



Seventh Special Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHT HUNDRED AND FORTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 20 September 1957, at 11.30 a.m.

President:

Mr. HOOD

(Australia)

The future of Togoland under French administration: report
of the United Nations Commission on Togoland under French
administration (continued)

Note:

The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.847 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

THE FUTURE OF TOGOLAND UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION: REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON TOGOLAND UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION (T/1336 and Corr.1, 1336/Add.1 and Corr.1, 1336/Add.2; T/L.809) [General Assembly resolution 1046 (XI)]
[Agenda item 2] (continued)

The PRESIDENT: The Council has before it, as the final stage of this special session, the draft special report of the Council to the General Assembly on the future of Togoland under French administration. This is in document T/L.809.

I propose to put this report before the Council and ask for a vote upon it.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): Before we take up the consideration of this report, I should like to make a few observations.

The other day I argued that the basic law of 23 June 1956, that is, the loi-cadre, envisaged two things for the Trust Territory: first, the devolution of further powers, and, second, the holding of elections on the basis of universal suffrage. (T/PV.845, p.32) I claimed then that article 10 of Title III of the Act applied also to this Territory, but the representative of France felt that the appropriate reference should be articles 8 and 9 of Title II of the Act. Since then I have read the Act very carefully, and I find that I am obliged to adhere to my original point of view, for the following reasons, which I should like to state for the record.

I agree with the representative of France that Title II refers specifically to French Togoland and authorizes the Government to establish the Statute. It refers to universal suffrage only in the context of the referendum, whereas Title III, article 10 of the Act, refers to the general introduction of universal suffrage and the holding of elections on that basis to Territorial Assemblies, circonscriptions and municipal councils in all Territories under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Overseas France. This article does not, it may be observed, exclude Trust Territories -- and indeed it cannot exclude them, for they are, under the Trusteeship Agreement, under the jurisdiction of the Government of France.

I submit, therefore, that the holding of elections in French Togoland is a requirement of the basic law itself. In other words, the decision to hold elections has already been taken by the French Parliament. It is now only a question of the implementation of that decision, and whether the decision is implemented by the Territorial Government or by the Administering Authority is quite immaterial. But of one thing we are certain, and that is that the law requires that elections shall be held on the basis of universal suffrage; and in our opinion the sooner this is done, without any strings attached, the smoother will be the course of future events, both in the Territory and in the United Nations.

I am fortified in this view of the question by the memorandum of the French Government itself of 30 July 1956, which is in document T/1274/Rev.1, where a distinction is clearly drawn between the authority for the referendum -- that is, article 8 -- and the authority for the introduction of universal suffrage which is derived from the Act itself. This view was later confirmed by Mr. Guy Périet de Féral, the Referendum Administrator, in his report in document T/1292, paragraph 5, where he says that the provisions regarding elections by universal suffrage applied to all Overseas Territories, including French Togoland, and quoted the authority as being derived in particular from Title III, article 10.

It is not my intention to reopen the debate, but the question was important enough for me to take the floor again, and I have done so not only to clarify our position but in the hope that the distinguished representative of France will study the matter further -- for this question may well come up again in the Fourth Committee.

Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) (interpretation from French): My colleague from Guatemala, who is very highly experienced in matters concerning Togoland -- having been a member of the Commission -- presented during the debate a certain number of suggestions in respect of the draft resolution submitted by the United States of America. Subsequently, and quite legitimately, he requested the Council to reproduce in the report now before us the text of the suggestions which he had made. Naturally no one had objected to that; we consider that it is the right of every delegation to express a separate opinion and to ask that this opinion be included in the report. Belgium has, in fact, more than

once used this right. However, the Guatemalan representative's request related to mere suggestions that had been made, and not to a formal amendment on which a vote had been taken. Therefore, I am somewhat surprised to observe that the suggestions made by the representative of Guatemala have been included in the report in the form of a separate annex, entitled Annex IV.

(Mr. Smolderen, Belgium)

What I am saying at present applies, in fact, not to my colleague from Guatemala who is not involved. The proposal which he has made to include this amendment in the report is a perfectly legitimate one and it is not he who prepares the report.

I wonder whether the only logical solution would not consist simply of having three annexes. In annexes I and II we would reproduce the texts which we transmit by means of this resolution to the General Assembly, and in annex III we could reproduce the observations of members of the Council which are merely their opinions. It seems to me that it might be more logical to include the texts of these suggestions, or amendments, presented by the representative of Guatemala, when the Secretariat summarizes the opinions of my colleague from Guatemala, and not have such comments included in a separate annex.

