

UNITED NATIONS  
TRUSTEESHIP  
COUNCIL



Distr.  
GENERAL

T/PV.1560  
11 June 1983

ENGLISH

UN/SA COLLECTION  
Fiftieth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 8 June 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 written petitions and communications (continued)

Organization of work

This record is subject to correction.

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 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); T/L.1238 (continued)

The PRESIDENT: The Drafting Committee has completed its work, and its report has been distributed in document T/L.1238. I suggested in informal discussions that we should start today by having the report introduced, and that subsequently, when representatives had had an opportunity to study it, we should continue our consideration of it on Friday.

I call on the representative of France to introduce the report.

Mrs. COCHIME (France) (interpretation from French): At its 1557th meeting on 27 May the Trusteeship Council decided to appoint a Drafting Committee to prepare the report of its fiftieth session. The Committee, consisting of members of the delegations of the United Kingdom and France, has held three meetings to that end.

The members of the Committee benefited from the assistance of the Secretariat and of a representative of the Administering Authority.

The Drafting Committee now has the honour to present its report, contained in document T/L.1238. The Committee took into account the opinions and views expressed during the current session by the various delegations, the Administering Authority, the Special Advisers and the petitioners. The Committee also drew on the 1982 report of the Administering Authority on the Trust Territory, as well as the two reports of the United Nations Visiting Missions, in documents T/1850 and T/1851. These views and opinions expressed to the Council or in the documents to which I have just referred are summarized in the form of recommendations at the end of the report.

(Mrs. Cocheme, France)

I should like to make two brief comments about those working documents, and in particular the report of the Administering Authority. The presentation of the report is of course a matter within the responsibility of the Administering Authority until the end of the Trusteeship régime. Therefore, the Administering Authority should co-operate closely with the constitutional governments so that the presentation of the report may be harmonized, the information given may be as complete as possible and the contents of the report may continue to be substantial.

We also hope that each of the conclusions or recommendations will be studied specifically and that a precise reply will be given. We are grateful to the Administering Authority for its collaboration in this matter.

I should like to make a special reference to paragraph 127 of the Drafting Committee's report, at the end of which there is the following phrase:

"... that those Territories would henceforth have Governments which were elected in accordance with their Constitutions." (T/L.1238, para.127)

It is the French text that is valid here, because the English version of the end of the paragraph carries a conditional nuance which is not an accurate reflection of the authors' intention.

On behalf of the British representative and on my own behalf, I thank the members of the Secretariat for their cordial and kind co-operation and the representative of the Administering Authority for his availability and assistance at our meetings.

The conclusions and recommendations in the report are those of the members of the Drafting Committee - that is, of those who took part in the Committee's work. We hope that the Trusteeship Council will take note of those conclusions and recommendations and endorse them.

The PRESIDENT: Without commenting on the substance of the report of the Drafting Committee, I should like just to thank the Committee for the hard work it put into drafting this report, and the members of the Secretariat for having been of great assistance in ensuring that it was printed - beautifully - and in our hands today.

If there are no preliminary comments, I would suggest that the Council consider this report fully at its next meeting, which is scheduled for Friday, 10 June.

EXAMINATION OF WRITTEN PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS (T/PET.10/293-298) (continued)

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now move on to consider a matter which I have mentioned informally to one or two members. As members will recall, the Council has already concluded its examination of written petitions and communications; it did so at its meeting of 2 June. I thought I should inform the Council that since then the Council has received six further written petitions. Our Secretary has arranged for these to be distributed in photocopied form.

Before seeking the guidance and agreement of the Council as to how these petitions should be dealt with, I should like to draw attention to the procedures outlined in rule 86 of our rules of procedure for dealing with written petitions. It seems to me that we have already stretched the rules very considerably - but, I think, quite reasonably - to deal with all the petitions we had before us when the Council began its current session. Under any reading of rule 86, these six subsequent petitions would normally be held over to our next session. There is provision, however, in exceptional cases and as a matter of urgency, for such petitions to be considered at short notice, provided, of course, that the Administering Authority is prepared to consider them. That, at any rate, is my reading of rule 86, but I do not wish to force the Council to take that line if members would prefer the matter to be dealt with in some other way.

May I perhaps refer the matter to members and ask if they have any particular observations to make?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Since the Council has only a small number of petitions before it and since they reached it during its session, I do not think it would be proper to

hold them over until our next session in 1964 as we quite obviously have time at today's meeting. We could deal with them with dispatch and respond to the petitions before us, thus demonstrating the efficiency of the workings of the Trusteeship Council and the attention it pays to any information which reaches it in connection with the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The PRESIDENT: From a very quick reading of the petitions it appears to me that none of them deal with subjects which are new to the Council and that they all deal with subjects the Council has already discussed and on which the views of people with views similar to those who have written these petitions have already been expressed and heard. As the Administering Authority has, I think, a very particular role in this under rule 36, may I ask what its view would be? Would the Administering Authority like these to be dealt with now or to be held over until the next session or to be disposed of in some other way that might be agreeable to the Council?

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): The United States would have no problem with regard to taking note of these petitions at this time. I would agree, Sir, with your characterization of the petitions as dealing almost exclusively with matters that we have discussed at length at earlier meetings of this session of the Council.

Mr. POUJADE (France) (interpretation from French): I think we have spent sufficient time on the various petitions that have been presented to us. As you yourself suggested, Mr. President, I believe it would be adequate to have them distributed, as the Secretariat plans to do, in Xerox form. If in the meantime they are published in final form in the various working languages, we would then be able to take them up at our leisure subsequently either at the special session which will probably be held before the next annual session or, if there is no special session, at the next annual session. In this way, I think we shall have sufficient time to consider these petitions once they have been published. They have only just been received and we have really not had a chance to study them, and I do not think we should extend the session to take up petitions which we have not even had time to look at.

The PRESIDENT: It seems to me that we have two options open to us: to consider these petitions now - and I imagine that, if we did so, it would be perfectly possible to do this rather quickly, in which case I would suggest that the Council could decide to draw the attention of the petitioners to the observations of the Administering Authority that have been made on these specific subjects at the current session, as appropriate - or to wait and have these petitions properly printed and distributed and then consider them at our next special session, which, at any rate, would be a little better than leaving them for another year until the next annual session.

As President, I may say that I would be entirely content to adopt either of these two options. I have no strong feelings in the matter - I see force in arguments both ways. I wonder whether we could not reach some agreement on this.

If I may just add something at this point, I think an important element is that the Administering Authority seems content that we could deal with these petitions now if that were the wish of the Council, and I think one has to place weight upon that view because the Administering Authority has a particularly important status in regard to petitions.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I would be quite happy to take up these petitions now, in accordance with our established practice at this session, namely, en bloc.

