

UNITED NATIONS TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL



JUN 30 1982

Distr.
GENERAL

T/PV.1539
28 June 1982

ENGLISH

UN/SA COLLECTION
Forty-ninth session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 11 June 1982, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. POUDADE (France)

Arrangements for the dispatch of a periodic visiting mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued)

Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 September 1981: 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 (XVI) 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 36/68)) (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)

Adoption of the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council [Security Council resolution 70 (1949)]

This record is subject to correction.

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

Any corrections 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.

82-60714 3442e (E)

43P.

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE DISPATCH OF A PERIODIC VISITING MISSION TO THE TRUST TERRITORY
OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (T/L.1231 and T/L.1232) (continued)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): During the past few days Council members have held informal consultations in connexion with the periodic visiting mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to be dispatched by the Trusteeship Council in 1982. It would appear that it is the desire of members that the mission should be composed of members of the Council who wish to participate, with the exception of the Administering Authority, which will provide an escort officer.

A draft resolution has been prepared by France and the United Kingdom on this basis. That draft resolution has been circulated under the symbol T/L.1231. Members also have before them the statement of financial implications in document T/L.1232.

I call upon the representative of France to introduce the draft resolution.

Mr. BARELLI (France) (interpretation from French): On behalf of the delegation of the United Kingdom and France, I should like to introduce the draft resolution concerning the dispatch of a periodic visiting mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (T/L.1231).

As Council members know, since 1950 the Council has periodically dispatched a visiting mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Those Missions are entrusted with the task of reporting to the Council on the steps taken by the Administering Authority to carry out the mandate entrusted to it by the United Nations in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter.

The last mission, scheduled for 1979, in fact took place in 1980. If the Council adopts the present draft resolution, the next visiting mission to the Trust Territory will arrive there in June 1982 and remain there for approximately four

(Mr. Barelli, France)

weeks. The mission will be composed of members of the Council. It will pay particular attention to questions raised in the annual report to the Council and examine the petitions submitted by inhabitants of the Territory.

The visiting mission will submit a report to the Council as soon as possible after the end of the visit.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): As there are no comments, the Council will now take a decision on the draft resolution with regard to the dispatch of a periodic visiting mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. I suggest that the Council adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

The draft resolution was adopted.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I would suggest that the persons to be appointed by their Governments as members of the Visiting Mission be approved automatically as soon as their names are received.

It was so decided.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation did not object to the adoption of the resolution - on the understanding that the Visiting Mission referred to in it will be a periodic visiting mission such as those dispatched in the past to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for the purpose of appraising the situation in the Trust Territory, and that the Visiting Mission will not have any additional terms of reference of any sort beyond the regular mandate of such missions.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I believe there is a general consensus in the Council to regard this Visiting Mission as a periodic visiting mission like those that have been dispatched in the past. It goes without saying that the attention of the members of the Visiting Mission will be drawn to the terms of reference contained in the resolution and that only those terms of reference will be valid as far as the Council is concerned.

EXAMINATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 1981: TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (T/1837; T/L.1228 and Add.1-3 and T/L.1229) (continued)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Council will now consider the report of the Drafting Committee on conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The report has been circulated as document T/L.1229 and was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom at the Council's 1537th meeting, on 8 June.

I call on the representative of the United Kingdom.

Mr. MACLAY (United Kingdom): On behalf of the Drafting Committee, I should like to introduce five brief modifications which we should like to make to the report I presented to the Council on 8 June. I beg the Council's indulgence for proposing these changes after the formal presentation of the report but I hope that delegations will agree that it will be most helpful for the official conduct of our business if we now proceed to adopt these minor modifications.

First of all, I should like to propose the insertion of the words "low-level" in section A, paragraph 4, in the second line, so that the phrase would read: "the question of the proposed dumping of low-level nuclear waste". I make this suggestion now because when the paragraph was originally drafted we had not yet received the text of the letter from the Japanese Permanent Representative dated 2 June 1982, published as document T/1841.

Secondly, in section D, paragraph 72, of the report, "United States National Health Service" should be changed to "United States Public Health Service". This is a purely editorial change.

Thirdly, in section F, paragraph 95, in the third line, we should like to insert the word "practically" so that the final clause would read: "each of the political components of the Trust Territory has practically achieved full functional self-government under the Trusteeship Agreement". We have made this alteration because we understand that Secretarial Order 3039 does stop short of self-government and the Administering Authority still holds certain reserve

(Mr. Maclay, United Kingdom)

powers. The day-to-day administration of the Territory is, of course, in the hands of the constitutional Government, and this was the point we wished to bring out in paragraph 95.

Finally, in section C, paragraph 60, in the final line, we wish to substitute the words "participating in" for "becoming a signatory to".

(Mr. MacLay, United Kingdom)

There is one further modification I should like to suggest. This is not a modification to the report of the Drafting Committee which the Council has before it in document T/L.1229; it is a modification which relates to the substance of the report, which will be released in due course on the basis of a draft by the Secretariat. This modification is being made in response to a suggestion by one delegation that the Drafting Committee has decided to take into account in its work. I suggest it now because the context of this suggestion was a discussion with that delegation of a number of points that they wished to put to the Drafting Committee and I think it is more appropriate to introduce it now than at a later stage.

The modification we would propose is that at the beginning of the section of the report dealing with "Arrangements for the dispatch of a periodic visiting mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands" there should be a new first paragraph, which would read as follows:

"Since 1950, the Trusteeship Council has despatched 11 periodic visiting missions to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

There would then be a footnote to this paragraph, and that footnote at the bottom of the page where the section on the dispatch of a periodic visiting mission begins would read as follows:

"United Nations periodic missions visited the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands at three-year intervals from 1950 to 1959. A mission was sent to the Territory in 1961, one year earlier than anticipated. The three-year intervals were observed from 1961 to 1976. In 1979, however, the Council decided to defer the dispatch of its periodic mission scheduled for that year to early 1980."

Delegations will recall that this formulation was used last year in a footnote inserted on the page of the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council which contained the agenda, which was inserted at the request of a delegation to last year's session of the Council. We think that it is most appropriate for this section to be introduced at the point in the report I have indicated and I hope that this procedure will seem logical to the members of the Council.