In making this comment I have in mind that this precedent might lead to a number of consequences. Any delegation might, in the future, express opinions and, in order to place them in the limelight, request that they be presented in a separate annex. I am quite sure that the representative of Guatemala will appreciate my point of view. I repeat that my colleague from Guatemala is not involved and I am sure he will recognize, with me, that perhaps the text of his amendment would be better included in annex III.

Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORISSE (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to reply briefly to the representative of India. I do not wish to enter into, or rather, reopen a legal debate. In any case, whether or not Title III applies to Togoland -- and I maintain my position that it does not -- the text does not provide for the automatic dissolution of assemblies but rather for the use of universal suffrage when they are renewed at the expiry of their term of office.

The question of elections was dealt with by Mr. Apedo-Amah and therefore I do not see any need to speak again on this point.

The PRESIDENT: In connexion with the remarks made by the representative of Belgium, I draw attention to the fact that the document before the Council is described as a "working paper prepared by the Secretariat" and it was thought convenient to incorporate the suggestions made by the representative of Guatemala, at his request, in the form of an annex. Nevertheless, this is not necessarily a hard and fast arrangement and I dare say it might be appropriate to include those suggestions, and, indeed, any others that may have been made, in the eventual section which will contain the observations made by individual members of the Council.

Mr. ROLZ-BENNETT (Guatemala)(interpretation from Spanish): I have listened with close attention to the observations made by the representative of Belgium a few moments ago concerning the form in which the report we have before us is presented and, in particular, to his comments concerning annex IV, which contains the suggestions introduced by my delegation to the draft finally approved by the Council yesterday.

I wish to make one observation, namely, that it seems to me that the presentation of these suggestions as annex IV is inappropriate and I had intended to suggest that they should, rather, appear as annex II to the report, since they are directly related to the draft resolution appearing in annex I. In principle, this is still my view on this point. Nevertheless if the members of the Council feel that the inclusion of these observations and suggestions in an annex is not completely in accordance with the practice followed by the Council -- a practice which I cannot verify at this moment -- it seems to me there is no precedent either for or against this practice and that it would be logical to include them as an annex. Nevertheless, having said this, I might suggest that perhaps we could solve the matter in the following manner:

In paragraph 8 of the report, where the text sets forth the fact that the representative of Guatemala asked that one of his suggested amendments, which had not been incorporated in the final text of the United States draft resolution,

(Mr. Rolz-Bennett, Guatemala)

be recorded, there I think we might do as is usually done in reports which come to us from the Committee on Petitions. When delegations wish to have their views set forth in reports of the Committee to the Council, the text of the suggestions that the particular delegations wish to have recorded is usually included in the paragraphs of the report.

To summarize, my view is that I would prefer to have my observations appear in an annex, as annex II. Nevertheless, if a majority of the members of the Council hold another view on this point, I would have no objection to having them included directly in the report, in paragraph 8.

If necessary, I may make some additional comments later.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I think the suggestion just made by the representative of Guatemala is in line with the decision taken yesterday which was that the suggestions put forward by him should figure in the report itself and certainly yesterday there was no mention of annexes. I, personally, am surprised to find his suggestions in annex IV.

In accordance with past practice, the proper place for this amendment is in paragraph 8 itself and we would like to see it there.

Now I have a few amendments to certain other paragraphs and I should like to read them out.

In paragraph 3, the second sentence begins: "The Council decided also to examine ...". I should like to propose the insertion of the words "at the same time" after the word "examine" and also the deletion of the subsequent clause within commas, that is, the deletion of the words "within the scope of its discussion", up to the word "administration".

Then, on the next page, page 2, I should like the first line to read: "which it had decided to postpone from its nineteenth session to the seventh special session." That would require the deletion of the words "during its examination of" in the first line, and the deletion of the next line, so that the whole sentence, that is, the second sentence of paragraph 3, might, I suggest, read: "The Council decided also to examine at the same time political conditions in that Territory, the consideration of which it had decided to postpone from its nineteenth session to the seventh special session." That would be a shorter sentence and more to the point, I think.