The PRESIDENT: Would it be agreeable - and I look now particularly to the representative of France because I think he held a preference for the other option - if we took up these petitions (T/PET.10/293 - 298) en bloc now so that any questions raised on them could be dealt with by the Administering Authority at this time?

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I have no objection at all to the wishes of the President.

The PRESIDENT: I would then propose that we take up these six recently arrived petitions (T/PET.10/293-298), thereby showing, as the representative of the Soviet Union said, that we are expeditious in our work. Any representative wishing to raise points on them may do so.

Reading through the petitions a little more carefully, I note that they concern three subjects which we have already dealt with at some length: the Palau Constitution and the Compact of Free Association; the question of nuclear wastes dumping; and the question of the presence of nuclear weapons.

If there are no questions, I suggest that the Council draw the attention of the petitioners to the observations of the Administering Authority made at the current session on these subjects, as appropriate.

It was so decided.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): We have embarked on two questions since the beginning of these meetings: the conclusions and recommendations of the Drafting Committee have been presented and we have now come to the report; we have also taken up the latest petitions.

I have a problem which I should like to put forward, that is, the submission of our report to the Security Council. If there is no objection, I should like to continue with this point.

(Mr. Poudade, France)

First, I should like to recall certain obvious facts. We must draw up a report to the Security Council that is legible, precise and concise. In this connection I have done some private research and it seems that this report in French - I do not know about English or the other languages - was 99 pages long for 1977-1978, 137 pages for 1978-1979; and 143 pages for 1980-1981. This year we have set a new record in the French version: we are up to 179 pages. The reports of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council have been growing at the rate of 20 per cent over the last four years, and this year's report will be double the length of its counterpart of five years ago - to say nothing of printing costs.

(Mr. Poudade, France)

If we assume that printing costs have not changed in four years, the report would have cost \$40,000 in 1979 and \$72,000 three years later. Of course there are other costs besides those of printing - for the different stages of processing, for photocopying the two preliminary drafts sent to the missions, for drafting, for negotiations among delegations, all of which I leave aside.

In other words, a document designed primarily to report our activities to the Security Council, and designed too for the consideration of the conditions prevailing in the Trust Territory and for leading its inhabitants towards independence or self-government, is far from achieving its purposes.

None of the 15 ambassadors, permanent members of the Security Council has read our 179-page report. No permanent representative in the Security Council has read it. No Micronesian is going to read it, even if it were to be distributed by the thousands. None of them is going to read it. If they intended to read it, they would simply end by putting it down.

One last example: in 1978-1979, the first part of our report on the various agenda items consisted of 12 pages. In 1982-1983 - I am again referring to the French version - there are 60 pages in this part. In less than four years, there has been an increase of 500 per cent. Is it reasonable to continue along these lines at a time when all States are clamouring for the control and reduction of documentation? Can we unashamedly, under the gaze of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory and the third world generally, consider these expenditures justified?

As for the presentation of the conclusions in the report and this year's examination of petitions, I should like to make a suggestion and to ask a question.

My proposal is the following. The French delegation proposes that the Trusteeship Council, in the case of oral or written petitions or communications, should revert to the practice it followed before 1979. We need merely refer to the symbol of the petition, its subject and the decisions taken, as in 1978. As we have verbatim records and the petitions are reproduced verbatim, a reference could be added also to the verbatim record of the meeting, particularly in the case of oral petitions. Let me give an example of the 1977 procedure. I refer to document T/PET.10/106 - page 4 of the French text. It is a petition from Mr. Aizawa, Chairman of the Magistrate's Conference, Truk District, concerning war-damage settlements. It would be sufficient to state this, together with a reference to the symbol. The report could be cut down then, by 30 pages to 5 or 6, if we were to proceed thus. Rule 101 of our rules of procedure says that the report is to be

(Mr. Poudade, France)

drawn up on the basis of the annual report of the Administering Authority and such other sources of information as may be available, including petitions, reports of visiting missions, and any special studies as provided for in rule 97. These petitions can easily be consulted, not just in the official documents of the United Nations, which are circulated, but also in the verbatim records. That is my first proposal.

And now a suggestion. Mr. President, you could appeal to delegations to agree that references to their statements and remarks be limited to the most essential points. This would be in keeping not just with General Assembly resolution 2538 (XXIV) and 31/140; it would also be in keeping with the recommendation of the Secretary-General contained in the annex to General Assembly resolution 2292 (XXII). The proceedings of the Committee on Conferences also indicate that that is how it should be done.

In helping to prepare the report, the Secretariat, as well as delegations, should bear this in mind. It seems to me that there is considerable room for reducing the length of our report. I fail to see why the report should reproduce verbatim what has already been fully reproduced in the verbatim records, as far as concerns the statements of delegations for example. Again, in view of the decisions of the Committee on Conferences and those of the General Assembly, is it necessary to reproduce pages and pages of procedural discussions in our report?

I believe that these three suggestions would make it possible to lighten our report, to make it readable for the permanent members of the Security Council as well as the Micronesians.

Those are the proposal, the suggestion and the question I wished to put forward.

The PRESIDENT: Before we proceed to consider this matter, could I just ask the representative of France to repeat his first proposition, which, in my understanding, was to revert to the pre-1979 procedures in dealing with the examination of petitions in the report to which he refers. Am I right in saying that the pre-1979 procedures would be first of all to refer to the petition, be it oral or written, then to state the reaction of the Council, and if necessary to refer to the verbatim record, which in the case of oral petitions gives full texts? Am I right in thinking that is correct? I was trying to make notes as the representative of France went along and I am not quite sure I have been accurate. Could he take us through that perhaps a little more slowly?

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to have a model distributed. I consulted all the reports addressed to the Security Council. If the Secretariat and you, Sir, so wish, I could give you the report of the forty-fourth session. I would like us to revert to the report of the forty-fourth session as a model. I could circulate the report outlining what actually happened at that session, if you like. It was perfect. It says: "Petition T/PET.10/106 from Mr. Susumu Aizawa concerning settlement for war damages", and then there is a reference. I should like us to revert to what was done at the forty-fourth session, and in this respect I can give a model of this kind of procedure to delegations which want it and to you yourself, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: I think we have now all had a minute or two to look at that model of the forty-fourth session. I should like to suggest that we should continue to consider this particular problem, but I should like to say, before calling on any other representative, that I think the representative of France has certainly outlined to us a real problem concerning the report as a whole. Certainly I had not realized, until he gave us the statistics, that the report had grown longer and longer and that the cost, of course, had risen proportionately.