(Mr. Maclay, United Kingdom)

I hope it has been helpful that I have introduced the modifications at this stage so that we can look at them together and then, with the Council's agreement, proceed to consideration of the report as a whole.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I propose that in accordance with past practice the Council examine the conclusions and recommendations contained in the annex to the report (T/L.1229) section by section. If I hear no objections, we shall proceed accordingly.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): We shall take first section A, headed "General", paragraphs 1 to 13 inclusive.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (intepretation from Russian): Before expressing the views of the Soviet delegation on this part of the Drafting Commitee's report, our delegation would like to make some general views and comments on the document as a whole.

The Soviet delegation must note with regret that this document suffers from a large number of defects and inadequacies and that, unfortunately, it does not take into account the comments made, in particular by the Soviet delegation, at the last session of the Trusteeship Council.

It must be noted here that this report, if we examine it as a whole, does not reflect the true situation in the Territory and the fulfilment of the responsibilities entrusted to the Trusteeship Council as a body whose function it is to assist the Security Council with regard to the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

With regard to section A, "General", we see here that there are many passages which are not clear, many instances of lack of precision and many points which do not adequately reflect the view of the Trusteeship Council. I shall not take up every point in this section separately, but just refer to a few examples of this. For instance, in paragraph 6 we see the following:

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

"The Council takes note of the concerns expressed by Senate President Olympio T. Borja of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands during the 1523rd meeting of the Council about the Tinian lease option ... The Council calls on the Administering Authority to clarify its intentions with regard to the lease option at the earliest possible date."

Is this the position of the Trusteeship Council on this question? Is this the way the question should have been set out? If we go to the root of the matter, we see that what we are talking about here is a so-called lease option - the lease by the Administering Authority of Micronesian land.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

The Administering Authority says it plans to terminate the trusteeship; yet we are here considering the question of the use of the Trust Territory's land by the Administering Authority. Now, the Trusteeship Agreement says that the Administering Authority shall "protect the inhabitants against loss of their land and resources".

The next paragraph reads:

"The Council notes with satisfaction that nearly all of the public land" - and I emphasize, "nearly all" - "in the Trust Territory has now been turned over to the respective constitutional Governments." (T/L.1229, Annex, para. 7)

Is that the case? We have seen in our discussions that this is not at all the case. We know that a great deal of land in the Trust Territory is in the possession of or being used by the United States, the Administering Authority.

I go on to the section headed "Population movements". At the last session of the Trusteeship Council we talked about these population movements. What is involved here? What have these population movements resulted from? Is this the usual demographic concept - the migration of peoples? What are the underlying reasons for these population movements? If we look into this question, we find what is indeed involved. These are population movements brought about by the use of the Trust Territory by the Administering Authority to carry out its nuclear tests. But the report speaks simply of population movements as if we did not know the reasons for it. We ought to say that these population movements are the result of activities of the Administering Authority on the Trust Territory - and what those activities were. We must call things by their real names.

In this section of the report on population movements, for some reason reference is made in paragraph 10 to the airstrip on Kili Island being opened in March 1982. Of course it is important to have an airstrip for population movements. But we believe that this paragraph should not be included in the report.

Then paragraph 11 states:

"The Council reiterates its concern over the social, cultural and economic difficulties of the people living on the island of Ebeye arising primarily from the over-population of that island." (Ibid, para. 11)

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

What is the reason for over-population? The paragraph does not say. But in fact over-population in Ebeye came about because the people of the Kwajalein Atoll were displaced and resettled in Ebeye, as a result of the military activities of the Administering Authority.

Going on to the next paragraph, we read:

"The Council urges the Administering Authority to make every effort to seek mutually satisfactory solutions" - I stress, "mutually satisfactory solutions" - "to specific problems arising from the presence of the United States military facility on the Kwajalein Atoll". (Ibid, para. 12)

The task of the Trusteeship Council, as well as that of the Administering Authority, is to be concerned with the interests of the population in the Trust Territory, not the interests of the United States to the detriment of those of the population. But the Council is in this instance urging a solution satisfactory to the United States. Is that correct? Is it proper? Hardly.

What we have in this report is a mixture of the important and serious problems which should be clearly and concisely reflected in this document, in order to inform the Security Council of them, with these lesser problems, which have a certain importance, but should not be mixed with the others. The first sentence of paragraph 12 deals with the serious problem which has arisen as a result of the resettlement of the population of Kwajalein. But the next sentence reads:

"The Council welcomes the assurance given by the High Commissioner that any resident of Ebeye or the other islands may be admitted to the hospital on Kwajalein" - the United States hospital - "referred by the Ebeye Health Services Officer ..." (Ibid, para. 12)

We all heard the very serious statement that someone had died because he was refused admission to that hospital. So the main, the fundamental, cause of the problem of the Kwajalein Atoll is the expulsion of the people of Kwajalein. And yet we are assured that the residents of Ebeye or the other islands can be admitted to the United States hospital, which is located on the very territory from which they were evicted.

I do not want to go into any more detail on this section of the report, but I think it should be basically and radically redrafted because it does not reflect the true state of affairs. Moreover, even the paragraphs which do touch on the real problems of the people of Micronesia do so in a superficial and inadequate way.

Mr. GOULDING (United Kingdom): I should like to make a brief comment on what the representative of the Soviet Union has just said and then to raise a procedural point.

The representative of the Soviet Union has taken us over some well-worn ground. He has raised issues that the Council has considered in previous years and has made some general criticisms of the report as a whole. He has identified in it defects that my delegation does not see. In my view, the draft report as a whole does reflect what this Council has been told by the Administering Authority and by the petitioners who have addressed us about the situation in the Territory. In my view, the draft report adequately discharges the Council's responsibilities.

With regard to the specific points made by the representative of the Soviet Union, about, for instance, the section on population movements, as my delegation understands it the drafters of the report have followed the practice of the Council in previous years, which has been to handle in this section the various questions that arise as a result of movements in the past by the populations of Bikini, Enewetak and Kwajalein. My delegation sees advantage in adhering to the format that the Council's report has had in previous years.