(Mr. Jaipal, India)

Then in paragraph 4, the fifth line begins with the words "speaking as a member of the French delegation, made statements". I would like to suggest the deletion of the rest of the sentence after the word "statements". I suggest that line 5 might read as follows: "speaking as a member of the French delegation, made statements..." and the rest of the text should be deleted as far as the word "statements" which appears in the penultimate line of that paragraph, so that the paragraph would continue "which are reproduced in annex II to the present report."

In other words, the second sentence of paragraph 4 would read:

"At the same meeting, Mr. Jacques Kosciuszko-Morizet, representative of France on the Trusteeship Council, and Mr. Georges Apedo-Amah, the representative of the Togoland Government, speaking as a member of the French delegation, made statements which are reproduced in annex II to the present report."

The reason for my suggesting these deletions should be quite obvious; I do not want to see any elaboration of the statements in the report itself since the statements are being reproduced in the annex. If we elaborate these statements, then I think it becomes difficult for certain other delegations which have made statements that they might also like to see incorporated in the body of the report.

These are the two suggestions I have to offer.

Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium)(interpretation from French): In support of the view that the suggestions made by the representative of Guatemala should be included in paragraph 8 of the report, reference has been made to the reports of the Standing Committee on Petitions. I think this is a very bad precedent. In fact, the reports of the Standing Committee on Petitions never contain any amendments which have not been voted on; all the amendments contained in the reports from the Petitions Committee are amendments which have been voted on -- with an indication of the number of votes obtained. I therefore cannot see how we could introduce into paragraph 8 the suggestions made by the representative of Guatemala, particularly since the representative of India has spoken indirectly in support of my view in proposing to eliminate from paragraph 4 the analysis of the statements of the representatives of France and Togoland. The report would be unbalanced, since in the introductory part we would have the opinion of the

(Mr. Smolderen, Belgium)

representative of Guatemala and not even the opinions of the representatives of France and Togoland.

In these conditions, I wonder whether the suggestion I made earlier to include the comments of the representative of Guatemala in its place, namely, in annex III is perhaps not the only possible solution under the circumstances.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I do not at all mind the analysis of the statements made by the representative of France being included in paragraph 4, but what I suggest is that this is a selective analysis and therefore it is objectionable.

On the other hand, yesterday the Council took a formal decision to incorporate the suggestions put forward by the representative of Guatemala in the body of the report and I am somewhat surprised to see that discussion on that question should now be reopened, after a decision has already been taken.

The PRESIDENT: In my recollection, there was no formal decision to do anything particular in respect of the request of the representative of Guatemala. The Council certainly acquiesced in a general way to the incorporation in some form of the suggestions made by that representative; but I do not think there was any formal decision that they should be incorporated at any particular point of the report or in any particular section. This, of course, is a difficulty which we now have to resolve, and I would like to invite members' comments.

Mr. THORP (New Zealand): I am somewhat out of touch with the form of this report as I see it here. It is my recollection that the text of observations made in the Council are normally not regarded as annexes but as part of the body of the report. They are not included in our normal reports as annexes but under the heading "Observations of individual members". The annex could well form part of the body of the report if we followed our usual procedure; and I am rather inclined to agree with the representative of Belgium when he suggests that the representative of Guatemala could include the full text of his suggestions as attributed to him in the observations of his delegation. I recall that when the President took up his suggestion, he remarked that he took it to be part of the normal procedure, when the representative of Guatemala asked that his observations should go into the report --

(Mr. Thorp, New Zealand)

and it is certainly fully within the functions of his delegation to ensure that what he says is put in -- and I assume that he will, when asked what his observations are, place these observations in the appropriate section.

Mr. ROLZ-BENNETT (Guatemala)(interpretation from Spanish): It is very clear to my delegation that if our intention had been merely to ensure that the suggestions we made concerning the draft resolution should be included in the observations attributed to members of this Council in the general debate, I would not have taken the trouble to submit the question to the Council, nor would I have taken the trouble to propose it to the President. This is a normal duty, in respect of which no requests whatsoever need be made. When the Council's report is submitted to the General Assembly, this includes the observations of various members and this certainly does not call for any request or application by any delegation.

It was a particular, specific and special case; and it was because my delegation wished to ensure that these suggestions, which it was not submitting to the vote, should appear in the report itself, that I took the liberty of asking the President for this authorization. The President in turn consulted the Council on this matter and the Council, tacitly but certainly, did decide -- in view of the fact that no observations were made on these suggestions -- to include them in the report.

