

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



JUN 29 1983

Distr.
GENERAL

T/PV.1558
9 June 1983

ENGLISH

Fiftieth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 27 May 1983, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom)

Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 September 1982: Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued)

Examination of petitions listed in the annex to the agenda (continued)

Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1982 (continued)

Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to observe the Plebiscite in Palau, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, February 1983 (continued)

Programme of work

Statement by the President

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

EXAMINATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 1982: TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (T/1853; T/L.1235 and Add.1) (continued)

EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS LISTED IN THE ANNEX TO THE AGENDA (see T/1852/Add.1) (continued)

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS, 1982 (T/1850) (continued)

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO OBSERVE THE PLEBISCITE IN PALAU, TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS, FEBRUARY 1983 (T/1851) (continued)

The PRESIDENT: I should like to propose that, subject to the agreement of the Council, we should finish asking questions of the Chairman who led the two Visiting Missions, Mr. Poudade, and dispose of the actual agenda items on the reports of the two Visiting Missions at our next meeting, when I understand the representatives of France and the United Kingdom will be submitting a draft resolution on each report. That would be the occasion for anyone who wished to make any statement on the subject of these reports to do so. I would like to confine our consideration of the reports today to completing the brief factual questioning of Mr. Poudade which we started before lunch.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I am in complete agreement with the procedure you propose, Mr. President. I should merely like it to be specified and understood by the members of the Council that if the other delegations that participated in the Visiting Mission to Palau and were invited to attend the meetings of the Trusteeship Council - that is, the delegations of Fiji and Papua New Guinea - wish to add any comments to or shed any light on what I may say, they are free to do so.

The PRESIDENT: I am sure that all members of the Council would welcome any intervention by either the representative of Papua New Guinea or the representative of Fiji in connection with the report of the Visiting Mission on which they have served.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I have another question regarding the report of the regular Visiting Mission of the Trusteeship Council. In paragraph 120 we read that the total annual income of the 5,000 people on the island of Fefan amounts to only \$5,000. A simple calculation reveals that the yearly income per capita is \$1. Is that really so, or is this a typing error in the report? If this is really the correct figure, it seems to me that it speaks for itself as regards the economic situation of the population of the Territory.

The PRESIDENT: I had assumed myself that that represented only the cash income and did not include non-cash goods and services, but I would be grateful if the representative of France could enlarge on that.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): At the meeting we had in Fefan that was the figure given to us and we have simply reproduced it. We have no other information. I think it is a question of \$5,000 in cash, but we printed what we were told by the traditional chief. He went on to say that, if the programmes referred to in paragraph 120 were not continued until his islands had achieved a greater degree of self-sufficiency, the worst was to be expected. Everything in that paragraph is what we heard and is in the records of the secretariat. I do not know if there are other sources of income, but that is exactly what was said.

The PRESIDENT: I intervene only to say that having had a little experience myself in the difficulties of assessing the incomes of people who live in subsistence-economy I know that there is often a danger that a cash income is taken to be the total income. I may be wrong, but I suspect that this would not include, for instance, fish which a man might pull out of the sea or coconuts which he would be growing. So sometimes these figures can be a little misleading. I wonder if the representative of the United States could help us on this. It is quite an important question.

Mr. KINNEY (United States of America): Indeed, you are correct, Sir. We are speaking here of a primarily subsistence farming and fishing community. I would note, however, that this is the largest agricultural community and producer in the Truk group. As an indication of cash income, the local informant may not have been including, for example, up to 20 teachers, who make \$4,000 to \$5,000 per annum each, and local government officials. But, as I say, that is a question of the local informant's information to the Mission.

The PRESIDENT: These are difficult statistical matters.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I understand the clarification, but that figure is so astounding that at first I could not believe that it was right. I did not believe that the per capita income of the population of - as has just been said by the representative of the United States - one of the most developed areas of the Territory agriculturally and in terms of the fisheries industry could be so miserably low. An income of \$1 per year per capita speaks for itself.

I shall not now refer further to the report of the regular Mission. We have a whole series of comments on this report but, in the light of the fact that you, Sir, have proposed that we make comments on the reports at one of our subsequent meetings, when the question of the Trusteeship Council's assessment of these reports will be raised, the Soviet delegation will take advantage of that opportunity to make those comments.

I should like to turn to the report of the Visiting Mission to Palau in 1983. First of all, I have a question of a general nature. At the beginning of the report there is a description - I would call it an interpretation - of the Compact of Free Association. I understand that this interpretation was the work of the members of the Mission themselves. It was not, of course, the interpretation of the entire Trusteeship Council, and I assume that it was not the interpretation of the Administering Authority. Is that correct?

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): First of all, I question the use by the representative of the Soviet Union of the word "interpretation" in connection with the summary of the Compact of Free Association in chapter II. It is not an interpretation, and I would like to explain the origin. We each prepared a part of this report, including the secretariat, and then we approved the entire report. Secondly, we had previously drafted jointly and approved all the conclusions and recommendations. Mr. Goulding, who is now United Kingdom Ambassador to Angola, undertook to prepare a summary of the Compact of Free Association and related agreements. That summary, which appears in chapter II is neither the summary nor the interpretation of the Administering Authority; it is the summary of all the members of the Visiting Mission. As the member from Papua New Guinea, Mr. Igo, a director of the Pacific at Port Moresby was absent, we sent him this summary by the diplomatic pouch to Papua New Guinea and we subsequently received his agreement. So, I repeat, this was drafted by Mr. Goulding, approved by all the members present in New York, sent to Port Moresby and approved by the representative of Papua New Guinea.

Secondly, this is not an interpretation, but rather an objective summary. Thirdly, this document is not a document of the Administering Authority; it is a document of the members of the Visiting Mission. I would add that it would have been a pleasure for us to benefit also from the interpretation of the Compact of Free Association which could have been given to us by the representative of the Soviet Union.