My procedural point is one which has been made before by this delegation. In the past the Council's practice in considering this part of its report has been to vote on it section by section and then to give delegations the opportunity to make general statements, general criticisms, general observations about the report. Last year my delegation proposed that we should adhere to that procedure - that is, voting fairly quickly on this part of the report section by section and then hearing general statements by delegations. I should like to suggest, Mr. President, that you might wish to consider that the Council should follow that procedure again this year.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): If I understand correctly the procedural proposal of the representative of the United Kingdom, he would like us to proceed to vote section by section on this portion of the report and then give delegations a chance to make their comments.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I listened carefully to the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom. I understand his hurt feelings as co-sponsor of the report, but to vote, as he proposes, without a discussion of the document would be extremely irregular. If no delegation has anything to say on an individual section of the document submitted for discussion and comment, of course we can vote. The representative of the United Kingdom clearly believes that the document is excellent and therefore there need be no discussion, just a vote.

Explanations of vote are normal practice, too, and of course it will be applied here today. I assure you, Mr. President, and the representative of the United Kingdom that the Soviet delegation will explain its vote after the vote on the whole document. But we have convened here today not simply to vote but to discuss the document submitted to us. That is the correct procedure - not to mention the democratic principles of the United Nations, which are so often referred to by many delegations, including that of the United Kingdom, in their statements.

I believe that to go straight to the vote now would be extremely improper and wrong, because the Soviet delegation has many comments to make on the document before the vote. And, who know, there may suddenly be a miracle and the representative of the United Kingdom may even agree with some of the comments made by the Soviet delegation. Why does the United Kingdom delegation want to refute everything that might be said and not want to listen to any comments but simply vote at once on the document? Such a procedure would be improper, and we are amazed to hear such arguments today.

Mr. BARELLI (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation took part in the work of the Drafting Committee. With the United Kingdom delegation, we strove to approach our task in accordance with the terms of reference given us by this Council. We sought to do our job and our drafting in a spirit of honesty and objectivity. For that purpose we took account of everything that was said during the debate - everything that the representatives of the Administering Authority and everything that individuals taking part and providing the Council with information said. By the same token, we took account of observations made by delegations.

(Mr. Barelli, France)

A careful reading of our report shows that it is the very opposite of one-sided. Indeed, in certain cases, when members of the Drafting Committee felt that the truth was best served in this way, we did not hesitate to criticize any given situation prevailing in the Trust Territory or any aspect of the Administering Authority's management of the Territory. In other cases, on the other hand, we felt that the Administering Authority had fully complied with its mandate, and we so indicated.

We are of course ready to listen to anything that the Soviet delegation or any other delegations may have to say, but we believe that it would be counterproductive to reopen the debate. We are familiar with the arguments of all sides. We know that in certain cases the delegation of the Soviet Union has expressed an opinion or stated a view of the situation that does not correspond with the views of other Council members. It is clear that the report reflects such differences and takes account of the fact that three delegations held one opinion while the fourth held another.

(Mr. Barelli, France)

It is only to be expected that in a Council report the majority view prevails over the minority view. While we respect it, we cannot say that the minority view is the Council's view.

To avoid reopening the debate and repeating arguments with which we are becoming fully familiar, I would endorse the procedure proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom. I believe that that is the best procedure, one which would allow the Council to do its work in the best possible conditions.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): If the Council does not object, I believe that we can proceed, as we have done in past years, rather swiftly.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation has an objection - a very serious objection - to the procedure proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom and supported by the representative of France. The representative of France says that he is ready to listen to comments on the document which he, together with the United Kingdom, prepared. That is what he said, but the fact is that that is not what is being done. I do not understand what procedure is being followed here. The agenda speaks of the "examination" of the report of the Drafting Committee - not "voting" on that report.

Therefore, we must protest most seriously and forcefully against such a procedure here in the Trusteeship Council. It is improper, unfair and not in accordance with the entire body of practice of the United Nations.

Why should the representatives of the United Kingdom and France feel that one of the delegations in the Trusteeship Council should not be allowed to comment on a document they have prepared? This is not in accordance with the practice or the procedure of work of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I think at this juncture there are two options. The first is to proceed to a detailed discussion of the annex, section by section. The second is to follow the procedure that has been proposed - that is, to proceed rather swiftly to a section-by-section vote, after which delegations may comment on points they wish to stress.

(The President)

Does any delegation wish to speak on those two options? I do think that delegations have expressed their views and that a trend has emerged in favour of our very quickly examining the various sections, and then allowing delegations to offer comments after we have voted on these sections and the report as a whole. If there are no objections, we shall follow that procedure.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Once again I must state that the Soviet delegation firmly opposes the procedure proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom and regards it as illegal.

Mr. GOULDING (United Kingdom): I should like to address two comments to the representative of the Soviet Union. The first is that this is not a question of hurt feelings. This is not an issue where feelings are involved. This is a matter of the Trusteeship Council carrying out its functions, carrying out its obligations under the Charter. The feelings of my delegation are certainly not hurt, and I am sure the feelings of the Soviet delegation are not hurt either.

Secondly, I would not wish the Council to leave this part of its discussion with the impression that there has been some attempt to muzzle the delegation of the Soviet Union, to prevent the delegation of the Soviet Union from expressing its views on the questions before us. The Council has now been in session for nearly four weeks; delegations have had many opportunities to express their views. Moreover, with specific reference to the document in front of us, the delegation of the Soviet Union had a standing invitation to work with the Drafting Committee on the preparation of the document and to give full expression to its views then.

In these circumstances, my delegation fully shares the view of the delegation of France that it would not be appropriate today, on the last day of the Council's session, to reopen a general debate on all the issues which have been so fully discussed during the last nearly four weeks.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to clarify once again what is going on here in the

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Trusteeship Council. The Soviet delegation is not proposing a reopening of the general debate. The Soviet delegation is advocating a discussion in the Trusteeship Council of the document submitted by the Drafting Committee. That would be in accordance with the rules of procedure, with today's agenda and with your earlier statement, Mr. President. This document has been prepared and it should be discussed.