My understanding of the situation is as follows: yesterday the Council actually did accede to the request made by my delegation, namely, that the suggestions made by it would be included in the text of the report itself and not in the observations of delegations.

The PRESIDENT: The Council must, of course, itself decide on this matter.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): The normal procedure is normally followed; but yesterday the representative of Guatemala wanted a different procedure. He made a suggestion for the incorporation of his amendments in the body of the report; and that, I submit, was accepted by the Council.

However, to cut short the discussion, I now formally move that the Guatemalan suggestions should be incorporated in paragraph 8 of this report and I should like that to be put to the vote.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The attempts to revise the decisions taken by the Council at yesterday's meeting cannot but arouse justifiable surprise. The fact that a decision was taken, without a formal vote, to incorporate into the text of the report the amendments submitted by the representative of Guatemala does not alter the situation, since such a procedure has frequently been followed here. In so far as no objections were raised, the decision was accepted unanimously, I would say, on that basis.

If there had been any objections, then probably the representative of Guatemala, or some other representative, would have put the question on a formal basis; but such objections did not arise and, so far as I can recall, the representative of Guatemala first of all requested that the question of the incorporation of these amendments into the report be resolved before his own position might be established on the other items in the report; his request was acceded to on the basis of acquiescence by the Council. Therefore, both the President's interpretation, and certain attempts on the part of other representatives to clarify the position -- that is, to raise this matter in the Council once again -- appear to us to amount to the reopening of issues which have already been decided upon, a procedure which is not usually followed in the organs of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to say that I now have the text before me of what precisely was said yesterday. Therefore, I can read it to the Council.

The representative of Guatemala said:

"At this juncture, my delegation does not intend to ask for a vote on an amendment, but I would like these suggestions to appear in their entirety in the report which the Council will submit to the General Assembly ...

I trust there will be no objection to this course of action." (T/PV.846, p.22).

And, the President replied:

"I will, of course, follow the wish of the Council in this matter."

At that point, I heard no objection and I proceeded to say:

"I take it to be part of the normal procedure and it will be done."

(T/PV.846, p.26).

(The President)

This is what was actually said. Now, as to exactly how it is done may possibly be another matter and the fact that the representative of Belgium has made a precise formulation of the way in which, in his opinion, it might be done is an indication, of course, that the acquiescence of the Council yesterday did not necessarily mean that everybody agreed as to how this particular incorporation should be applied.

Now the Council has before it a formal proposal submitted by the representative of India that this suggestion be incorporated into paragraph 8.

Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I should like to assure the representative of Guatemala that I see no objection to the inclusion of his suggestions in the report and, as I said a few moments ago, I think that when a member of the Council asks to have his individual opinion included in the report, the decision is always taken to grant him this privilege. If this is so, and if the suggestions made by the representative of Guatemala are to appear in paragraph 8, I should like to make a formal proposal that the entire text of annex III -- entitled "Observations of members of the Trusteeship Council on political advancement in Togoland under French administration, representing their individual opinions only" -- should be included after paragraph 8. We would, therefore, have a logical text which would have only the two texts as an annex to the document which we are submitting to the General Assembly for its consideration.

Thus, we would have a voluminous report which would summarize all of the views of the members of the Council.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put the proposal of the representative of India to the vote of the Council.

I call upon the representative of India.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I see now that this Council is equally divided between the administering members and the non-administering members. I find that Syria's place at the Council table is not occupied at the moment and, on issues like this, it has been customary in the past to defer a vote until all members are present.

The PRESIDENT: I take note of that remark but the Council must nonetheless proceed with its business within a reasonable time.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): If it will help the representative of India out, it is the purpose of my delegation to vote in favour of his proposal; as I understand it, that is agreeable to the representative of Guatemala. Therefore, the question of balance is not involved here.

Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I wonder whether it is necessary to take a vote. I have just mentioned that I would accept the inclusion of the opinion of the representative of Guatemala in paragraph 8. However, I should like to see the opinions of all of the other members included as well in paragraph 9 and subsequent paragraphs. If the Council accepts this course of action, then there is no need for a vote: we shall adopt the report without taking a vote.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): With all due deference to the representative of Belgium, I did ask for a vote and I should like a vote to be taken. As regards his suggestion, my delegation would not like to see its observations included in paragraph 8.