The PRESIDENT: Perhaps I could express my gratitude to a representative of my own country, Mr. Goulding, for undertaking what must have been an extraordinarily arduous job - to boil down a very complicated document into a few pages. I personally thought it read very well, and I think it may be of help to all of us in understanding an extraordinarily difficult bit of legislation.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I agree with you Sir, that this really is a very complex piece of work. It is very hard to compress such documents as the Compact and the 16 related agreements into three pages and at the same time try to reflect all the necessary elements of all these documents. Unfortunately, what makes you so

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

happy Mr. President, is precisely what alarms me. However, since we agreed that we were going to be asking questions now and not getting into a discussion and expressing views, we shall follow that procedure.

I have another question on this report. When the Trusteeship Council Mission was in the Territory the plebiscite was taking place. Did the members of the Mission receive any kind of petitions from the population? If so, I should like to know how many such petitions there were and where it would be possible to get copies of them and familiarize ourselves with their contents.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I think that "petition" can mean many things, so I will try to summarize what I can say about this. Most of the letters - let us call them petitions - drew the attention of the Visiting Mission to the so-called Guam vote affair. This appears in the report under the heading "polling in Guam" and also in our conclusions. I received and Mr. Abebe arranged to have distributed at once to all the members of the Visiting Mission letters addressed to me personally - in particular, one from Senator Koshiha - drawing the Mission's attention to the polling place in Guam.

Furthermore - and I am broadening the concept of "petition" - a person who did not live there asked to meet me to show me a letter that he had received from a relative in Guam. All these documents that we received are reflected in one way or another in the report. They are filed by the secretariat and can be inspected. I will not go into details of all the private and public meetings that we had, but with regard to petitions we have had many letters on this subject.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from

Russian): The reason I asked that question was that it was not clear to me from the report whether there were such petitions and, if so, how many of them there were. There is mention in the report of what are called "irregularities" during the plebiscite. The representative of France said that most of the letters received dealt with that. How many were received altogether? Was there any calculation of how many there were? There could have been three or 300 - we do not know from the report. What kinds of contacts were there between the Visiting Mission and the population of the Territory?

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I think there is a

slight misunderstanding between the delegation of the USSR and my own. If the delegation of the Soviet Union would be kind enough to give me the numbers of the paragraphs I can look at them and we shall be able to understand each other better. The Soviet representative speaks about petitions and so on. There were no such petitions as are officially submitted to the Council requesting that they should be published and so on. If, therefore, he could give me a specific reference and tell me what he means by "petition" I could do my best to answer. He says that he does not know what contacts we had with the population. I thought there was a chapter here that answers that - the chapter covering the itinerary of the Visiting Mission, which appears in annex I with a map attached. These members can see the contacts we had. In addition, there are paragraphs 73 to 87, which describe exactly what contacts we had with the population. So, if the Soviet representative wishes to have more precise details, perhaps he would refer to specific paragraphs.

The PRESIDENT: Perhaps I could lend a helping hand here, because I think

there is a misunderstanding in the use of words and I dare say we have some interpretation difficulties. It seems to me that the Visiting Mission received a great many oral communications and possibly a certain number of written communications. None of those, probably, could be described as petitions in the rather technical sense in which we use that word here, but my understanding is that the representative of the Soviet Union is referring rather to what we might describe more accurately as informal written communications, which might range from a letter to a piece of paper pushed at a member of the Visiting Mission - which would be very informal indeed, but which would be a written communication. Does that help at all?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, you have been very helpful to me. I did not intend to annoy the representative of France by my question. I really only wanted to know what kinds of requests were addressed to the Mission in written form. I am not asking why those written communications were not published as petitions here. I am simply interested in the extent of the contacts between the Mission and the population of the Territory. I know that when a mission visits a country - and this refers not only to Trusteeship Council missions but also to many other kinds of United Nations missions to different countries - they usually receive various kinds of documents and letters. That is why I asked that question. If it was incomprehensible in any way I apologize. I think perhaps I did not formulate it clearly enough, and it is true that I really had in mind what you said, Sir.

The PRESIDENT: I think that reformulation would help the representative of France.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I should like first to make one point clear. I want to assure the representative of the Soviet Union that I am not annoyed, for the very good reason that I am the one who departed from what has been the practice of this Council for over a decade by dealing with questions. As you know, Mr. President, ever since there have been Visiting Mission reports questions have not been asked because the reports speak for themselves. Thus it is in a spirit of goodwill and to help the Soviet delegation, which unfortunately was unable to join the Mission, that I am answering his questions. There is no question of irritation; I am willing and, indeed, very happy to give additional information to the Soviet delegation. I should like to stress that it is at my suggestion that these questions are being asked, because the tradition of the Council is that no questions should be asked.

Having said that, I will deal with the question. The Soviet representative says that he does not know how many letters were received. I should like to give him an example. If he looks at paragraph 109 he will see that it reads:

"On 9 and 11 February 1963" - I cannot be more specific than that - "the Chairman of the Visiting Mission received letters of complaint from a senator and two other Palauan citizens."

(Mr. Poudade, France)

The letters stated their complaints. One senator and two other citizens - 1 plus 2 equals 3; so there were three letters concerning Guam. Is that clear, Sir?

As for the rest of the question, during every public or private hearing we had conversations, we had communications given to us, but the communications were of different types. Some were letters of a personal nature; some were of a more technical nature. But each time we received such communications - notes, letters, oral information - we used them to prepare the report.

I will give another example. When we held the public meeting in Koror, the capital, some people made allegations that foreign Powers were interfering against the Compact. We asked them if they had any irrefutable proof. A person attending the meeting - I think it was a woman - submitted to us a duplicated sheet of paper in Japanese. This was translated by the secretariat, but the Visiting Mission felt that it did not constitute irrefutable proof of interference because it was the only document of this nature that we received.

Another contact I could describe to the Soviet representative took place one evening when the Visiting Mission went to a restaurant and somebody who was completely in favour of the Compact reproached us for having had a meeting that turned out to be in favour of those who objected to the Compact. The person in question felt quite strongly and said that we were not objective, that we were campaigning in effect against the Compact. But again that was not a petition. Indeed, we noted that in many cases the Visiting Mission upset people both in favour of and against the agreement and thus we felt we had done our work well.