Now it is proposed that we should not discuss the document, but just vote on it. What is going on here? Why should the delegations that were members of the Drafting Committee feel that this document is perfect and without any flaws? Why should the delegations which prepared this document feel that they can prevent other delegations from expressing themselves on the substance of the document?

I am not even talking about the fact that at the beginning of this meeting you, Sir, as President of the Trusteeship Council, took a decision that we would examine this document section by section - examine it, not vote on it - and that once we had finished that examination we would vote. That was your decision, and I must insist once again that the working procedure of the organs of the United Nations, including the Trusteeship Council, be complied with, that the established practice and rules of procedure be respected.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): As I have just said, I propose that we follow traditional procedure. The verbatim records of past years do in fact make clear that we have always followed a certain procedure.

Nevertheless, if the Council wishes to depart from previous procedure, I am prepared to do so. It is obvious that, as President, I am in the Council's hands. I gather, however, that there is a general sentiment in favour of the proposal that we proceed to vote on the Drafting Committee's report section by section, after which delegations could of course make their comments.

Would the representative of the Soviet Union agree to having the Council proceed as it has done in past years, namely, to vote on the annex to the report section by section, after which delegations would express their opinions or make any points they wished to make.

I would appeal to the Soviet Union delegation's spirit of co-operation and understanding. If it has no objection, we shall follow traditional procedure.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I have already repeatedly expressed my objections to the procedure being proposed.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I believe that we can now vote on section A, paragraphs 1 to 13, of document T/L.1229.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not think I understood the President. Is he proposing that we now vote on the sections of the document or that we continue to discuss them? If the President is proposing a vote on section A of the document, I would once again repeat that the Soviet delegation opposes such a method of proceeding in the Trusteeship Council.

Mr. PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Indeed, what I am now proposing - and this is a procedure that may, it seems to me, be followed in light of the opinions expressed by various delegations - is to proceed to a section-by-section vote, with delegations afterwards having the opportunity to make their comments.

(Mr. President)

I would draw the Soviet representative's attention to the fact that I am following the procedure followed in past years. On the basis of the verbatim records that I have before me, this was the procedure used in 1981 and 1980. I do not have the verbatim records for preceding years, but I believe we have a sound precedent and I would appeal to the delegation of the Soviet Union to enable us to settle this matter in the spirit of understanding that governs the work of this Council.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We always try to see to it that the work of the United Nations bodies reflects a maximum of understanding and agreement, but in this case the Soviet delegation is being refused understanding by others.

The representatives of the United Kingdom and France, having prepared this working document, now do not want to submit it to discussion, contrary to the rules of procedure and to established practice.

The Soviet delegation cannot - I repeat, cannot - agree to such an illegal approach to the work of the Trusteeship Council. Our demand is completely proper and legitimate: a document has been prepared by the Drafting Committee and, in accordance with the Council's rules of procedure and with United Nations practice, that document must be examined section by section. The Soviet delegation has stated its views on section A and is ready to vote on that section, on the condition that the Soviet delegation will be then able to make comments on section B as well, just as it is prepared to listen to the comments of other delegations on that section.

If you are proposing, Mr. President, that we proceed to vote section by section without a discussion, the Soviet delegation must once again state that we disagree with such an approach.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I am of course in the hands of the Council, and I wish everyone to be able to speak. The Soviet representative has said that he is prepared to vote on section A of the report and that we might thereafter examine section B, hearing comments before proceeding to the vote.

We now have two possible approaches, and I would like to hear the Council's views before we take a decision. Can we now proceed on the basis of the first of the proposals made, namely, to vote section by section as usual and then hear comments by delegations, or should we vote immediately on section A and then hear comments on section B, vote on section B - and so on for all the remaining sections?

Mr. BARELLI (France) (interpretation from French): I understand that the delegation of the Soviet Union has a preference and other delegations have other preferences with regard to procedure. On the other hand, I fail to understand why the representative of the Soviet Union should describe the procedure being proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom, which I endorse, as illegal. That procedure is, in fact, customary procedure in the Trusteeship Council. I have before me the verbatim record of last year's meeting on the examination of the report, held on 11 June 1981. It is contained in document T/PV.1522. In it, I note that in response to a proposal by one delegation, the President proposed that the annex to the draft report be voted on section by section and that afterwards delegations should be called on to speak on points they wished to stress. That is what the President of the Council said last year. Further on, he said:

"As I understand it, the Council is now ready to take a vote on section A,

'General', which comprises paragraphs 1 to 11." (T/PV.1522, p. 26)

He then put to the vote section A of the report. The President then put to the vote section B, "Political advancement", comprising paragraphs 12 to 22 inclusive - and so on, through to the end of the report.

Consequently, if that was the procedure followed last year, I believe we should follow exactly the same procedure this year.

Mr. GOULDING (United Kingdom): Time is passing and the Council has much yet to do. I wonder whether the most sensible procedure now would not be for me to ask you, Mr. President, to put to a vote the proposal that I originally made - that the Council, in considering this part of its report, should follow the procedure of previous years, namely, to vote on the draft section by section and then for delegations that wish to do so to make general points about the draft.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Time is indeed passing. Time that we have wasted here on this procedural discussion could have been used to good purpose to discuss each of the sections of the Drafting Committee's report.

The Soviet delegation is not to blame for this loss of time. Rather, the delegations of the United Kingdom and France are to blame.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

The representative of France and the United Kingdom have asked that general remarks be made at the end of the meeting, but the Soviet delegation does not have general comments; it has comments on specific paragraphs and specific points, and we should like to make them before the vote on the report, in accordance with all the rules of procedure and the usual practice of the United Nations and its organs. That is precisely what we are trying to do here. References to the procedure followed in earlier years - last year, for instance - do not add anything to what has already been said. Last year perhaps individual delegations had no comments on specific paragraphs or sections and they concluded that they could make general statements after the vote. But this year the situation is somewhat different. The Soviet delegation has comments on individual sections and individual paragraphs of the document, and we continue to insist on an orderly approach to the work of the Trusteeship Council. If the delegations of the United Kingdom and France do not agree but continue to insist that one delegation will not be allowed to present its comments on a document submitted to the Committee, the Soviet delegation is ready to have this procedural question put to a vote. We ask that the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council reflect the fact that the conclusions and recommendations were not examined in the Trusteeship Council, because of the position adopted by the delegations of the United Kingdom and France.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to sum up the discussion. The delegation of the United Kingdom has made a proposal on the question of procedure. The proposal is that the Council vote on the draft report section by section and then that delegations be allowed to make general statements. I now put that proposal to the vote.