I must say, from my own reading of reports dealing with this subject, that I have found that almost without exception they are virtually unreadable. I do not mean to be rude to anyone, but even the person with the greatest interest in the subject of the Trust Territories must find it extremely hard to read these reports and to get a clear picture of what is intended to be given to them. I found, for instance, the report of the Administering Authority very hard going; I found the report to the Security Council terribly hard going; the one exception is this report of the Visiting Mission and that, it seemed to me, one could read with some degree of pleasure, that it was clearly written, that it was very informative and it was readable.

So I should just like to make this one point from the Chair, that I am very much in favour of any action which makes a report more easily readable.

As a matter of fact, by a strange coincidence, at an official lunch today, I asked three members of the Security Council if they had ever read last year's report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council and each said they had initialled it without reading it, and I have an awful feeling that what the representative of France says is true: that probably no Permanent Representative - or maybe only one or two - read this and, if they do, I think all of them will find it extraordinarily heavy going.

So we want our reports to be informative and readable and I believe that reports can be both informative and readable and concise and clear, and I would think that the report of the Visiting Mission 1982 is an example of such a report. So my own feelings from the Chair are that this is a problem; that we should be able to make some progress; and that we should consider seriously the two points which the representative of France has made and any other points that other representatives may like to make on this subject. So perhaps we could pursue the general point and, in particular, the first proposal of the representative of France about dealing with petitions in this report to the Security Council.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I entertain no doubts whatsoever about the essentially noble motives which have prompted the representative of France to make such a proposal. It is perfectly clear that the representative of France would like to have the clearest and most concise report possible.

However, Sir, you quite properly pointed out that the material which reaches the Trusteeship Council is in its turn not that clear-cut nor necessarily that concise. If we take, for example, the report of the administering Power, that document is extremely difficult, not necessarily to read, but to digest and enable a clear picture to be formed of what is actually going on in the Trust Territory. For that reason alone, any other information which reaches the Council is particularly valuable. The representative of France stated, with some authority, that none of the Permanent Representatives, members of the Security Council, had read or read the Trusteeship Council's report. I have heard this statement made before by the representative of France and once again I should like to reiterate that such bold statements must be left to the conscience of the representative of France. I think he can only make an authoritative statement about whether this document is or is not read on behalf of his own delegation. I myself would not be emboldened to make such an assertion.

As is known, these reports are prepared by the Trusteeship Council not only for the benefit of the permanent members of the Security Council. The Permanent Representatives here in the United Nations are not the ultimate authority; they represent their States. How they process the documentation which reaches them is something which is purely germane to their own system of dealing with documentation and should not be a cause of alarm for the representative of France; he should not be over-concerned about who reads these documents. If we proceed further along the line of logic put forward by France, then it would appear that these reports of the Trusteeship Council are hardly necessary. If no-one reads them, then why prepare them at all? Perhaps we do not need to produce any such reports.

The Soviet delegation cannot concur in this approach. So much for who does or does not read the documents from the Trusteeship Council. As to your statement, Sir, that the Trusteeship Council's reports are very hard going, once again this really depends on the individual capabilities of the person reading as to whether something is difficult or easy to read, and we cannot really argue about that.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Finally, as regards what the representative of France has suggested - how can that effect any savings in preparing the reports from the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council? The only way in which there could be any savings would obviously be not to include in the reports the only additional source of information available to the Trusteeship Council over and above the report presented by the administering Power. Is that correct? I think not.

(Mr. Barzovsky, USSR)

I would not dispute the fact that the content of the petitions may not be to the liking of certain people. This again is a question of political attitude as held by certain delegations in the Trusteeship Council. However, I would repeat that petitions are sources of information and, indeed, not only sources of information but also evidence to a certain extent. They attest to the views held by people from various walks of life, from various educational backgrounds and from various geographical areas. This is in a sense an expression of public opinion about the situation obtaining in the Territory.

Finally, talk about savings we might make by leaving out that part of the report of the Trusteeship Council seems to me to be lacking in seriousness and, from the political point of view, unjustified. As I understand it, the expense involved in producing the twenty pages, the expense or the savings, whichever way you regard it, does not involve amounts which would justify having this material left out of the Trusteeship Council's report.

We are all very keen on saving money, the money which is spent by the United Nations in the course of its activities. I must make it clear that the Soviet Union, for example, is much more concerned about what is expressed by the United Nations on missions sent by this Council to observe various kinds of referenda and plebiscites, which simply serve virtually to camouflage the policies of the administering Power. None of those who has as yet spoken in favour of reducing the size of the Trusteeship Council report to the Security Council has made any proposals about reducing expenses involved in observer missions.

May I once again emphasize that if the report were to omit that section which, in accordance with last year's practice, reflects the content of the petitions and the content of the communications received by the Trusteeship Council, this would be detrimental to the attitude to the Trusteeship Council taken by

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

those peoples which have, after all, taken the trouble to send this information to us in the first place.

The representative of France said that no one in the Security Council reads these reports and that the Micronesians will not read them, but, he said, if these petitions are to be found in the verbatim records of the meetings of the Trusteeship Council, this will be quite enough, even better. But, in what way would it be better if the report of the Trusteeship Council is not sufficient for the Trust Territories? I would like to know, supposing that the verbatim records of meetings of the Trusteeship Council were distributed among the Micronesians, how much more they would then be read by the population? I would refer to the report of the regular Visiting Mission to Micronesia, which was headed by the representative of France, where frequent references were made to the inhabitants. The inhabitants said, "Well, you come here. You ask us questions, then you go back again and we know nothing more about what happens there." I cannot refer to the exact paragraph in the report which refers to this particular matter. This is mentioned in various places. I am sure the representative of France will recall these points made by the Micronesians, which he himself includes in the report. And now he is suggesting that we exclude from the report a rather important source of information and a section which reflects public opinion.

Furthermore, I must say that, when the report of the Visiting Mission was prepared, the question of expenses hardly ever came up -- not to speak of the actual value of the report, because I am quite certain that half of what is contained in this report could quite easily also be omitted without any damage to the substance.

I wish to state quite definitely that the Soviet delegation is categorically against any proposal to curtail or reduce the size of the Trusteeship Council's report, particularly that section which is concerned with petitions, because this can only be regarded as an attempt to conceal the views held by the petitioners and an attempt to make it more difficult for readers to have access to those opinions, and this is the only way we can regard it.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to make just one explanatory remark to the representative of the Soviet Union about books and reports being hard going.