To find out what kind of contacts and conversations we had, there is, I repeat, a map annexed to the report that shows the different groups that went to the different villages. There is the itinerary of the Visiting Mission, which appears in annex I, and there is also a chapter on the activities of the Visiting Mission - paragraphs 73 to 87 - which shows all the meetings and conversations that we were able to have.

(Mr. Poudade, France)

All documents of any importance whatsoever were kept by the secretariat and are open for consultation by any Member of the United Nations or any investigator who would like to carry out a study on the Palauan plebiscite. They are in the files of the secretariat of the Trusteeship Council.

The PRESIDENT: I wonder whether the representatives of Papua New Guinea or Fiji might like to add anything to what the representative of France has said on the subject of written and oral communications?

Mr. RAM (Fiji): I confirm that what the representative of France has said adequately reflects what happened with regard to the written and oral communications which the Mission received.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to introduce a little détente into our work because the questions of the Soviet delegation are not asked because the Soviet Union suspects that the Chairman or members of the Mission or the secretariat or anybody else has hidden something or has not submitted something to the Trusteeship Council. We are asking questions in order to have a clearer understanding of the procedure and of the situation in which the Mission found itself at that time. We want to find out how it worked. That is a perfectly legitimate question and should not be interpreted as a hostile act towards the Mission in any way, even less as an expression of suspicion.

Further, I should like to ask a question concerning paragraph 88, which reads:
(spoke in English)

"The Visiting Mission arrived at Palau a week before the plebiscite and was only able to make limited observations of the political campaign. The campaign remained lively, vigorous and full of surprises until the day of the plebiscite." (T/1851, para. 88)

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

(continued in Russian)

Perhaps those surprises were not worthy of being noted in the report. Nevertheless, it would be interesting to know what kind of surprises they were.

The PRESIDENT: While not of course answering the question, I would offer the short comment that in my experience the democratic process inevitably has surprises and to me this is self-evident. But apparently it is not self-evident to the representative of the Soviet Union, so I call on the representative of France to answer his question.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): First of all, to clarify the situation, as I understand it. Between the Soviet Union and France there can be no difficulty, because the Soviet delegation has never tried to question or cast the slightest suspicion on my delegation or the delegations of Fiji, Papua New Guinea or the United Kingdom. I merely thought that, when the Soviet representative said, with reference to the polling in Guam, that he did not know how many letters we had received, I should specify that we had received all three.

Coming now to paragraph 88, it is true, as we have said there, that the campaign was lively, vigorous and full of surprises, and I shall explain why.

We were there for only one week, but on the day of our arrival there was already a demonstration in the centre of Koror and we were asked to join it. We replied that our purpose was not to join demonstrations either in favour of or against the Compact but to observe the voting on the plebiscite. We had a meeting and we received a communication to the effect that the demonstrators had (spoke in English)

"demanded that the Mission will join the demonstration"

(continued in French)

We responded, the four of us, that whatever the demands of the demonstrators either in favour of or against the Compact there was no question of our joining them.

(Mr. Poudade, France)

With respect to the word "vigorous", as I explained and as the report states, we came to a town where there were posters all over the place with very strong-worded slogans, both in favour of and against the Compact, some even implicating the President of the Republic and referring to him in terms that were not very polite and which would have been surprising in other countries.

Regarding the expression "full of surprises", during the week we were in Palau there were a number of events which we have noted throughout the report. The two most important have already been mentioned. One was the fact that the electoral rules had been amended on the very eve of the voting so that all the ballots, whether marked or not, could be considered valid. According to the rules of procedure, the voters had to fill in the first section of the ballot paper for the ballot to be valid, but by a presidential decision all ballot papers which had been marked one way or the other were considered valid. We felt this was an improvement, because everyone has the right to express his views and even the right not to fill in the answer to one of the questions.

The second event which was full of surprises was the suspense maintained up to the final days of the campaign by the traditional head of Palau who is also the Mayor of Koror, High Chief Ibedul Gibbons. Up to the last minute, he refused to decide and then decided that he was against the Compact and held public meetings for the purpose of announcing that decision.

That is what we mean by "lively, vigorous and full of surprises".

But, as this is a traditional democratic right, one cannot expect people who are in favour of or against a position to join in a general consensus. That is what we mean by this paragraph.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I listened with great satisfaction to your comments, Mr. President, before the representative of France answered my question, regarding the extent to which you are acquainted with the surprises of democratic election processes. You shared your experience with me and I am very grateful for that. However, it is not part of our task here and now to share our experiences, even less to consider our respective understandings of the term democracy. You and I are apparently looking at this from different aspects but I am not going to dwell on this and shall go on to my next question to the Mission.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

I am somewhat troubled by the fact that some sections of the report are limited to recalling what the Mission did, without developing or giving the reader an idea of what was talked about during its meetings.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Paragraph 79, for example, merely mentions that the Mission met separately with the members of the Senate and the House of Delegates and heard their views concerning the plebiscite, and that is the end of that matter. It is not clear to the reader as to what the views were, nor how they were expressed. That is not clear. That is my first question.

And then to take paragraph 97 of the report, simply as an example of a whole series of other paragraphs, it states that the Mission was asked questions, but the way in which the Mission reacted to those questions is not indicated in the report. In view of the fact that the Mission does say what work it carried out, it would be quite legitimate here to give the reactions of the Mission. How did the Mission react to the questions which were asked of it?

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I shall answer the representative of the Soviet Union, who spoke about several paragraphs at the same time, so I shall try to refer to them in order.

Paragraph 79 says that the Mission met separately with the members of the Senate and the House of Delegates and a group opposed to the plebiscite, but does not state what they said. Well, it is rather like the Berlin quadripartite agreement: one has to read each chapter in relation to the other. If one links paragraph 79 to paragraph 89 (b), it will be seen that the opponents of the Compact and of section 314 included, in general, the inhabitants of the capital, Koror, and most of the senators. So it can be deduced from this that most of the senators told us that they objected to the Compact. The reasons are well-known.

When we prepare a report at the end of a Visiting Mission, it must be read in a different way from a report of the Security Council. We tried to be concise. Everyone will understand that, if the senators objected to the Compact and to section 314, then the arguments they put forth can be deduced.