The proposal of the United Kingdom was adopted by 3 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Council will therefore now vote on the annex to the report in document T/L.1229, section by section. I put to the vote first section A, "General", which contains paragraphs 1 to 13 inclusive.

Section A was adopted by 2 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I shall now put to the vote section B, "Political advancement", which contains paragraphs 14 to 35 inclusive.

Section B was adopted by 2 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I now put to the vote section C, "Economic advancement", containing paragraphs 36 to 68 inclusive.

Section C was adopted by 2 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Next we shall vote on section D, "Social advancement", containing paragraphs 69 to 75 inclusive.

Section D was adopted by 2 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I shall now put to the vote section E, "Educational advancement", which contains paragraph 76 to 93 inclusive.

Section E was adopted by 2 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Council will now vote on section F, "Constitutional developments and progress towards self-government or independence", containing paragraphs 94 to 110 inclusive.

Section F was adopted by 2 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Council will now turn to paragraph 4 of the report of the Drafting Committee contained in document T/L.1229. In that paragraph the Committee recommends to the Trusteeship Council that it adopt the revised working paper on conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (T/L.1228 and Add.1 to 3) as the basic text for the chapter on conditions in that Territory to be included in the next report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The report states that the Committee recommends to the Trusteeship Council that it adopt the revised working paper on conditions in the Trust Territory in the Pacific Islands and it gives a reference to certain documents. I should like to know where I may find the documents referred to.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thought I had indicated that the document in question was document T/L.1228 and Add.1-3. If I failed to indicate that, I apologize.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I have before me document T/L.1228. This document was issued on 26 April. One addendum was issued on 28 April, another on 6 May and still another on 7 May. This is a working paper prepared by the Secretariat. It says nowhere here that it is a revised document. Who revised it? What revision took place? Where does it say that it is a revised document? We have before us a paragraph referring to a revised document, but we do not see what revision was undertaken. What is the revised element in this document? We do not understand why it should be called a revised document.

That was our first point. The second is that this document, as I understand it, was not considered as such by the Trusteeship Council. It was prepared by the Secretariat. As members recall, at the last session too the Soviet delegation expressed some doubts as to whether the Trusteeship Council should be voting on these documents and recommending them to the Security Council without having examined them.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I call upon Mr. Abebe, who wishes to give some clarification on this point.

Mr. ABEBE (Secretary of the Council): In the past the working paper prepared by the Secretariat was revised in the light of additional information provided by the Administering Authority in the course of the session. But in 1979 the Council decided to include all statements made during a session in one paper, of the type which was distributed this morning to members. As a result, the working paper summarizing the annual report of the Administering Authority is no longer revised. It becomes the first section of part II of the annual report to the Security Council.

- The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I did not read out the symbol number of the document correctly, and I apologize for that. It should be document T/L.1228/Add.1, 2 and 3. But I would note that the recommendation in the report of the Drafting Committee is that the Council, drawing on the work done by the Secretariat, should adopt this paper as an integral part of the Trusteeship Council's report to the Security Council. It seems to me that there is nothing in this recommendation that is incompatible with United Nations practice.

If the clarification just given is satisfactory to the representative of the Soviet Union, I propose that we now vote on paragraph 4 of the report.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Do I understand correctly that the word "revised" means that the working paper prepared by the United Nations Secretariat, which appears in document T/L.1228, distributed on 26 April, and the quite voluminous document submitted to us today by the Secretariat, which reflects the discussion which has taken place during this session of the Trusteeship Council, should be viewed as one unified whole to be included in the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council?

That was my first question. Secondly, I should like to repeat that the basic working paper prepared by the Secretariat even before the Trusteeship Council session should be discussed and used by the Drafting Committee in the preparation of the report.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I call on Mr. Abebe to comment on what has just been said.

Mr. ABEBE (Secretary of the Council): Beginning in 1979, the Council adopted a procedure which differed somewhat from that of earlier years. It is the following: The basic text for section 1 of part II of the report, "Outline of Conditions" is document T/L.1228/Add.1-3, the summary of the Administering Authority's annual report. Section 2 of part II is a summary of the discussion throughout the session, drawn up after consultations with each of the delegations concerned.

That is the procedure that we have followed in the past three years and we intend to follow it in future if the Council agrees.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Following that explanation, I put to the vote paragraph 4 of the report of the Drafting Committee.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 3 votes to 1, with no abstentions.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Council will now turn to paragraph 5 of the report of the Drafting Committee, which reads:

"The Committee also recommends that the Trusteeship Council adopt the conclusions and recommendations set out in the annex and include them at the end of the report." (T/L.1229)

I now put to the vote paragraph 5.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 2 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I shall now put to the vote the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1229) as a whole.

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

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): My delegation voted in favour of the report to the Security Council as a whole, but we have taken no position on the recommendations and conclusions of the Trusteeship Council in its report.

Indeed, my delegation abstained in the vote on the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report of the Drafting Committee, as they are addressed to the United States as the Administering Authority. Of course, by so doing we in no way wished to indicate that we do not support many of the views expressed in the report. But, as we have said in the past, it is much more important that we receive those conclusions and recommendations, take them into serious consideration and then decide on the appropriate way in which to act, as opposed to expressing our position through a vote for or against them.