I do not object to hard going as such. As a student I had to read the works of Plato, Kant, Kierkegaard and A.J. Ayer, and when the content makes it worth while, hard going is admirable. What worries me is when one finds it hard going to read reports which do not have content, that make it necessary for the paper to be so difficult to read and so uninformative at the end. This is by way of explanation.

Let me say how much I agree with the representative of the Soviet Union that the 1982 report of the Administering Authority is extremely difficult to read. I had a word with the Administering Authority about this, and the point was very well and quickly taken and I am confident that next year the report will be a great deal more readable and perhaps more informative. It is because I think that we may reasonably expect an improvement in that particular document that I am rather anxious that we should also make some improvement with the other document, that is, the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council. So the representative of the Soviet Union and I have something in common in our view about this report of the Administering Authority.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I think I ought to clarify matters since I may have been misunderstood.

There is one first point I wish to clarify. My delegation categorically rejects the assertion of the delegation of the Soviet Union that my proposal is designed to hide the views of the petitioners. Let me give an example to show that the French delegation has never hidden anything of what the petitioners say.

In the report of the regular Visiting Mission, Ms. Harden and I heard petitioners complain of French testing in the South Pacific. As the Secretariat will testify, I asked that those complaints should be mentioned in the report of the Visiting Mission. Therefore I conceal nothing of what the petitioners say. On the other hand, at Uliti the representative of the Governor complained that a Soviet ship had entered their waters, refused to dip the flag, enter into contact or declare its presence. I asked that the complaint of the representative

(Mr. Poudade, France)

of the Governor of Uliti should not be included in the report of the Visiting Mission since the delegation of the Soviet Union was not present in that mission. So much for these empty charges that I had concealed the statements of petitioners.

I could accuse the Committee of 24 of proceeding in the same manner. Indeed, petitions are not included in the report of that Committee to the General Assembly. It simply lists the number of petitions and refers us to the records. The Council could check the latest report of the Committee of 24 to the General Assembly. It does not comment on petitions in its reports because of a desire to economize. This has not, however, prevented the Committee of 24 from functioning.

I should like to reply to several questions. It is not my intention to reduce the report merely in the case of petitions but rather to give expression to a general desire. If one looks at last year's report S/15705, in paragraph 57 the representative of the Soviet Union expressed the wish that the report be made more concise and a better instrument for the Security Council to use. In paragraph 59 this view was endorsed by the representative of the United Kingdom. The report submitted by the Council to the Security Council should be concise, precise and easy to read.

In document A/C.5/37/SR.16, which is the summary record of the sixteenth meeting of the Committee on Conferences of 20 October, the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Grodsky, who unfortunately had to leave New York because he was ill, spoke of a minimum reduction of 5 per cent on an experimental basis.

I now wish to refer to another subject. I also requested that statements of members of the Trusteeship Council should be reduced also. Indeed, in document A/AC.172/87/Add.2 of the General Assembly, we read that

"speeches or statements by representatives, by the Secretary-General or his representative, or by persons presenting reports on behalf of committees or other bodies may be reproduced in extenso in summary records or as official documents only if they serve as bases for discussion, provided that the relevant decision is taken by the body concerned after a statement of the financial implications has been submitted in accordance with the Financial Regulations of the United Nations." (A/AC.172/87/Add.2, para. 13)

(Mr. Poudade, France)

Furthermore, the representative of the Soviet Union asks why, in the circumstances, have a report at all. It is because we are under obligation to have one. Rule 100 of our rules of procedure states that

"The Trusteeship Council shall present annually to the General Assembly a general report..."

Since the Trusteeship Council deals with strategic Territories, it must report to the Security Council.

I do not exclude, on the other hand, the sole source of information indicated, whether it be the report of the Administering Authority or petitions, but, as rule 101 says, these documents can easily be referred to.

I must say that I am surprised at the vehemence of the delegation of the Soviet Union since it is not voting for this report. I think it is useful and should be read. I have never said that the permanent members were the only ones who did not read it. I said that the 15 Permanent Representatives, members of the Security Council, had never read the report and I maintain that the ambassadors who represent their countries in the Security Council have never read it.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I have listened with interest to the remarks of the representative of France and I confess that I find his arguments extremely compelling. We too have been disturbed at the increasing size of the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council. There were 100 pages in 1978, 159 pages in last year's report.

(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

This is occurring at a time when other parts of the United Nations machinery are being exhorted to cut back as far as possible, to economize on the paper that they produce.

Some would argue that the strictures that apply to what are perhaps subsidiary organs of the United Nations do not apply to the Trusteeship Council. To that I would reply that, even though we have the privilege of serving in this august body, we must surely bear in mind that the constraints that affect other bodies should be taken into account in this chamber, and that indeed we should inspire others by our example by seeking to apply to our reports the same constraints as other parts of the United Nations machinery are required to apply to theirs.

It seems to me that we should bear in mind two principles in deciding how the petitions should be handled. One is that those interested in the Council's proceedings should be able to ascertain from the Trusteeship Council's report that petitions have been heard and noted. Secondly, they should be able to discover from that report where to look in order to find the text of petitions of interest to them. In this way we can both cut costs and produce a balanced, easily digestible, attractive report that will by its size encourage others to read it. At the same time, due attention will have been given to the petitioners.

I also disagreed with the comment of the representative of the Soviet Union that what my French colleague had proposed was the exclusion of petitions from the Trusteeship Council's report. I did not interpret it in that way at all. When oral petitioners appeared in this chamber, I prefaced my questions to them with the observation that we found their comments useful, that we appreciated the fact that they had come all this way to present their petitions, and that it would be difficult for the Trusteeship Council to function without their important contributions. Therefore, there is no question of our delegation wishing in any way to downgrade the importance that we attach to the petitioners.

On the other hand, we have the problem that the report is increasing in size and that at the same time we are required as far as possible to economize on its size. It is surely for us to find a way to marry those two concerns. It seems to me that the most sensible way is to revert to the practice followed by the Council before 1978 of listing petitions briefly and cross-referencing them with references to the verbatim records.

The PRESIDENT: Would the representative of the United States like to express any views that he may have on this subject? I do not want to force him to take the floor if he does not wish to, but I think that it would be useful if he could tell us what he thinks about this matter.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): Our views are similar to those just expressed by my colleague from the United Kingdom in support of the proposal made by the representative of France which, we believe, to be appropriate under the Council's rules of procedure. We think that the suggestion is wise and fair.