The representative of the Soviet Union then referred to paragraph 97, which states:

"At various times, those with whom the Mission spoke asked about the possible ways in which Palau might have recourse to the United Nations, both before and after the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement, if the United States should fail to implement the compact." (T/1851)

(Mr. Poudade, France)

We have stated that both the Palauan authorities and the inhabitants could always speak to the United Nations. They would have many opportunities to do so. High Chief Ibedul Gibbons was still there. He told us that, if they have to some day, they will go to the International Court of Justice to do this. I do not know whether or not they will do so.

Secondly, there is a procedure that has to be followed, and we did explain to them the different bodies to which they could have recourse, the letters that they could send to the Secretary-General to attract his attention, etc.

All of this can be found in paragraph 119, which is the response to the questions asked in regard to paragraph 97 and to other questions. Paragraph 119 states:

"Many Palauan citizens expressed to the Visiting Mission the high respect in which they held the United Nations and the hopes they placed in it as a body to which they could have recourse if the Administering Authority failed to carry out its obligations under the Trusteeship Agreement. The Mission welcomed those expressions of confidence" (ibid.)

We then listed the different programmes for which they are eligible. Now if my memory is correct - and our colleague from Fiji may check this - we listed all the organs to which they had recourse, and I think we even referred to the Committee of 24.

The PRESIDENT: Would the representatives of Papua New Guinea or Fiji like to add anything to these answers? I have not been trying to attract their attention particularly, but would they please indicate whether they feel they would like to add anything to these answers which have been given by the representative of France? Please feel free to do so.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The report states that members of the Mission were at the polling places. Unfortunately, I do not remember the particular paragraph in which this appears, but it follows from the whole report that the members of the Mission

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

split up and were present at the polling places. I understand from the entire content of the report that they were present during the voting process.

In that connection I am interested in knowing whether they were there during the entire day, from the time the polls opened until they closed, or did the members of the Mission visit various polling places periodically.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): Since I do not have a paragraph to which to refer, I shall try to speak from memory and I should like to ask Mr. Abebe to correct me, if necessary.

If the representative of the Soviet Union looks at the map which appears in the annex, he will see that there were four teams and on the voting day they went to the main polls.

The PRESIDENT: Perhaps I could help the representative of France. I have found paragraphs 86 and 108 very informative in this connection. I wonder perhaps if we could read those two paragraphs.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): If members will look at the map, and again I ask the secretariat and the participants to correct me if necessary. The secretariat indicated the best polls to visit and so we made sure that we were present at these polls.

Now on the election date, it seems to me that the representative of Papua New Guinea went to Angaur, Peleliu and another place. I know he went by plane to Angaur and Peleliu. He did not spend the night there, you can be assured, but he did go to all the polling sites in those areas.

A group led by the representative of Fiji, accompanied by members of the secretariat, went to the west coast of Babelthup and to as many of the polling sectors as they could visit in one day.

(Mr. Poudade, France)

Another group led by the British representative, accompanied by several members of the secretariat, left Koror very early - I think at four or five o'clock in the morning, owing to the tides - and covered the east coast of Babelthup and visited several polling sites that day. The Secretary of the Council and myself went to all the polling sites in the capital and to all the polling sites in Airai. We visited these polls two or three times a day. Then, at 5 p.m., all the members of the Mission met with all the members of the secretariat and once again we went to all the polling sites in Koror and Airai, concentrating on central points where people of other villages could come to vote under their own village's name. When the members of the Mission noted any irregularities, they pointed them out to the polling officers and asked them to stop the vote immediately or to correct the mistake that had been made. They came back an hour or two later to make sure that that irregularity had been corrected.

At my personal request, Mr. Abebe was with me at an isolated place where there was only a table with a little chart but it was not private, as we require for voting. As the polling site was in a home, we took the sheets from somebody and hung them from a window so that people could vote in total privacy. In another place we asked people to stand far away from the polling table. We also noted that in the capital, wherever we went, people both in favour of and against the Compact had set up teams that relayed one another. The polling officers were deployed so that there was always one person who was in favour of the Compact and one who was against it at the polling site. That is all I can say.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Now the picture is somewhat clearer than it was after reading the report.

I should like to ask another question. This question is linked to a certain extent to the previous question. In order to link it directly to the corresponding paragraph in the report, I shall have to look through the report for just a moment.

I should like to ask my question in connection with paragraph 57 which explains the system used during the plebiscite in Palau. Here it says that:

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

"Any person might file an oral or written complaint of any plebiscite irregularity with a member of the Board present at the polling place."

(T/1851, para. 57)

I should like clarification of the following: did the Mission find out from the members of this Commission whether there were such complaints, how many complaints there were and what their thrust was? Did the Mission familiarize itself with the situation in connection with such complaints and the voting process, not merely as a group which observes the process while standing off to the side? How actively did the Mission co-operate with the Commission on the holding of the plebiscite?

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): To reply to the question of the representative of the Soviet Union, the Mission fully participated and co-operated with the Commission on the plebiscite, particularly Mr. Goulding, Mr. Igo and Mr. Ram, who on several occasions spoke to the election Commission and on several occasions they asked for explanations. We met with Mr. Nakayama. We spoke with people from villages who had problems. For instance, some people lived in one village and could not vote in another one. There were also people who said that the voting and the closing of the polls would be too early: so we requested additional hours. There were also discussions on some votes that were doubtful at the time of the polling. The person who stayed behind, Mr. Mustafa Ozdineh, who is a Professional of the Secretariat and was with our Mission, worked closely with the Commission to rectify these irregularities.

We also have several documents from the Commission on this, and they can be consulted in the Secretariat because Mr. Abebe kept these documents. Naturally we worked closely with them.