Mr. THORP (New Zealand): I intervened in this debate at a time when I thought that the representative of Guatemala might well see his way to put his observations in the section dealing with individual observations. It was not, however, my intention to vote against his proposal that they be put in paragraph 8 because I agree to this extent with the representative of India that this is not a normal procedure: it is an exceptional procedure and one which is part, perhaps, of the compromise which has gone into the making of this report.

Therefore, in order not to prejudice any further action which my delegation may take in the future, I will abstain from this vote.

Mr. MUFTI (Syria) (interpretation from French): In paragraph 9 of the report contained in document T/L.809, it is stated:

"...the observations on political advancement in Togoland under French administration made by individual members of the Council during the examination of the annual report on the Territory for 1955 ... are reproduced as annex III to the present report."

However, in annex III we note no reference to the observations which were mentioned in paragraph 9.

My delegation feels that it would be better to say that these observations are referred to in annex III to the present report and will be reproduced in the final version of the Council's report.

The PRESIDENT: I think that we can take up that point later.

I must now put to the Council the proposal of the representative of India for the inclusion in paragraph 8 of the suggestion made by the representative of Guatemala.

Mr. KIANG (China): If the President puts that proposal to the vote, I have only one comment to make; in any event, I do not wish to prolong the debate. However, I think it is perfectly all right to include the suggestions made by the representative of Guatemala in paragraph 8, which is acceptable to my delegation. The only thing which I should like to say is that, in including the suggestions made by the representative of Guatemala, I think that the word "amendment" should be deleted because I have studied the two statements made by my good friend, Mr. Rolz-Bennett, and I have not noted the word "amendment" ever mentioned by him.

Now, for instance, in his first statement he said: "I emphasize the word 'suggestions'"; therefore, I consider that in order to be correct, I would say that in including his suggestions we should delete the word "amendment".

The PRESIDENT: Is there any objection to this subsidiary suggestion?

Mr. MUFTI (Syria) (interpretation from French): I have no objection. However, the text has been presented in writing and usually suggestions are not presented in writing. If the Council considers that these were simply suggestions, my delegation sees no objection to introducing such a change in the paragraph.

Mr. THORP (New Zealand): I was going to support the proposal of the representative of China. It might even be desirable to say "suggestions to the sponsor".

Mr. ROLZ-BENNETT (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): I think that this would directly affect what I said in the meeting and I adhere to what I said earlier on this point.

The PRESIDENT: In that case, I think that the phraseology of paragraph 8 is still dependent on the motion I will put to the Council. I take it that if such a motion is adopted, the phraseology will not include the word "amendment".

I will now put to the vote the proposal of the representative of India.

The proposal of the representative of India to include the suggestions made by the Guatemalan representative in paragraph 8 of the report was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We come now to the two amendments proposed also by the representative of India. The first refers to paragraph 3. As amended, the second sentence of the paragraph would read:

"The Council decided also to examine, at the same time, political conditions in that Territory, the consideration of which it had decided to postpone from its nineteenth session to the seventh special session."

The Indian amendment to paragraph 3 was adopted.

The PRESIDENT: Secondly, in paragraph 4, the amendment is for the deletion of the words after "made statements", so that the end of the paragraph would read "made statements which are reproduced in annex II of the present report".

Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (interpretation from French): I consider that this proposal is both unfriendly and unacceptable. It would seem to me that in a debate such as this, if any opinion is to be taken into account, it is surely the opinion of the Power administering trusteeship. The report, as we see it, refers to the statements I had the honour of making on behalf of the French Government as well as those of Mr. Apedo-Amah, and I do not see why the reference to these statements should be deleted from the report.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): I should like to support the remarks just made by the representative of France. It seems to me both appropriate and necessary that these words should be included, and I can see no reason for any amendment.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I should like to assure the representative of France that there is nothing unfriendly in my suggestion. All I said was that this was incomplete and inadequate. For example, there is no reference here whatever to the intention of the Togoland Government to hold elections before 1960, to which intention many members here attach considerable importance. If the Secretariat is going to do a job of summarizing the statement, I think it should do an adequate job, and in my opinion this is not adequate. That is why I suggested the deletion of these words.

The amendment to paragraph 4 proposed by the representative of India was rejected by 7 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. MUFTI (Syria) (interpretation from French): I should like to suggest that paragraph 9 be redrafted. We might say that "... the

(Mr. Mufti, Syria)

observations on political advancement in Togoland" and so forth "are referred to in annex III to the present report and will be reproduced in the final draft of the report of the Trusteeship Council". We note that, as a matter of fact, the observations are not reproduced as annex III. This is a fact which can easily be verified.