I would simply say that the United States certainly has no desire to hide or suppress the information or opinions presented by the many petitioners. On the other hand, we feel keenly that the inclusion of large quantities of testimony, much of it repetitive, in the report to the Security Council renders that document somewhat less appealing to the casual reader who has not, on a day-to-day basis, kept up with developments in this body.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In response to the further clarifications offered by the representative of France, I should like to say that apparently the language barrier had something to do with the matter. The representative of France did not understand what I said about attempts to suppress oral or written petitions or their contents. He immediately shifted the centre of gravity from the petitions submitted during the Visiting Mission of the Trusteeship Council to the Trust Territory. We are not now talking about what petitions were submitted to the Mission, or when or where in the field, what petitions were sent to the Trusteeship Council, or when they were published. That is not the point that we were making. We were referring to a clear tendency to leave out of the Trusteeship Council's reports an important source of information and something which indicates the view of international public opinion about what is happening in the Trust Territory.

I repeat that any other procedure, any other way of dealing with the petitions and the statements made by petitioners here in the Trusteeship Council, would lead to the opinion of the petitioners and those petitions being concealed. If the representative of France says that 15 ambassadors in the Security Council have not read the report, I repeat that that assertion should be left on the conscience of the representative of France.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

If we follow his line of reasoning, and if, to speak only of his own delegation, the French representative on the Security Council has not even read the report, I wonder if he would have the energy to ferret out the petitions from other documents, such as our verbatim records which are not actually annexed to the report.

I would also note that the Permanent Representatives who sit on the Security Council are not the last stop: like other documents of the Security Council, our reports are studied in Foreign Ministries and at other levels of government.

I wonder if the representative of France would guarantee that, were our report 20 pages shorter, as he has suggested, his Ambassador on the Security Council would read it.

From that point of view, the statement of the representative of France does not hold water.

I reiterate that questions of economy are always deserving of great attention, but the price of these savings would be the concealing of information, and such savings can hardly be welcomed. The representative of France was right to say that the Soviet delegation is in favour of a comprehensive reduction of unnecessary expenditures. Yes, we have always favoured this and will continue to do so, but we must consider at what price such reductions are to be made: it has now been suggested that we throw out the baby with the bath water, and I really cannot agree with such an approach.

We have heard a great deal of talk here about the Council's rules of procedure. Let us take a look at them. Rule 100 states the following - I shall read it out in English so that there will be no language barrier:

(spoke in English)

"The sections of the general reports of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly relating to conditions in specific Trust Territories, referred to in rule 99, shall take into account the annual reports of the Administering Authority, and such other sources of information as may be available, including petitions - "

(continued in Russian)

-- I repeat:

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

(spoke in English)

" - such other sources of information as may be available, including petitions, reports of visiting missions, and any special investigations or inquiries, as provided for in rule 96."

(continued in Russian)

Why should we make an exception in this case?

If we are to be consistent in applying the proposal made by the French delegation, we ought also to consider shortening the Visiting Missions' reports to the Trusteeship Council. I was following the logic of the French delegation when I suggested that we might raise the question of reporting to the Security Council at all: that caused some surprise. I am perfectly familiar with the rules of procedure, including the rule which states that the Trusteeship Council must present a report to the Security Council.

I should note too that the Trusteeship Council has not as yet made full use of all the sources of information listed in the rules of procedure and which the Council should have made use of, including sources mentioned in rule 100. The local press in Micronesia, for example, has not been used; and it may be said that such information is not accessible to the Trusteeship Council. That is true: it is not easily accessible. But material from, for instance, United States Congressional hearings - which in many respects is extremely informative and which reveals the attitude of the administering Power to the political actions it takes in the Trust Territory - has not been utilized here either.

Further, we have unexpectedly heard from the representative of France and from you, Sir, as President, but also as representative of the United Kingdom -

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I do not understand, Sir. The representative of the Soviet Union has said that you were speaking in your capacity as representative of the United Kingdom. I am sure that was not the case, as I am representing the United Kingdom here today, and I am sure that your remarks were made entirely in your presidential capacity.

The PRESIDENT: That is so. I have tried not to enter into the substance of the debate and have not expressed myself either in favour or against any proposal in front of the Council. I have only given a personal view on how extraordinarily unreadable certain documents are. That, I think, is within the rights of a President. Indeed, the Soviet representative agreed with me about a particular document we both had in mind.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I am prepared to withdraw my remark about you, Sir, representing the United Kingdom. You are the President; you are not the representative of the United Kingdom. The representative of the United Kingdom is sitting beside me, and I do not think he said that this was a bad report.

But I repeat that what we heard today was surprising. I remind the Council that these reports, including those of last year and the year before, were prepared by a drafting group consisting of representatives of France and the United Kingdom. The Soviet delegation was rather critical of those reports in many respects.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Today we seem to have reversed roles. I am not saying that the Soviet delegation is now praising this report; in fact, it voted against it and both the French and the United Kingdom delegations voted in favour of it. Nevertheless, today apparently the representative of France, who has frequently headed drafting committees preparing reports, has indulged in self-criticism. At the same time, he has levelled his criticism only against one part of the report, the part dealing with petitions and reflecting the views coming from various parts of the world, including the people of Micronesia. That is rather astonishing.

I repeat what the Soviet delegation said at the very outset of this meeting. We continue to maintain that, were we to remove those 20 pages of petitions from the Trusteeship Council's report to the Security Council, it would be virtually tantamount to the members of the Trusteeship Council, at the suggestion of France, making it impossible for the petitioners to convey their views to the Security Council. If this were to occur, the Soviet delegation would wish to have nothing to do with such a decision by the Trusteeship Council.

Secondly, I repeat that the entire responsibility for such a step would lie squarely on the shoulders of the French delegation.

The PRESIDENT: I do not want the debate on what is really a procedural matter to go on too long, but I now call on the representative of France.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to assure members that the French delegation accepts and assumes responsibility for its proposal - and I have fully weighed its pros and cons.

With respect to petitions, the representative of the Soviet Union said that the important point was not just the ambassadors members of the Security Council but also the ministries and other government departments whose function was to study given situations. I do not quite understand. Indeed, how can the Soviet Foreign Ministry and possibly the international section of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party be satisfied with understanding the situation in the Committee of 24, when only the number of petitions

(Mr. Poudade, France)

is given? How can these governmental and Party organs of the USSR understand the situation from the report of the Committee of 24 to the General Assembly without the petitions but all of a sudden be unable to understand the situation of the Trust Territory when our report contains not just a list of petitioners but their status, the subject they are raising and references to the verbatim records and the symbols of official documents? In this respect I endorse what the representative of the United Kingdom said.

Secondly, I was not talking about a 20-page reduction: I was aiming at a 100-page cut, if that is possible. And here I have a question: I fail to see why some statements are reproduced in extenso in the section of the report prepared by the Secretariat whereas other statements are not so reproduced.