The PRESIDENT: I do not wish to impose any precise time-table for our discussion, but I would like to remind the representative of the Soviet Union that he has now been questioning the representative of France for one and a half hours on the reports of the Visiting Mission. As the representative of France has said, this particular procedure is not in accordance with precedent. Nevertheless, he has been happy to answer questions so as to explain any misunderstandings there

(The President)

might be about the two reports. I think we are all very grateful to Mr. Poudade for this and I hope the representative of the Soviet Union has found it useful, particularly in preparing for any final comments he might wish to make when we take up the resolution on these reports. I do not think, however, we should continue too long with this questioning. I wonder whether, reserving his right to return to the subject, if he so wishes, the Soviet representative might agree to draw his questioning to a close at this point.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In sharing my experience with you, I would like to say that in the Soviet Union there is a concept known as planning. I can explain this concept in detail. One plan is made up by an enterprise, and then another, more progressive plan is made up in response to the plan which was originally drawn up. This plan is called the second plan and it covers the concerns of the first plan. I am ready to agree to your plan, Sir, taking into account your comment that the Soviet delegation may come back to this question should it so desire.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

I now intend, therefore, to end my questions to the Chairman of the two Missions to Micronesia without, as I understand it, establishing a precedent. Had we thought it necessary to ask questions for yet another hour, had it been urgent and necessary for us to do so, then we would have continued, but the Soviet Union is now ready to cease asking questions and to turn to the remaining unfinished matters pending before the Council today.

The PRESIDENT: I am grateful to the representative of the Soviet Union. I might remind all members that, subject to their agreement, we shall return to the reports of the Visiting Mission when we meet next week, at which time we shall have draft resolutions before us and an opportunity for all members to comment on the two reports of the Visiting Missions.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to make a clarification. Since I could not find the paragraphs, I was answering questions on the activities of 10 February from memory. For the interest of the representative of the Soviet Union, the information appears in paragraphs 108 and 133, which confirm exactly what I said.

The PRESIDENT: I am grateful to all members. I believe Mrs. McCoy has asked to speak and I now call on her.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): I should like to clarify one of the statements in the Palauan closing statement this morning.

I should like it to read that the Interior Department Assistant Secretary Sanjuan has taken no official position on the IPSECO power project.

The PRESIDENT: I wonder if you could help me by explaining whether that is an amendment to his actual statement or an additional remark. Is this not in connection with the statement made by Mr. Willter?

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): Yes. Assistant Secretary Sanjuan has just informed me that the statement has just been read out to him and he wishes it to be reflected that the Interior Department Assistant Secretary, Mr. Sanjuan, has taken no official position on the IPSECO power project.

I am sorry, but I do not know whether that would be technically feasible.

The PRESIDENT: If I could help you, I think that would refer to the penultimate sentence in the second paragraph of Mr. Willter's statement, where it says:

"... Assistant Secretary Sanjuan fully support the IPSECO power deal". I understand that you are now amending that with your statement.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): Yes, Sir.

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 37/35) 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))

The PRESIDENT: These two items - agenda items 12 and 13 - are usually taken together and I propose to do that this afternoon.

Are there any members who wish to speak on these two agenda items?

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I believe that this has been discussed on many occasions at previous Council meetings. However, I should like to set out again the position of my delegation on this issue, although we have made it clear on previous occasions in this chamber.

The Trusteeship Council has in the past worked very closely with the General Assembly in the case of non-strategic Trust Territories. But in the case of Micronesia - a strategic Trust Territory - the Trusteeship Council reports to the Security Council, having regard in particular to Article 83 of the Charter, which, as I think it has already been pointed out, in this case confers all functions of the United Nations on the Security Council.

The Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples - the Committee of 24 - was established as a subsidiary body of the General Assembly. It is certainly true that in resolution 1654 (XVI) the Trusteeship Council was requested to assist the Committee of 24 in its work and such assistance was indeed extended in relation to the former non-strategic Trust Territories. Now, however, there are no longer such Trust Territories. The fact is that the Trusteeship Council reports only to the Security Council and not to the General Assembly.

In the circumstances, the position of my delegation is that the Trusteeship Council is no longer called upon to assist the Committee of 24 in its work.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Trusteeship Council has begun consideration of two rather serious agenda items, namely, those concerning the attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territories and the situation in Trust Territories with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and co-operation with the Special Committee on decolonization.

Taking into account the situation of conflict existing in the strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the policy of the Administering Authority, which has led to fragmentation of the Territory and is aimed at annexation of the Territory, the Soviet delegation attaches great significance to the consideration of these questions by the Trusteeship Council.

The adoption, on the initiative of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community, with the wide and active support of countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples marked a new stage in the struggle of oppressed people for their liberation. The Declaration on decolonization became a concrete programme for the struggle of peoples to achieve freedom and independence.

The Declaration, and the United Nations decisions adopted to develop it, demanded the elimination of all colonial régimes, proclaimed the legitimacy of the struggle of people of the colonies for their national liberation and called on all States to give them material and moral support in that struggle. The Declaration on decolonization has played, and will continue to play in the future, an important role in rendering assistance to people under colonial domination in their struggle for freedom and independence and in the mobilization of world opinion in support of the elimination of colonialism.

"Immediate steps shall be taken, in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed or colour, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom."

(resolution 1514 (XV), para. 5)

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

The Soviet delegation believes that the Trusteeship Council is called upon to consider very thoroughly the position regarding the implementation of this Declaration in relation to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under United States trusteeship. We have said this at earlier sessions of the Trusteeship Council and everybody must regret that in this year's report to the Trusteeship Council, as in the reports of previous years, and in the statements of its representatives at the present session, the Administering Authority has passed over in silence the question of how the provisions of the Declaration on decolonization are being implemented with regard to Micronesia.

We have already stressed that the situation in this Territory already bears witness to the fact that the United States is acting in violation of the United Nations Charter, the Trusteeship Agreement and the Declaration on decolonization. In effect, the Territory of Micronesia has been fragmented and a new colonial status is being imposed on it at an ever increasing pace. This clearly shows that the policy of the United States is in contradiction with the Declaration on decolonization, which clearly states that

"Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations." (ibid., para. 6)

The Declaration also proclaims that

"The subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation." (ibid., para. 1)

The policy which has been followed in the Trust Territory by the Administering Authority is a violation of this provision of the Declaration. The people of Micronesia are under American domination, and the United States is now attempting to present the world with the fait accompli of the total absorption of Micronesia.