The PRESIDENT: I think this is very likely a technical point. Due to the pressure of time, the actual preparation of the text containing these observations has not yet been completed. It will be done and will be circulated to all the members of the Council for their approval or correction and will then be incorporated in the report in its final form. I would suggest that we look at this matter from the technical point of view.

Mr. MUFTI (Syria) (interpretation from French): This clarification is satisfactory and I will not press my proposal.

The PRESIDENT: Finally, I draw attention to the phrase at present in brackets in paragraph 9, namely, "as well as during the consideration of the question of the future of the Territory at the seventh special session". If it is the wish of the Council, this passage will be included in paragraph 9.

It was so agreed.

The PRESIDENT: The Council now has before it the draft report as amended. Is there any objection to its adoption? Since there is no objection, the report is adopted.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): As the Council has very recently been faced with the rather unusual phenomenon of a proposal not formally voted upon being challenged, perhaps for the purpose of avoiding similar occurrences in the future it might be logical to take a formal vote.

The PRESIDENT: Does the representative of the Soviet Union refer to the vote on the report?

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Yes. I was wondering whether there would be any objection to the Council's following the normal procedure, as has been done on previous occasions. Today's occurrence raises the following question: Would the Council's decision not be challenged or misinterpreted by someone? It might perhaps be preferable to vote upon the report in order to avoid similar occurrences.

The reason why I ask this question is that the action which I noted a few moments ago in the Council has raised doubts which I wish to clarify with the President; it is not due to any doubts which might have arisen in my own mind.

The PRESIDENT: As the President has stated that the report has been adopted, that is a formal adoption by the Council. However, if a vote is requested I am bound to accede to that request.

Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I can understand the USSR representative's desire for clarification, but I should like to recall that I have already submitted some proposals to the Council that have been adopted and then disputed for several days.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In order to avoid any misinterpretation and additional discussion, I should like to propose that the report as a whole be put to the vote. This should avoid any misunderstanding in the future.

The PRESIDENT: I shall put the report to the vote.

The report as a whole was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I will now point out one or two matters connected with the documentation of the present session. The Council has decided to transmit to the General Assembly, together with the report of the special Commission, the official records of this session. As members of the Council know, the blue mimeographed records which have been circulated are provisional only and are subject to correction by delegations. The final records are only issued in printed form after corrections, if any, have been received by the Secretariat. In order that the final records of this session may be available to the Fourth Committee when it considers the question of Togoland, it is necessary that those delegations wishing to submit corrections to the provisional records should do so as soon as possible. I would urge that these corrections be submitted by 12 noon on Tuesday next, at the latest.

I would also point out that the observations to be included in Annex III to the report will be prepared by the Secretariat and circulated to members of the Council for their approval on Monday morning. In order to expedite the preparation of the final report to the General Assembly I would also urge delegations to submit their comments on this draft when they receive it on the same day, that is, on Monday.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): I believe this is the last time the President will be presiding over the Council and, without wishing to initiate a long and embarrassing period for him, I merely wish on behalf of my delegation to thank him for the fairness in which he has presided over this Council. He has shown a very sensitive understanding of the Council's moods, which has enabled him to preside so well. He has been a skillful presiding officer whom my delegation will miss very much. It has been a pleasure to serve under him and we wish him the very best of luck for the future.

Mr. MUFTI (Syria) (interpretation from French): I should like very much to support the words of praise addressed to the President. I should, however, like to go back for a moment to the discussion of the Council's documentation. Although my delegation had made three preliminary comments on the Council's report, heretofore no reply has been made on these points by the Commission itself. I should like, if possible, to hear the Commission's view on the three preliminary comments I made during the general debate which related more to the form of the report and to questions of drafting.

The PRESIDENT: Is the representative of Syria asking that the Commission be invited to reply to his comments in the Council?

Mr. MUFTI (Syria) (interpretation from French): I shall not insist upon such action being taken but, if possible, I should like to know exactly what action will be taken on the three remarks I made during the general debate.

The PRESIDENT: I believe it would be difficult to take any formal action in this respect. As the report of the Commission in its present form is final and the Commission has, in effect, ceased functioning, I am not quite sure how to deal with this request. Perhaps it is a question that could be dealt with in the Fourth Committee, but I hardly feel that it is a concern of the Council at the present time.