I wish to assure the Council that we shall study those conclusions and recommendations with great care in the course of the year to come and that we shall, of course, try to the extent possible to bring to fruition during that time the recommendations of the Council which will most benefit the peoples of Micronesia.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): A vote has just been taken on the report of the Drafting Committee, on which the Soviet delegation had, and still has, many comments. Unfortunately the Trusteeship Council did not deem it necessary to listen to the comments at the appropriate time, and thereby it violated the rules of procedure of the United Nations.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

The Soviet delegation voted against all sections of the report of the Drafting Committee on conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, since that report does not reflect the true situation in the Trust Territory. It contains conclusions and recommendations, comments and references which the Soviet delegation feels are greatly at odds with the real, existing situation in Micronesia. We are firmly convinced that in its report to the Security Council the Trusteeship Council should present a clear picture of how the Administering Authority has fulfilled its obligations under the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement in the period under review. The Council should draw the appropriate conclusions from this and, on that basis, adopt the appropriate recommendations and conclusions with regard to the implementation of measures by the Administering Authority.

The Soviet delegation has already had the opportunity of making a number of specific comments on section A of this document. We hope that the comments we have made, and are making, will be duly reflected in the appropriate sections of the report to the Security Council.

The entire course of our discussions at this session of the Trusteeship Council, last year's report, the statements of representatives and special representatives of the delegation of the United States of America, the written and oral communications and petitions presented to the Council, and the answers given to questions by the members of the Council have shown very clearly that the United States, as Administering Authority, is not at all complying with its obligations under the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement. The basic goals of trusteeship are, as we know,

"... a. to further international peace and security;

b. to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence ...

c. to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion ..."

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

This report does not reflect the deficiencies in the performance of the Administering Authority in these various areas. It contains a number of passages welcoming the activities of the Administering Authority in the Territory. The Soviet delegation can only interpret that as encouragement, an incentive to the United States, the Administering Authority, to continue its policy of fragmenting and militarizing the Territory and, in the final analysis, turning the Territory into its own colonial appendage.

In several areas the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands has not changed for the better over the past years; on the contrary, it has deteriorated. First and foremost this is the case with regard to political development in the Territory. The United States has not fulfilled its basic obligation to maintain the political unity of the Territory; rather, it has contributed to its dismemberment, the fragmentation. In 1975 part of the Trust Territory of the Mariana Islands obtained the status of free association, in the framework of political union with the United States. In the report it is already virtually called a state of the United States. In the past year the United States Administration has been carrying out active negotiations with the representatives of two or three other Micronesian groups on granting to them the status of free association with the United States. We consider that tantamount to pure and simple annexation by the United States.

With respect to constitutional progress and progress towards self-determination and independence, the report of the Drafting Committee basically endorses the policy of the Administering Authority aimed at the dismemberment of the Territory and the artificial creation of island entities fully dependent on the Administering Authority in the political, social and cultural spheres. For instance, the document says:

"The Council notes that, in 1981, further progress was made in the negotiations on political status and that these negotiations were continuing throughout the forty-ninth session of the Council." (T/L.1229, annex, para. 97)

We feel that that statement on the part of the Trusteeship Council is extremely irresponsible, because the Council cannot describe the negotiations between the Administering Authority and the representatives of the Micronesian entities as "progress", for the simple reason that the Council has not been able to judge the results of those negotiations.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

The Trusteeship Council was told by the Administering Authority that the negotiations were secret and that the Council would not be informed of what was going on in them but only of the results. So what "progress" can the Trusteeship Council report to the Security Council? What are the results of the closed, secret negotiations with representatives of the Micronesian people?

The Soviet delegation cannot agree with the view of the authors of the draft report that the negotiations between the United States and the Micronesian entities, dependent upon the United States in all sectors, can really achieve the objective of promoting the true independence of the Micronesian people or even be described as progress towards the achievement of self-determination by the people of the Territory. The measures being taken by the Trusteeship Council constitute a form of cover-up, hiding the illegal, anti-constitutional activities of the Administering Authority in Micronesia. We know that for many years the negotiations have been carried on behind closed doors in an atmosphere of secrecy and diktat vis-à-vis the Micronesians. Indeed, we have heard representatives of Micronesia speak of that here. The negotiations are being carried on behind the back of the United Nations.

The Soviet delegation can in no way agree with the statement in the report that so-called free association is not incompatible with the Trusteeship Agreement. We continue to believe that such a conclusion by the Council is extremely premature and unfounded. In making such judgements the Council is taking on itself great responsibility, in that any such statement by the Council constitutes a weapon in the hands of the Administering Authority to put pressure on the Micronesian people. As I have said, the statement in question is premature. The Micronesian people have not yet expressed their views on this question; yet the Council is already proposing to it a formula, a decision. It is thus working hand in glove with the Administering Authority and is not protecting the interests of the Micronesian people.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

The report says practically nothing about the military activities of the Administering Authority in the Territory, military activities that in no way accord with the tasks, goals and principles of the United Nations with respect to the promotion of international peace and security. Members of the Council know very well that the military activities being carried out by the United States in the Territory are significant and they know of the plans of the Administering Authority in imposing agreements and treaties on the Micronesians behind closed doors - plans to expand, consolidate and strengthen the military presence of the United States in the Territory. In its conclusions and recommendations the Trusteeship Council remains silent on that matter. Is that proper? Is it appropriate? Does it accord with the Council's mandate? Is it in accordance with the task entrusted to the Council? Hardly.

We know that in the subsidiary agreements under the Compact of Free Association the United States reserves the right to use the air space of and waters around the Micronesian islands for from 30 to 100 years for military purposes. But in its report the Council says not a word about that. In that report, prepared by the delegations of the United Kingdom and France, all that is spoken of is "progress" in the negotiations. What progress? Agreements on a military presence for the United States in the Trust Territory for 100 years. Such is the progress that the United States wishes. We cannot subscribe to that.

Everyone knows, too, about the broad use by the United States of the Trust Territory of Micronesia as a testing ground for nuclear weaponry. But the report drafted by the delegations of the United Kingdom and France is careful to avoid mentioning that, as it would be an embarrassment. Instead, it speaks only of a resettlement of the population, of population movements. Not only at this session but at many earlier sessions attention has been drawn repeatedly to the results of the military activities of the United States on the Trust Territory. Attention has been drawn repeatedly to the fact that the United States Administering Authority has not taken urgent, effective measures to eliminate all the vestiges of the effects on the population of the nuclear tests. Where is that reflected in the

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Drafting Committee's report? Nowhere. The report merely expresses very weakly the Council's concern about the level of medical services and the social and economic problems of the people resettled from the islands, with no reference to the causes of those problems. The Council is now expressing its concern about the inadequate medical services, but not a word is said about the Administering Authority's activities that led to the situation in the Trust Territory, or the fact that the measures that it has taken are inadequate to solve the problems and to promote the economic and social development of the people.