The Administering Authority is violating other provisions of the Declaration as well, inter alia, those concerning the right of peoples to self-determination and to determine their own political future. As we have already stated in this Council, it is impossible to talk about a free choice of political status for

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

people that are fully dependent on and under the continuous control of an Administering Authority which has imposed on the Territory the nature of its future political existence. The exercise of the inalienable right to true self-determination and independence remains an unsolved problem for the Micronesian people.

It is precisely for this reason that the United Nations has the right to, and must, raise its voice against all manifestations of neo-colonialist policy and against the transformation of a Trust Territory into a military-strategic beachhead whose existence deprives the indigenous population of Micronesia of self-sufficiency and independence and is contrary to the interests of international peace and security.

The programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which was adopted at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and the subsequent Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which was adopted at the thirty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly, clearly reaffirm that all peoples have the right to self-determination and independence and that the subjection of peoples to alien domination constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights and is a serious impediment to the maintenance of international peace and security and the development of peaceful relationships among nations.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

The General Assembly in its Plan of Action entrusted the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples with continuing to examine the full compliance of all States with the Declaration and with other relevant resolutions on the question of decolonization. It provides, inter alia, that where General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) - that is, the Declaration on decolonization - has not been fully implemented with regard to a given Territory, the General Assembly shall continue to bear responsibility for that Territory until all powers are transferred to the people of the Territory without any conditions or reservations and the people concerned have had an opportunity to exercise freely their right to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Declaration.

The United Nations Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples plays an important role in producing recommendations on questions relating to the struggle against colonialism. It considers that the situation in the Pacific Islands is on its agenda on the basis that that Trust Territory was included by the General Assembly in the list of Territories to which the Declaration on decolonization applies. Therefore, the comments made here to the effect that, in the light of the strategic nature of the Trust Territory, the Administering Authority is responsible only to the Security Council, are incorrect, because, despite its special status as a strategic Trust Territory, that Territory also falls within the purview of the Declaration on decolonization for the simple reason that its people are not free, but under trusteeship.

In its conclusions and recommendations to the thirty-seventh session of the United Nations General Assembly, the Special Committee once again reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It took note of the Trusteeship Agreement concluded between the Administering Authority and the Security Council on that Territory and once again stressed the importance of ensuring that the people of the Trust Territory could exercise their rights fully and freely and that the Administering Authority

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

fulfilled its obligations. As can be seen, that General Assembly body makes no claims concerning the status of the Territory; it takes into account the Trusteeship Agreement concluded between the Security Council and the Administering Authority.

The Special Committee again took note with regret of the refusal by the Administering Authority to co-operate with it on this point in the light of the situation in the Trust Territory. It once again called upon the Administering Authority to arrange for its representatives to attend meetings of the Special Committee to provide badly needed information that would help the Committee in arriving at conclusions and recommendations on the future of the Trust Territory. Taking into account the principles of the Charter and those of the Declaration in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the Special Committee once again reaffirmed that it is the obligation of the Administering Authority to create the necessary conditions in the Trust Territory to enable its people to exercise freely and without any impediment their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

Recognizing that the final decision as to their political status must be made by the people of the Trust Territory, the Special Committee once again called on the Administering Authority to preserve the unity of the Trust Territory until such time as its people could exercise their right to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Declaration on decolonization.

The representatives of the United States refer constantly to Article 83 of the Charter -- to which the representative of the United Kingdom has also referred. This is not a basis for depriving the people of Micronesia of their inalienable right to genuine self-determination and independence. The implementation of the Declaration on decolonization in connection with the people of Micronesia would in no way contradict that Article of the Charter. On the contrary, the implementation of the Declaration in Micronesia is fully in keeping with Article 83 and nothing in that Article prevents other United Nations organs, in particular the General Assembly, from following the situation in that Territory.

The Soviet delegation believes that the refusal of the Administering Authority to co-operate with the General Assembly and its Special Committee on decolonization is contrary to the United Nations Charter and established practice. For a number of years now the United States has participated in the work of and presented information to the General Assembly precisely about the Trust Territory of the

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Pacific Islands. The General Assembly, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, is carrying out certain specific functions with regard to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the Administering Authority is required to co-operate with it and its organs, in particular the Special Committee on decolonization.

In General Assembly resolution 37/35 there is an appeal to all States, in particular the administering Powers, the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system, to give effect to the recommendations contained in the report of the Special Committee for the speedy implementation of the Declaration and the other relevant resolutions of the United Nations. It is precisely that policy that should be followed by the Trusteeship Council.

In conclusion, to avoid any misunderstanding, I should like to say that the Soviet delegation once again reaffirms its unswerving position in support of the United Nations Charter, including Article 83, which provides that any change in the status of a strategic Trust Territory can be effected only by a decision of the Security Council. Consequently, such change cannot be undertaken unilaterally by an administering Power.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to stress that the Charter is quite clear on the question of this item of our agenda. The powers with regard to strategic Trust Territories are set forth in Article 83 of the Charter, which gives full competence to the Security Council and asks the Trusteeship Council to assist the Security Council. That was the decision of those who signed the San Francisco Charter.

(Mr. Poudade, France)

The Agreement with regard to strategic trusteeships was approved in 1947 by the United States Congress on the one hand and the Security Council on the other. As far as I know, no veto was recorded in 1947 in the Security Council. Therefore my delegation considers that the founding fathers were wise to entrust responsibility for strategic Trust Territories to the Security Council and to the Trusteeship Council. For us the question lies clearly in the hands of the Security Council and the Trusteeship Council.