I come to my third point. I was led to make this suggestion after my fourth session in the Council and I also had in mind the year that you, Mr. President, will be spending in the Council.

This is how things are done: the Secretariat prepares extracts from statements which it submits to delegations and to you yourself, Mr. President, and delegations flesh out each of these extracts. Finally, we come to a difficult situation: we then have a report in which certain résumés, if they can be called that, have been inflated to the size of verbatim records - which, I repeat, is contrary to the wishes of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General and the Committee on Conferences.

Now, what I want is that in respect of petitions a decision along the lines I have suggested should be taken - and this also goes for statements by Member States containing descriptions of the country and its inhabitants which have remained unchanged for dozens of years. All this should be cut down. As the adage goes: clear thinking makes for clear expression. Hence, what is clearly thought should be clearly stated. It was said that one of the reports of a visiting mission, that of the Mission to Palau, was widely read outside this chamber. Why? Because it was clearly thought out and everything is said in it.

Hence, I repeat, I am in favour of cutting, including cutting the statements by France. I am also requesting this because in line with the rules of procedure this is a request of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General, delegations and the Committee on Conferences.

(Mr. Poudade, France)

I come to my last point. Whereas the representative of the Soviet Union says that I have engaged in self-criticism only in respect of petitions, I engage in self-criticism on everything. And I am doing this in order to avoid overburdening you, Mr. President, because you will have to arbitrate between this and that delegation seeking at every turn to expand its share of the report, whereas that purpose is served by our verbatim records that are issued in the various languages and we must have a concise report.

You can be sure, Mr. President, that what is prompting me is the concern for effective work and not some kind of gerrymandering. As is well known, I need no gerrymandering.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union and I would ask him if he could not perhaps make a fairly short statement.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I shall try and be briefer than I was in my previous statement and even, indeed, to speak at shorter length than did the representative of France.

Once again may I say that essentially all the petitions received by the Trusteeship Council should have been published in full and as separate parts of the report. After the previous session of the Trusteeship Council the Soviet delegation agreed to a compromise: to entrust the Secretariat, which is very experienced in such matters, with the work of reproducing these petitions in summary form, which was in fact done perfectly adequately, and I am sure that the Secretariat will not fail to do this adequately this time as well.

Now, as regards eagerness to reduce the reports of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council, the representative of France for some reason was not so keen on this when he compiled the report of the Visiting Mission to Palau. A large number of pages therein are devoted to a summary of the Compact of Free Association. By the way, that was not part of the mandate of the Mission; that is something that could have been done by the Administering Authority, which it in fact did. But in this case the Mission took it upon itself to expound views on this Compact of Free Association, as expressed by individual members of the Trusteeship Council and the Administering Authority itself.

The PRESIDENT: Could I just ask the representative one question by way of explanation of a point he made? If I understood correctly, he said that all petitions should have been printed in full, and the Soviet Union therefore agreed on a compromise so that the petitions were given only in summary form. When he states that all petitions should have been printed in full, am I right in thinking that that is just his view? It has never been done before in my understanding, and it is not required by anything in the rules of procedure. So when he says "should have been", is he expressing his own wish rather than any imperative either of precedent or of procedure?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, I do not know what compromise you are referring to. If all the petitions received by the Trusteeship Council this year were to be included in extenso in a separate part of the report, I would agree to such a compromise.

May I refer once again to rule 100 of the rules of procedure, which indicates exactly what the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council should consist of. I apologize for not having made in my first statement a point I should have made on the comment made by the representative of France about petitions to other United Nations bodies. Quite recently the representative of France spoke about different statuses pertaining to different bodies and he emphasized the particular status vested in the Trusteeship Council and the fact that it was subordinate to the Security Council.

I think that in the case of the Committee on the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples the matter can be regarded as a separate issue, and I am very grateful to the representative of France for having reminded the Soviet delegation of that. Obviously appropriate steps should be taken to bring that about in the Committee of 24 as well.

Now, as to where the reports are studied and who studies them, I think that here once again possibly the language barrier came between us. I should like to make a minor correction to what was said by the representative of France. When the Soviet delegation said reports are studied in ministries of foreign affairs, I stressed that they are studied not only by delegations

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

and not only by ambassadors here; they go on to be studied in our capitals. I was not trying to have one replace the other. Ambassadors here represent their countries; they represent their capitals here in the United Nations, and the method they employ in studying documents is something for which they themselves are entirely responsible. It is entirely dependent on the particular approaches they take to any particular document. The argument that ambassadors do not read the reports is not at all relevant. I am sure that sometimes ambassadors are not even required to read documents from beginning to end; they have sufficient assistants who are involved in doing just that. But that is another issue; it is simply a question of methodology or approach. I do not think that that is the crux of the problem or something that we should think about here.

What we have to think about is the extent to which our reports to the Security Council reflect the real state of affairs and in fact shed light on all aspects of what is occurring in the Trust Territory.

The PRESIDENT: We have been discussing this procedural problem for rather more than one hour, but I have allowed this to go on because I think it is an important point, and it is a point on which it is apparent that there is disagreement, and I wanted every delegation to feel that it had had an adequate opportunity to state its case at length and as cogently and convincingly as possible.

**I should like to proceed by consensus rather than by voting.**

We have managed to reach this stage of our meeting with only one vote on a comparatively minor point. Perhaps by more skilful chairmanship I could have avoided that. On this occasion I think it may be a little hard, because the proposal of the representative of France has been supported by two other members, and it has been opposed, somewhat strongly, by one representative, who, if I may say so, has spoken very eloquently in some three interventions and has supported his views with much thoughtful argument.

(The President)

I wonder if I could perhaps put a rather commonsensical view to the members, and particularly to the representative of the Soviet Union, to see if this might help in achieving a consensus on this point.

It does seem to me that the Trusteeship Council, for the first 20 years of its life, went through what we can call its great period; that is to say, there were a large number of Trust Territories for which it bore responsibility and there were very many members of the Trusteeship Council and there were Presidents sitting in this Chair very much more eminent than I am. Those were, I would say, the great days of the Trusteeship Council.

The point I am going to make is that surely what was good enough for them in those days, when they had really great responsibilities on their shoulders, should be good enough for us today. I would therefore find it a reasonable thing to do to proceed as they proceeded in this matter, which, as I understand it, is in line with the proposal that has been put to us: to go back to the procedures that existed before 1979.