The report says that:

"The Council notes with satisfaction that nearly all of the public land in the Trust Territory has now been turned over to the respective constitutional Governments." (T/L.1229, para. 7)

But at this session, as well as earlier sessions, it has been pointed out that a great deal of land was taken away from the population and given to the Administering Authority's military authorities for military activities by the United States.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

The delegation of the Soviet Union cannot agree with the conclusions and recommendations relating to economic, social, cultural and agricultural development, to employment, to medical services and to many other spheres. The report does not assess the results of the activities of the Administering Authority in the Islands and this too is tantamount to covering up the fact that the Administering Authority has not carried out its obligation to promote the well-being of the Territory under its administration. Moreover we think it is extremely serious that the authors of the report have tried to introduce recommendations with regard to the situation in the Territory which are addressed not to the Administering Authority itself, but to the local governing bodies, the local organs of self-government.

The Administering Authority has led the Trust Territory into the situation we find it in today. The Administering Authority is shirking the responsibility for its own activities, trying to place that responsibility on the Micronesians themselves. The Trusteeship Council, through this document prepared by the British and French delegations, is actually helping the Administering Authority in this effort.

The conclusions and recommendations do not refer to the Trusteeship Council's co-operation with the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples - despite the fact that these are items on the agenda of this session. The Council has examined these items and views have been expressed. That is very appropriate indeed, because the question of the destiny of the people of Micronesia is a component part of the problem of decolonization. The people of Micronesia are not free, they are governed by others, they are administered by others. Therefore, the United Nations must continue to bear responsibility for this Territory - authentic, genuine responsibility, not just technical responsibility - and that responsibility must be reflected here, as should have been the case from the outset, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, rather than hiding behind questions of procedure by refusing to include certain provisions in the report of the Council, on the pretext that the format does not allow a two or three page increase in the size of the report. The United Nations must shoulder responsibility for the Trust

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Territory of the Pacific Islands until its people exercises its inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

For those reasons, the Soviet delegation has voted against the report prepared by the Drafting Committee, and against the recommendations and conclusions contained therein. We are deeply convinced that the United Nations, including the Trusteeship Council, must do everything possible to ensure that the obstructions created by the United States to the genuine political, economic and social development of a unified Micronesia, are removed, and that the necessary conditions are established to ensure that the Micronesian people can achieve genuine freedom and independence.

Mr. GOULDING (United Kingdom): My delegation will not reply to the points of substance made by the representative of the Soviet Union in his explanation of vote just now. Our views on those questions, like the views of the Soviet Union, are well known. I see no need to state them again today.

But my delegation does feel obliged to rebut what the representative of the Soviet Union said at the beginning of his statement about the conclusions and recommendations in our report having been adopted without discussion.

The Trusteeship Council has had an exhaustive discussion during the last four weeks. All delegations have had the opportunity to express their views. All delegations have done so. The Drafting Committee performed its task in the full knowledge of the views of the Soviet delegation and of the other delegations in this Council. A full summary of those views will of course be contained in the Trusteeship Council's report to the Security Council. Moreover, the Soviet delegation had a standing invitation to join the Drafting Committee in its work. It chose not to take up that invitation. That, of course, was its right. But what is not acceptable is that the Soviet delegation should now complain that no account was taken of its views.

In short, the conclusions and recommendations have been adopted today in accordance with the time-honoured procedures of this Council. Let us hear nothing more about alleged breaches of the rules of procedure or of the normal practice of the United Nations.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Do I understand correctly that we have now concluded the voting on the report of the Drafting Committee and that we are therefore not going to be voting further on that document?

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): For the benefit of the representative of the Soviet Union, I would specify that we have concluded the voting on the report of the Drafting Committee as a whole.

I would add that, of course, we shall proceed to consider agenda items 11 and 12, which were the subject of informal consultations earlier. The Council will also take up a very minor point concerning our agenda that is still pending and that poses no real problem.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Now that I know where we are and before we proceed to the next items, I should like to respond to the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom.

The working procedures of the United Nations are as well known to the delegation of the Soviet Union as to the delegation of the United Kingdom. Therefore, to say that no violation of those procedures has been committed is not well founded. If some document is prepared in the United Nations, that document must of course be examined. That is my first comment. Secondly, the comment of the representative of the United Kingdom that the Drafting Committee knew the views of the Soviet Union on these problems and that there was therefore no need for the Council to examine the report of the Drafting Committee does not justify what has occurred, for the simple reason that the report of the Drafting Committee was prepared by two delegations. Despite their statements that the views of the Soviet delegation on the problems in question were known to them, that report does not reflect the views of the Soviet delegation. It does not reflect the Soviet delegation's approach to the problem, nor does it reflect the Soviet delegation's assessment of the existing situation in the Trust Territory.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

The representative of the United Kingdom said that the Soviet delegation had had an opportunity to participate in the work in the Drafting Committee. It is true that any delegation can participate in the work of the Drafting Committee if it so wishes. It is its sovereign right to participate or not to participate. However, using the fact that a delegation decided not to do so as justification for not allowing it to present its comments and views on the final product is in our opinion extremely improper and, I would say, not very responsible.

Mr. BARELLI (France) (interpretation from French): I do not wish to engage in polemics. I would simply repeat what I said earlier. First, our Drafting Committee was appointed by all of the Trusteeship Council members and therefore enjoyed the Council's confidence. Secondly, each delegation had an opportunity to express its views. Each delegation did so here and, as the representative of the United Kingdom said, every delegation had an opportunity to participate in the work of the Drafting Committee and to state its views at the Committee's meetings. Thirdly, the representative of the Soviet Union has noted and deplored the fact that the Drafting Committee's report does not reflect the opinion of the Soviet delegation. That is quite natural, given that the Soviet Union's position on certain issues is a minority one so far as the Trusteeship Council is concerned. It is therefore natural for the majority opinion to be reflected in the report of the Drafting Committee, not the minority opinion.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I think it would be superfluous for the Soviet delegation to comment on the French representative's brazen statement, which reflects the democratic institutions and procedures adhered to by some of the delegations in the Trusteeship Council. Such a blatant statement that the so-called majority view is to be reflected and the minority view ignored makes any further words in this regard completely useless.