I do not recollect the names and figures, as I am not up to date on this subject, but perhaps the secretariat, with the help of the services of the Under-Secretary-General, could distribute a copy of the draft resolution circulated in the Fourth Committee - I think it was in 1981 - on this subject. I should like to see the list of the sponsors of that draft resolution of 1981. I am quite sure that those in the Secretariat who were responsible for the work of the Fourth Committee could make available a copy of that draft resolution as distributed to delegations in the Fourth Committee. It would be interesting to see the names of the co-sponsors. I do not recall them at the moment. I am merely curious to know whether a copy of that document could be distributed to us. It would be most useful.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I am somewhat surprised that the representative of France is so vehement about finding out who sponsored the draft resolution in the Fourth Committee in 1981. I could give him a much better example, one that is closer to home. Perhaps he would like a newer draft resolution, one that was submitted at the last session of the General Assembly. I can tell him that that draft resolution was submitted by the Special Committee as a whole and not by separate States. It was a decision of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples as a whole, as a United Nations body, if that would refresh the memory of the representative of France. We could also have that document distributed.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): My memory could be incorrect. It was not my intention to create such a reaction from the Soviet delegation. I seem to recall that the first time I heard anything about this matter was at the thirty-fifth session. I recall a document on the subject we are dealing with, and there was a list of five or six sponsors. I was merely curious as to whether the Secretariat could provide this information and give us the list of sponsors of that draft resolution. I do not think it would be difficult to do this. If the Soviet Union wants to have another document distributed, I see no objection to that. I merely wanted to refresh my memory, because I do not recall this matter very well, and I should like to have the list of sponsors. I believe it included the names of Afghanistan and Cuba and it seems to me there were some other co-sponsors. Perhaps the Secretariat could provide me with the list of the sponsors of that draft resolution. It would be useful to me in doing my work if I had further information on that draft resolution.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): If anything depends on the question of who submitted a draft resolution, in the view of the French representative particularly - if the position of the French representative depends on that - I understand his attitude to that question and what is going on here. I should like to remind him of another relevant document at the last session of the General Assembly - that is, the report of the Special Committee of 24 to the Fourth Committee. If the representative of France is interested in the whole array of documents on this question, we can only say that we welcome his interest, which has finally awakened, in the work of the General Assembly with regard to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. I should like to direct his attention to all the previous reports of the Special Committee of 24 to all the previous sessions of the United Nations General Assembly, containing the decisions of the Special Committee on decolonization - reports which the General Assembly endorsed at each session.

The PRESIDENT: The secretariat would be very happy to arrange for the distribution of those documents, if that is the wish of the members.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I am quite well acquainted with the draft resolution presented at the thirty-seventh session, since I was responsible for following that issue. I was quite surprised when one day the Chairman announced to us - I think it was in the middle of November, and there was still a good deal of time left - that consideration would be postponed until later. You can understand that I was not going to object to the decision of the Cuban Chairman, who had been doing excellent work. I know all about that. However, if there is an objection by any delegation regarding the document I want, I can find it myself and if anyone else wants copies I will provide them.

The PRESIDENT: Are we still on about these wretched documents?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I just want to correct the impression that the representative of France was attempting to create here. The Soviet delegation is in no way opposing distribution of documents in the Trusteeship Council, especially of official documents that were submitted by the Special Committee on decolonization to the General Assembly. We would welcome that, particularly as I see in this a certain change in the position of France, which has begun to demonstrate an interest in what the Special Committee of 24 is doing. Perhaps this is a first step towards similar co-operation in the future between the Trusteeship Council and the Special Committee of 24. That is marvellous.

The PRESIDENT: I fear that those words of the representative of the Soviet Union, who is normally so moderate - that France has started to demonstrate - may cause the representative of France to react. I think we can assume for the purpose of this discussion that everyone has a great interest in the work of the Special Committee of 24, and leave it at that.

Mr. KINNEY (United States of America): My delegation associates itself with the remarks of the French and United Kingdom delegations with respect to items 12 and 13 of the Council's agenda. Self-determination is under way in Micronesia, under Trusteeship Council observation. My Government takes the position that the General Assembly and its Committees have no jurisdiction or authority with respect to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Accordingly, the co-operation or co-ordination between the Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly or any of its Committees mentioned in these agenda items is in our view entirely inappropriate.

The United Nations Charter explicitly provides in Article 83 that

"All" - I repeat "All" - "functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas ... shall be exercised by the Security Council", which in turn has authorized the Trusteeship Council to carry out certain of these functions with respect to this strategic trusteeship. The Trusteeship Agreement reaffirms the exclusive jurisdiction of the Security Council in this respect. Accordingly, the Trusteeship Council reports on the strategic Trust Territory only to the Security Council and is in no way obligated to assist the Special Committee of 24 in its consideration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. We consider that attention to and consideration of the trust contrary to the Charter.

In this regard my delegation would like to note that this position was supported by the decisions of the Fourth Committee during the thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh sessions of the General Assembly. The Fourth Committee chose to take no action on the attempt of the co-sponsors referred to by the representative of France, and the next year on the new and questionable procedure and decision of the Special Committee on decolonization to adopt a draft resolution concerning the strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Such legal and political authority reaffirms the unquestionable propriety of this position. The Trusteeship Council has ably carried out its proper role under the Charter. We are confident that it will continue to do so, without the

(Mr. Kinney, United States)

involvement of other bodies, as we near the successful termination of the Pacific trust in line with the wishes of the peoples of Micronesia expressed in free and open plebiscites, observed by the Trusteeship Council and regional United Nations Member States.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): That last statement regarding the situation created in the General Assembly looks more like

(spoke in English)

wishful thinking on the part of the representative of the United States than the actual situation.

(continued in Russian)

I said that in English in order to have a bit less interpretation. The point is that the impression given today by the representative of the United States that the General Assembly supported this, that it did not reaffirm the draft submitted to it, is not quite correct, because the decision was prepared by the Special Committee of 24, and it was not the first such decision. It was supported by members of the Special Committee of 24. The substance of these decisions is supported by practically everybody. We know this. We know that it was only as a result of the procedural manoeuvres and tricks when it went to the General Assembly that the draft resolution was not put to a vote. But it did not disappear. That question remains on the agenda of the General Assembly because it is on the agenda of the Special Committee of 24, the Committee on decolonization.

Therefore, to present the matter as the representative of the United States is trying to present it is, it seems to me, simply to distort the truth. Secondly, the reference in, to say the least, a disrespectful tone to the delegations that submitted that draft resolution is an attempt somehow to cast doubt on the draft resolution prepared by the Special Committee on decolonization and to call into question the sovereignty of a United Nations body, a body of the General Assembly.