Could I therefore, with a reference to the great days of the Trusteeship Council, appeal to the representative of the Soviet Union perhaps tacitly to accept this proposal and to join a consensus on this?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Sir, your description of past history was very touching, but the Soviet delegation cannot agree to what you have called a consensus in this case. We cannot agree to a consensus in memory of the good old days of the Council and at the same time violate a principle, the principle that reports of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council should contain as much information as possible on the state of affairs in the Trust Territory.

Furthermore, my delegation insists that, if the decision is taken to omit the section on petitions from the report, then the discussion on this issue that has arisen today should be complete as possible and should be as completely as possible reflected in the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council, so that there can be no doubts or misgivings whatsoever as to who was responsible for the report omitting an important part containing information on the Trust Territory.

In connection with the proposal that the structure of the report should be changed, I should like to remind the other members of the Council, including the representative of France, who has today demonstrated how carefully he has perused

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

the records of previous meetings, of what was said by the French delegation and by other delegations at the last session and the session before that against a proposal made by the Soviet Union that the report should be restructured. They also referred on that occasion to the good old days and said that the format of the report had become established and that it was fully consonant with the needs of the Trusteeship Council and with its mandate, but today the delegation of France has done a 180-degree turn and has proposed that the layout of the report should be changed and that it should be restructured, not in a way that is warranted by political considerations - and by political considerations I mean the authority of the Trusteeship Council, its mandate, its obligations to the Security Council to report to it on the situation in the Territory and to reflect it as fully as possible.

The PRESIDENT: Well, I can only express regret that what looked like becoming a consensus of four remains, I am afraid, only a majority view of three.

I would add only one point: that the Soviet Union considers that the French proposal violates an important principle, or at least a principle. The point of my intervention was to suggest that, when the Council was much larger - much more important than it is today, it did not then consider that principle was violated, and I think it is the view of three of the members today that the principle that the report should reflect, as appropriate, should take into account, as the rules of procedure say - take into account, not publish in full - various sources of information, including petitions, this principle should remain valid.

I fear that we shall have to put this to the vote. The proposal is that, in dealing with petitions in the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council, the Council shall revert to the pre-1979 procedure, that is to say, that the petitions should be listed, together with the reference number, the name of the petitioner, the subject, with perhaps a reference to the verbatim record, and that at the end the reaction of the Council to these petitions should be given.

Perhaps the representative of France would indicate whether I have correctly formulated the proposal.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): You quite correctly described my proposal. May I simply add that my proposal covers not just written or oral petitions but also communications and, for that purpose, I have distributed the model of the forty-fourth session, which was perfect. We should add to that simply the reference to the records; then they could be easily consulted.

The PRESIDENT: I should have mentioned that the word "petitions" should be taken to include communications as well.

I must now put this proposal to the vote.

The proposal was adopted by 3 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT: We have taken rather a long time over that but, as I said, I think it was important that the matter should be dealt with fully.

Are there any other points which members would like to raise at this stage before we go on to consider our programme of work for our next meeting? I should like to devote the whole of our next meeting to recommendations and conclusions and then to the adoption of our report. If there are any other matters, now is the opportunity to take them up.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): To make it clear that my proposal is not designed to conceal any of the petitions, I would hope that in the report to be drawn up and which is prepared by the Secretariat, discussed among delegations and submitted to the Council, the Secretariat will be guided by one of the suggestions I made - there is no need to vote on it - to the effect that the statements, procedural debates and so on should be reflected in the most concise manner possible, because this, I repeat, reflects the unanimous will of the Members of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General and the Committee on Conferences. There is no need to reproduce verbatim the statements of this or that delegation on any subject. This is merely a suggestion. I should be very glad if the Secretariat would be mindful of it.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The representative of France, I believe, is already beginning to impinge on the sovereign rights of sovereign members of the Trusteeship Council. I appreciate that the report should reflect the views of the delegations and the

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

important ideas which they have put forward during the discussion. Therefore, the attempt to dictate to the Secretariat, to lay down the law, by suggesting that the statements of one delegation should be included and those of another not, I think would be really going too far. That would be the expression I would use. Naturally, the Secretariat must take into account the views of the French delegation, but without, at the same time, doing any mischief to the substance of the points made by others during the discussion.

The PRESIDENT: I think there is a slight misunderstanding here. Doubtless it is one of these things that arise from the difficulties of simultaneous interpretation. I had noted that the representative of France had asked the President, myself, to appeal to delegations to limit references to statements and remarks to essentials, to the essence of their statements and remarks. So, there was no attempt to dictate or to infringe the rights of any member. Naturally, if a member insists that something should be printed verbatim, it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to refuse that. But, what I was going to do was to appeal to delegations, and I was going to do so on my own authority, because it seemed to me that this was in keeping with a United Nations resolution and the Secretary-General's recommendation. I do not think this is a matter on which we should disagree at all. I propose to do this perhaps on Friday when we consider the report and decide on what goes into the report. I do not think we need spend any more time on this. I shall take certain presidential action which will not in any way infringe the rights of members or in any way attempt to dictate to them. I can assure the representative of the Soviet Union of that.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We are delighted, Sir, that you so correctly interpreted the statement of the representative of France regarding the sovereign rights of each delegation.

Since I have the floor, Sir, and I do not want to irritate you because I have taken the floor so often, I would like to emphasize once again that, so far as the discussion which took place today is concerned - on this procedural issue - that is what you call it, but we believe it goes far beyond a procedural issue; it is a question, we believe, that has great political significance - this discussion which took place today should be reflected as fully as possible in the

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

report to the Security Council, so that even such statements as the one to the effect that members of the Security Council have not read the report should also be reflected in the report. I would very much like the representatives of States in the Security Council to have a complete picture of exactly how certain members of the Trusteeship Council regard the functioning of members of the Security Council and their attitude to the duties which are incumbent both on the Trusteeship Council and the Security Council.

The PRESIDENT: I think it is fully understood that this discussion will indeed be reflected accurately and appropriately in our report. As regards the question as to whether permanent representatives of the Security Council read that report, I do not think their non-reading may be taken to be a criticism. The ones I have talked to, three, all fully accepted with a laugh that they had not read it, and I imagine that this is true of the vast majority. I do not think this is a criticism of the Security Council or one which will cause anyone to worry at all. We shall see whether this particular point should appropriately be in the report. I would certainly have no objection at all. It is just a question of whether it is worth the space of putting it in.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I have no objection to reporting a procedural debate nor to my name or that of the French delegation being mentioned, as the Council well knows. I would simply refer to document A/INF/38/1 of 27 April on "Control and limitation of documentation". In paragraph 32 (b) of part D 1 it stipulates as follows:

"Introductions containing background information should, as far as possible, be confined to matters of substance rather than procedure and should contain only what it is essential to bring to the notice of the organ to which the report is addressed".