Mr. BARELLI (France) (interpretation from French): I believe that the essence of democracy is a majority opinion that characterizes the body from which it emanates.

The minority view will be reflected in the report, inasmuch as discussion is summed up therein, and since the view of each delegation, whatever it may have been, is or will be reflected in the report as a whole, how, with regard to conclusions and recommendations, could anyone wish the Council to recommend thinking that represents a minority of its membership? Such is impossible. When a body proffers recommendations, it can only proffer those that reflect the thinking of its majority. That, I believe, is commonsense.

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 36/68) (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 (interpretation from French): At the Council's 1535th meeting on 28 May 1982, members took part in the discussions concerning those two items and explained the respective positions of their Governments.

At this juncture, and on the basis of informal consultations that took place among members, the Council will proceed to take a decision on the two items taken together.

(The President)

In this connexion, 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 end of the forty-ninth session concerning the attainment by the Trust Territory, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter, and in particular Article 83, of self-government or independence, 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.

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL [Security Council resolution 70 (1949)] (T/L.1230)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I call on the Secretary of the Council, who wishes to raise a minor point concerning our agenda.

Mr. ABEBE (Secretary of the Council): Last year the Council decided to include its agenda as adopted in the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council. That has not been done in document T/L.1230, but we shall rectify this omission and include the agenda in the report of the Council to the Security Council this year, if there is no objection.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In accordance with the decision taken at last year's session, the agenda will be included in the report (T/L.1230).

Part I of the Council's report is entitled "Organization and activities of the Trusteeship Council". In completing that part, the Secretariat will follow the procedure adopted last year - that is, using the official records of the Council's meetings during the current session. I wish to add that, in accordance with the decision taken by the Council at its 1536th meeting, on 1 June 1982, the section entitled "Examination of petitions" in part I will include a summary of statements made during the discussion on each communication and petition.

(The President)

Council members will note that part II of the report contains chapters on conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. In accordance with the decision taken by the Council earlier at this meeting, part II will consist of the working paper on conditions in that Trust Territory (T/L.1228/Add.1 to 3) as well as sections entitled "Discussion in the Council and opinions expressed". I understand that the members of the Council have already received a draft text of those sections and that, after members have had time to study them and to make any necessary corrections on the basis of the records of the Council's meetings, they will be incorporated in the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council. I also understand from the Secretariat that a summary of the statement made at our 1538th meeting by the representative of the Soviet Union will be included in those sections as appropriate.

Finally, following past practice and decisions, part II will be completed by the addition, at the end of the report, of the conclusions and recommendations contained in document T/L.1229 as adopted by the Council earlier at this meeting.

Those, then, are the contents of the Trusteeship Council's report to the Security Council. Does any member wish to comment on the draft report in document T/L.1230?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We should like once again to draw the attention of members of the Council to the fact that the procedure used in drawing up the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council has a number of defects. At the last session we proposed reducing the number of defects and making the report more concise and a better instrument for use by the Security Council. In particular, we drew attention to the fact that the headings of the individual parts of the report were not in accordance with the agenda. The Soviet delegation feels that this defect could be very easily corrected by adding one or two lines as headings of individual parts of the report to bring them into accordance with the Council's agenda. That is our first comment.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Secondly, individual sections of the report, before describing the work of the Council at this session, have preambular parts, as it were, in the form of historical summaries, giving the reader some idea of what has gone on in the past. But other sections have no such preambular parts. We feel that perhaps, without making the report much longer, we could include one or two paragraphs that would be "historical excursions", as it were - stating how and when the questions were examined and what decisions were taken. That applies in particular to the question of the achievement of self-government or independence by the Trust Territory, in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, as well as to the question of co-operation with the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the Committee on decolonization.

The members of the Drafting Committee have used that method and have included such historical summaries in the section on the visiting missions of the Council to the Territory. I think it would be only logical for us to add one or two paragraphs and thereby to those sections of the report which have not already been dealt with in this way.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): If I correctly understood the statement just made by the representative of the Soviet Union, he would like the headings used in the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council to be brought into line with those used in the agenda. Moreover, he would like to see a preamble included in regard to various items, giving the historical background in order better to inform those who will read this report.

Mr. MACLAY (United Kingdom): Just like the Soviet delegation, my delegation is concerned that the report which we submit to the Security Council should be concise, accurate and readable. We have over the past two years as a Council accepted certain modifications to the format of the report at the specific suggestion of the Soviet delegation. Indeed, the modification I introduced earlier today was made at the request of my Soviet colleague.

The exchange that Mr. Berezovsky has just initiated about the most appropriate formulations to be used in the earlier part of the report has become rather customary in the Committee. It has also been pursued in informal consultations. I would stress that the Drafting Committee and, indeed the other members of the Council have in the past been willing to look at any proposals which the Soviet delegation might make.

However, in the cases mentioned today by the Soviet representative, we have considered informally that it would be wrong in the first instance to weigh down chapter headings more than they already are with references to General Assembly resolutions and documents of the United Nations. Secondly, we are not happy with the idea in his second proposal, which is to have what the Soviet representative described as "historical excursions" in the first two paragraphs.

(Mr. Maclay, United Kingdom)

As someone with a historical background, I would on a personal level leap with alacrity on the idea of bringing a further historical dimension to this report, but I do feel we have a responsibility both to the Security Council and to our readership in the United Nations at large not to make this document too heavy and not to fill it with material which refers to other published documents of the United Nations

I would therefore appeal to the Soviet delegation not to insist on pursuing this question. We took certain ideas of his into account last year and have done so this year and it would make our task very much easier if we could agree now to submit the document as it is emerging to the Security Council without pursuing these points.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.