happy to reply to the representative of the Soviet Union. Of course, it would be for those who participated in the visiting missions - representatives of the United Kingdom, France and other countries - to comment on the allegation that they only superficially observed events in Micronesia, and I hope that they will do so.

As to the Compacts, I thought I had replied at great length yesterday. If our friend from the Soviet Union wishes me to do so, I shall reply again today. But the question he finally came to was rather different, so I shall say what have been the goals both of our administration of the Territory since 1947 and of the negotiation as to the future status of the Territory.

(Mr. Feldman, United States)

Those goals have been: to foster the development of political institutions as suited to the Trust Territory; to promote the development of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory towards self-government or independence; to develop the participation in government of the inhabitants of the Territory, giving due recognition to the customs of the inhabitants; to promote the economic advancement of the inhabitants; to encourage the development of fisheries, agriculture and industry; to protect the inhabitants against the loss of their lands and resources; to improve the means of their transportation and communications; to promote the social advancement of the inhabitants; to protect their rights and fundamental freedoms, including those of all elements of the population, without discrimination; to promote the educational advancement of the inhabitants, and to that end to establish a general system of education, to facilitate vocational and cultural advancement and to encourage qualified students to pursue higher education.

If the representative of the Soviet Union wishes, I can go on.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): As to the remark made by the representative of the United States that the countries participating in the Trusteeship Council Missions should have reacted to what the Soviet delegation said - namely, that those countries had observed the plebiscite procedures - and that the words "superficial process" had been used, perhaps was not understood clearly. What I was talking about should be clear to the representative of the Administering Authority as well as to the members of the Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory. I was talking about the fact that they were observing the technical implementation of what had already been prepared over decades.

As for the question of the goals of the United States, I am grateful to the representative of the Administering Authority for quoting a provision of the Trusteeship Agreement. Of course, it does not accord very well with the statements made in this connection during the Congressional hearings; or with the military activities of the United States in the Trust Territory and the plans of the Administering Authority for the military use of the Territory in the future; or with the statement of the Personal Representative of the President for Micronesian Status Negotiations, Ambassador Zeder, in the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate, who said:

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

"Fifteen years ago the United States entered into negotiations on political status, pursuing from the viewpoint of the United States the following general goals:"

(spoke in English)

"To stimulate the development of long term growth through the creation of a stable political framework in this vast area of the central Pacific; to terminate the trusteeship and maintain the close and friendly relationships which have developed during the period of United States Administration; and to protect United States security interests in the area."

(continued in Russian)

As regards the strategic significance assigned to this Territory by the United States - not as a strategic Trust Territory of the United Nations, but rather from the point of view of the strategic interests of the United States - we could quote in this connection not just to the end of today's meeting but for still longer. However, we will not go into the statements that have been made in the United States Congress by representatives of the President and by representatives of military circles in the United States. They are well known.

My next question has to do with the military interests pursued by the United States of America in the Trust Territory now and for the future. We have heard statements by the representatives of the Administering Authority and we have carefully studied the report of the Administering Authority in this regard.

(Mr. Ber ezovsky, USSR)

Unfortunately, the representative of the Administering Authority told us that military agreements which are concluded by the United States with the Micronesian entities also at present are unavailable to the Council as well as the so-called Compacts. That is why we should like to have some clarification. Could the representative of the United States tell us at least very briefly what those military agreements with the Micronesian entities actually contain - what do they amount to? Under those agreements, what does the United States receive from the Federated States of Micronesia, the Marshall Islands, Palau and the Mariana Islands?

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): I listened with interest to the quotation as to United States goals, what we hope to accomplish in moving to a new relationship with the States of Micronesia. I found nothing to object to. Perhaps our learned friend from the Soviet Union will want that written down, as he said yesterday, in capital letters. I find nothing either peculiar or subversive of international morality in wanting to bring the Micronesian States into a situation of political and economic advance and friendly relations with the United States and thereby, by having a situation of friendship and stability in the Central Pacific, to protect United States security. None of this, as I have said, seems to me subversive of international law or morality.

It is, of course, a fact that this area was designated as a strategic trust. It is in fact, as we are all aware, the only strategic trust ever created. In what did its uniqueness consist? Why was it created as a strategic trust and why was the United States named as the trustee of this strategic trust? I think it was precisely because the Security Council, including the Soviet Union, recognized that just as parts of Micronesia had once been a spring-board for aggression against the United States, so they could be again. Apparently our colleague does find something offensive in the idea that, in bringing the Micronesian peoples to the exercise of self-determination, we would want to do so in a way which would not detract either from our security or from the stability of the region. I, for my part, do not find that objectionable.