Having quoted this, I have no scruples about the Soviet delegation wanting i it to be indicated that it is the French delegation which asked for the report to be shortened.

The PRESIDENT: The words I used were "reflecting accurately and appropriately", and I think we must examine the text before we go any further in this matter.

Mr. BERMAN (United Kingdom): I am going to take up the Council's time for just a moment to express my tribute to the representative of the Soviet Union for the fertility of his invention. Not only has he succeeded this afternoon in inventing, after 33 years of the Trusteeship Council, a pretended principle, which, going back to the standard practice of the Council, it would in some sense violate, but he has also, in the recent discussion, invented a doctrine under which the reports of principal organs of the United Nations are in some sense the property of individual delegations. That is not a discussion that I would wish to prolong and certainly I wish to assure the Council that I do not insist on my tribute to his inventiveness being recorded in the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council.

I should, however, like to make it perfectly plain that in the view of my delegation the report of the Trusteeship Council is the property of the Council as a whole and that it is for the Council as a whole to decide what goes into the report and in what sense and, if need be, even to decide upon its report paragraph by paragraph, sentence by sentence and word by word - if individual delegations should insist on that. We cannot accept any pretended principle under which it is the sovereign right of any delegation to insist

(Mr. Berman, United Kingdom)

upon the drafting of a particular section in one way or the other. That is a matter for the Council to decide.

Having made these few remarks, I should like to say that it did seem to us that the suggestion put forward by the representative of France was one of such obvious good sense that it would have been accepted as such. We understood the French suggestion to be that the report of the Council to the Security Council should concentrate on questions of substance and should deal in a suitably concise form with questions of procedure. In other words, it would lay the emphasis of the report on the substantive work of the Council and not on clearly procedural discussion.

I would also say that the report of a principal organ, or indeed of any organ, should not be, by definition, a verbatim record let alone a summary record of proceedings but, being a report of that body to its parent body, must obviously not fall into the trap of reproducing what already exists as, in this particular case, verbatim records. Should any member of the Security Council or any Member of the United Nations or any member of the general public or any member of the academic community wish to see exactly what was said, word for word, by members of the Council in this procedural discussion, then, thank goodness, we have in existence an excellent set of verbatim records from which those very words can be read. But this is most emphatically not an argument in favour of reduplicating verbatim records when it comes to preparing a report of this body, or any body, which would simply serve the function of being a gross waste of the money of the United Nations which is contributed by all Member States of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT: I am very grateful for being reminded of some important points which are indeed very relevant to our discussion. I think we need to be reminded of these points and "we", I think, includes the Secretariat on whose shoulders much of the drafting of this report falls.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the latest remarks of the representative of the United Kingdom I should like to make the following statement.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

As regards the statement that the Soviet delegation has invented principles, it seems to me that such a statement is clearly an invention on the part of the United Kingdom delegation. The Soviet delegation's statement was based on facts and on the rules of procedure, and for that reason what was said a moment ago by the representative of the United Kingdom is something to which we must obviously respond.

To turn first of all to his statement to the effect that the report should be brief, an attack is now commencing against the opinions expressed in the Trusteeship Council. It is for the United Kingdom delegation to choose, if it so wishes, not to express its opinions at all or to have them expressed in whatever form is necessary for the United Kingdom. That is its right.

As far as the Soviet delegation is concerned, it will insist that its position be reflected fully. We are not talking about procedural questions. There is obviously no need to concentrate on procedural matters. On that the United Kingdom representative is quite right. However, the substance of these procedural questions ought to be clearly and precisely reflected, especially as regards the substance of such procedural questions that are not truly procedural at all, as was the case today. This is not a procedural discussion; it is a political discussion, which has a direct bearing on the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and how that situation is to be reflected in the report.

Furthermore, as far as concerns the notion that the report is not the property of any individual delegation, it is true that it is not the property of a single delegation. However, neither is it the property of three delegations. Therefore opinions must be fully reflected in the report. Otherwise, making use of a two-vote edge here, one can talk of a majority, yes. All right. But what kind of majority is that? That is the question.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

While the report is not the property of individual delegations -- and never has been, as I understand it -- it has always been the property of three delegations for some reason. In this case it seems to me that the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom was inappropriate.

The PRESIDENT: As President I have been very mindful throughout our meetings of the particular position of the Soviet Union, which often finds itself on matters of substance, as on matters of procedure, in disagreement with other members. For that reason I have made quite sure that the Soviet Union has had a very large share of the meetings.

To mention one or two matters, I seem to remember something like a whole day devoted entirely to listening to the Soviet Union's questioning of the Administering Authority, half a day looking at petitions one by one, as the representative of the Soviet Union had requested, and so on. Therefore, I hope that the Soviet Union feels that its voice has been heard and that it has been given not only its fair share but perhaps a little more than its fair share. That is perhaps no bad thing in a Council which, as the representative of the Soviet Union pointed out, tends to divide three and one.

I have no doubt that the views of the Soviet Union will be "fully reflected" in the report. The trouble is that the words "fully reflected" can mean almost anything -- from a verbatim account to a one-sentence summary. It is our interpretation that matters.

I think that the Council's view has been fairly well expressed. It is that this year we should try to achieve a more readable, more succinct report than in the past.

The discussion this afternoon is procedural, although, as the representative of the Soviet Union reminded us, it has a political element to it. But everything said in this building could be described as political. As regards the reflection of this afternoon's discussion, I suggest that a succinct summary might appear in the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council, in the section entitled "Examination of Petitions". That, I think, would fairly reflect the fact that the French have made a proposal, that it has been agreed by the majority and that the Soviet Union has opposed it for various reasons.

(The President)

The reasons for the proposal and the reasons for opposing it might be given succinctly.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that that meets the wishes of the members of the Council.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The PRESIDENT: Subject to the agreement of members, I propose to schedule two meetings on Friday, 10 June. The Council will first be asked to take decisions on the report of the Drafting Committee which has been distributed in document T/L.1238 and which was introduced today by the representative of France. Following that, I should like the Council to take a decision on agenda items 12 and 13, "Attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territories" and "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". That would be in line with the procedure that the Council decided on at its meeting on 27 May.

I propose that the Council then consider and adopt its report to the Security Council.

I find it very difficult to judge how long these matters will take, which is why I have scheduled a meeting in the morning and another in the afternoon on Friday, 10 June, but, of course, we need not go on longer than we have to, and we might be able to adjourn before 6 o'clock on Friday.

If there are no comments on that proposed programme of work for Friday, I shall adjourn this meeting until 10.30 a.m. on 10 June.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.