That is a matter for the conscience of the United States representative, but I would not like those statements, or statements similar to them, to remain unanswered.

Mr. KINNEY (United States of America): My statement stands. The General Assembly chose to take no action. It did so in full dignity, which was not here impugned.

The PRESIDENT: The consideration of items 12 and 13 of the agenda has taken a rather predictable course. Members have spoken in accordance with views expressed very many times over the last few years. I am grateful to them all. Their views were perfectly clear and will of course be recorded in the verbatim records of this meeting.

I regret that the two positions adopted on these matters appear to me not to be reconcilable, and I should therefore like to deal with these two agenda items in accordance with established precedent.

(The President)

I would propose that the Trusteeship 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 fiftieth session concerning the attainment, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter, and in particular Article 83, of self-government or independence by the Trust Territory and to the statements made by the members of the Trusteeship Council on that question.

That is my proposal, which is based on precedent.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, I think your comment that our discussion has followed a predictable course applies also to the proposal you have just made. It seems to me that at this stage it would be, to say the least, premature to decide to draw attention to the conclusions and recommendations adopted by the Trusteeship Council at the end of its fiftieth session. Thus far, we have not seen those conclusions and recommendations, and to affirm them a priori would not, I think, be quite correct. Let us, therefore, wait until those conclusions and recommendations appear before we turn to the question of whether or not to affirm them.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation has no objection to the President's proposal, which is based on precedent. We are therefore fully prepared to agree with the wording he has just proposed.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I too endorse the President's suggestion. If the representative of the Soviet Union has any difficulties with it, I would suggest that the text might perhaps be given to him in writing tonight so that he can consider it.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Apparently I did not express myself clearly, or perhaps the representative of the United Kingdom did not understand me. I was not referring to the wording of the President's proposal - although we do have views on that formulation: I am very familiar with that wording - but rather to the Trusteeship Council taking a decision at this meeting to draw the attention of the Security Council to the conclusions and recommendations adopted by the Trusteeship Council

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

at the end of this session. If the conclusions and recommendations are to be adopted at the end of the session, how can we affirm them now? Whether from the procedural point of view or from the logical point of view or from any other point of view, that is incorrect. Without having those conclusions and recommendations before us how can we now affirm them? So that we can clear up this question, I would draw the attention of members to the fact that at the last session the corresponding language was proposed at the 1535th meeting and adopted only at the 1539th meeting, that is, after the conclusions and recommendations appeared.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I said I had no objection to the proposed wording, and I still have no objection to it. I seem to recall that in previous years that wording was adopted to avoid long, drawn-out discussions. I do not think that delegations object to the wording, but the delegation of the Soviet Union has pointed out that it might be premature to draw attention to recommendations which have not yet been written. Unless any delegation prefers to delay action on this proposal, we might consider it adopted. In preceding years we adopted similar wording, and this is undoubtedly the wording that will eventually be used. It is up to the President, if he wishes, to make this decision, either now or later. But the wording itself should give rise to no problems.

The PRESIDENT: I think that is very helpful. I would just ask the Council Secretary to explain what lies behind this.

Mr. ABEBE (Secretary of the Council): In previous years the Council did indeed take this decision previous to the adoption of its conclusions and recommendations. In 1982 at the forty-ninth session of the Council there were at least three informal meetings of the Council members on this very same subject, and with slight modification of the formulation of the conclusions and recommendations the members informally agreed to adopt this decision at the end of the session, after the conclusions and recommendations had been adopted.

The PRESIDENT: That is very helpful, because it makes it clear that what I had proposed, while acceptable in its formulation, does not actually follow last year's precedent, which I had intended to do. I apologize to members of the Council; I was under the impression I was following the precedent of last year. I should therefore like to suggest that we keep that formulation in mind and that it be put to the Council at the appropriate time, which will be the meeting equivalent to last year's 1539th meeting.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The President's summary of the situation is quite correct. But there does seem to be a need to take another, closer, look at the wording of the proposal before it is adopted at the appropriate later meeting.

The PRESIDENT: It would be my intention that that wording should indeed be looked at again, but when, and how much time would be devoted to it, we cannot, I think, say at this stage.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I repeat for the third time: the French delegation is completely ready to accept the wording that was accepted last year after long, ceaseless, painful, I would even say quaint discussion. Hence, I wish to stress that my delegation abides by the wording you propose. Whether it is adopted today, tomorrow or in three weeks does not matter. My delegation will abide by the same wording that was adopted last year.

The PRESIDENT: I would not wish the Council to repeat long and painful - I think those were the words of the representative of France - long and painful discussions on this unless it were absolutely necessary. I therefore propose that we put this aside, on the understanding that we will return to it at the appropriate time so as to dispose correctly of items 12 and 13.

It was so decided.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The PRESIDENT: As the Council knows, the Drafting Committee will, of course, be very busy next week. For that reason, the Council will not be able to meet on the sort of basis that we have been meeting for the last few weeks.

Subject to the agreement of members, I would therefore propose to schedule only one meeting for next week: That would be on Thursday morning, 2 June. I would propose then to try and deal with the three matters which have been left over from our considerations up till now. With regard to the first - the Report of the Secretary-General on Credentials - the Secretariat will distribute the necessary papers early next week. As to the second matter, I should like us to complete our consideration of the reports of the Visiting Missions; I hope that representatives will be able to make their final comments on those reports and that we can then proceed to adopt a resolution on that subject. We should also complete our consideration of the third item: written petitions and communications.

(The President)

The remaining written petitions and communications which we had and which we did not consider when we took up this agenda item earlier on are now being processed and will be distributed shortly - certainly in good time for members to study them before the meeting to be held next Thursday at 10.30 a.m.

If there are no comments I shall take it that the idea of one meeting on that day, and the suggested programme of work, meets with the approval of members.

It was so decided.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: I wish to welcome to this Council chamber Mr. Nieman Craley, Jr., who was an official in the Trust Territory Government for many years and is therefore known to many of you here. It is a great pleasure to see him here and to welcome him to the Trusteeship Council, which he must know well from previous years.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.