Now as to the second part of the statement - the military arrangements foreseen under the Compact - in brief, when the Compacts are approved, when the process is completed and the Trusteeship is dissolved, the military relationship will be the following. The United States will have agreed under the Compacts to defend the freely associated States, that is, the Republic of Palau, the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands. When the

(Mr. Feldman, United States)

Trusteeship is dissolved with respect to all of them, when the Compacts are in effect, the United States will have undertaken to defend those territories as though they were United States territory and to defend the citizens of those States as though they were United States citizens.

The PRESIDENT: Unless the representative of the Soviet Union or other members of the Council see any objection, I should like to suspend the questioning of the Administering Authority at this point and resume this afternoon.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not object to adjourning the meeting at this stage, although I would like very briefly - if necessary I can continue at our next meeting - to respond to the comment that has just been made by the representative of the Administering Authority. I think it is necessary to make my response right now.

First, with regard to what constitutes a contradiction of international morality and what does not, we should like very briefly to say that international morality, just as international law, is contradicted when an independent State, a great Power, takes advantage of its situation and concludes an agreement with the people of a Trust Territory which is virtually or de facto under its administration. There would be no contradiction of international law or morality if the United States gave independence to Micronesia and after that began negotiations and concluded an agreement with the representatives of the independent people, to which they agreed without outside pressure from the Administering Authority. That would be in keeping with both international morality and international law.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I do not wish to prolong the discussion unnecessarily, but since we are on the business of reacting to comments, I should like briefly to respond to a comment made by the representative of the Soviet Union concerning the task of the Visiting Mission as one that was described as superficial. I could talk much about the hard and conscientious work we attempted to put into our visit, but since time is short, I shall quote very briefly from the statement made by the Chairman of the Visiting Mission at the start of the mission. I quote from the report on the plebiscite in the Federated States of Micronesia. He said:

(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

"We are here to see how the plebiscite is conducted and to write a report so as to tell the United Nations about it.

"We must look to see whether the people of the Federated States of Micronesia understand what the plebiscite is about, and understand the questions which they are being asked to answer in the ballot.

"Then we must look at the polling arrangements, the counting of the votes and the declaration of the results, to see whether all these arrangements are fair and conform to the law which the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia has passed to ensure the absolute fairness of the plebiscite.

"We must see whether all the voters, and that means all men and women who wish to vote, understand the issues in the plebiscite; and that all men and women have an opportunity to express their views freely in the plebiscite, or, if they wish, not to vote at all.

"We must see whether the ballot is secret and that no one can know how any individual votes." (T/1860, annex I, paras. 11-15)

Now it seems to me inconceivable that anyone who is remotely familiar with the importance of democratic procedures, who has any aspirations to take account of the wishes and the needs of the people of Micronesia, can describe those tasks as superficial. Had our distinguished Soviet colleague accepted an invitation to participate in the Observer Mission, he would have seen exactly what I meant.

Mr. ROCHER (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to thank my British colleague for expressing my reaction as well. I simply wish to make one additional comment. The Observer Mission carried out its duty in strict compliance with its mandate and with the guidelines set by the Trusteeship Council. All the members of that Mission performed their duty with complete impartiality, in good faith and certainly not in a superficial manner. Their conclusions were adopted by the Trusteeship Council, and they expressed their gratitude to the administering Power, which gave them complete freedom to conduct their mission. That was of course the duty of the United States, but it was also to their credit.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): First of all I am grateful to the representative of the United Kingdom and the representative of France for confirming the opinion of the Soviet delegation that they did indeed participate in the observation of the technical implementation of what has already been prepared by the Administering Authority during the last 10 years.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

So far as the word "superficial", the terms "superficial manner", "superficial task", are concerned, apparently, simply because statements have been made in various languages here, no one noticed that this term was introduced by the representative of the Administering Authority and was not used at all by the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. ROCHER (France) (interpretation from French): I do not want to prolong the debate, but I listened to the interpretation - the French version, of course - and so far as I am concerned, I did, in the interpretation from Russian hear the word "superficial".

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): I wish to make it very plain. I did not introduce the term "superficial". I quoted from the translation of the remarks of the Soviet representative.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): All I may say in conclusion is that I am glad that the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union now agrees that our task was not superficial.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The PRESIDENT: I informed the Council yesterday evening that the representative of the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat would be here this afternoon to introduce the report of the Secretary-General on the dissemination of information on the United Nations and the international trusteeship system in the Trust Territory. I am now informed that it will in fact not be possible for Mr. Masha to be with us this afternoon, since he is involved in the current meetings of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, but we will arrange for him to appear as soon as possible.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.