Mr. MUFTI (Syria) (interpretation from French): If the Commission's report is considered to be final, I do not see how the debate in the Fourth Committee could provide any solution to this problem. Perhaps it might be wiser to raise the question now, so that the Commission could then give us its views.

The PRESIDENT: I am still faced with a difficulty. Am I being requested to invite the Commission to attend a Council meeting? I must consult the Council on this matter as I do not see how it can be dealt with here.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I must confess that I have not entirely understood the scope of the proposal. However, I have the impression that it concerns only the French text of the report. If that is so, it is simply a question of translation which, I feel, could be undertaken by the Secretariat itself.

The PRESIDENT: I think the point raised is one which would be better dealt with in another place. Is the representative of Syria satisfied to leave it at that?

Mr. MUFTI (Syria)(interpretation from French): I regret to say that I am not completely satisfied, but I will not press the point.

Mr. ROLZ-BENNETT (Guatemala)(interpretation from Spanish): I cannot at this time specify how we might satisfy the request made by the representative of Syria, but can only suggest that perhaps some members of the Commission who are now in the Fourth Committee might be able to clarify the matter to his satisfaction, acting merely as individuals and presenting their personal views. It might be difficult for anyone to undertake such clarification as members of the Commission, inasmuch as the Commission has been dissolved.

The PRESIDENT: There being no further business, I shall proceed to the adjournment of the session.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I should like, on behalf of my delegation, to associate ourselves with the eloquent tributes paid to the President by the distinguished representative of the United States of America. As you must know by now, sir, the task of the President of a body like this requires that one shall often -- if I may so express it -- sit on a razor's edge. The fact that you have done this delicate job so well is, I think, a tribute to your many fine qualities -- qualities of patience, understanding and kindness -- which have greatly impressed my delegation.

I should also like to thank you personally, sir, for your many courtesies to me, and my delegation would like to wish you success and all happiness in all future endeavours that you may undertake.

Mr. ROLZ-BENNETT (Guatemala)(interpretation from Spanish): For my delegation it has been a privilege to have worked under you as President, and before concluding our work we should like to record our deep gratitude for the correctness, the wisdom, the tact and ability with which you have directed our labours.

In particular, the head of my delegation has entrusted to me the expression of his gratitude and satisfaction, the more sincerely felt because your efficiency has reduced his own duties to a very healthy minimum in his office as Vice-President. For this further evidence of your ability, my delegation is extremely grateful to you.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Soviet Union wishes once more to assure you, Mr. President, of the fact that your direction of this seventh special session has confirmed in us the respect and appreciation we felt and expressed in our tribute to you at the conclusion of the twentieth regular session of the Trusteeship Council.

Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium)(interpretation from French): I wish to associate the delegation of Belgium with the tributes paid to you by the representative of the United States of America and many of our colleagues. I also take the liberty of expressing my most sincere good wishes for the complete success of your career.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): I think the Secretary of the Council will be able to confirm my view that, somewhere in the archives of the Trusteeship System of the United Nations, there is a picture of the good ship "Trusteeship" by a former member of the United Kingdom delegation. If I may say so, Mr. President, you have steered this ship with a light but firm hand which we all have enormously appreciated. I wish to speak very briefly to associate my delegation with the expressions of thanks and appreciation and good wishes which have already been conveyed to you.

May I also, on my own behalf, say that I came to this Council as a "new boy" under your presidency, and I am most grateful to you for your very great kindness to myself.

U THAN HLA (Burma): Many delegations have paid high tributes to you, Mr. President, for your ability, patience, fairness and tact. My delegation takes great pleasure in joining with these delegations in paying these tributes.

Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France)(interpretation from French): The French delegation wholeheartedly associates itself with the tributes which have been paid to you, Mr. President, unanimously by our colleagues. I should like to add that, on my joining the Trusteeship Council at this time, your assistance and encouragement have been particularly useful to me and I wish to thank you personally for them.

Mr. SALOMON (Haiti)(interpretation from French): My delegation cannot but join its voice with those of so many other delegations which have paid to you, Mr. President, such well-deserved tributes for the tact, competence and ability with which you have conducted our work during this last session. I cannot fail, either, to wish you all manner of personal happiness and express to you on behalf of my delegation our best wishes for your future career.

Mr. KIANG (China): If I am very brief this time, it does not mean I have very little to add to the tribute my delegation paid to you at the last meeting of the last session of the Trusteeship Council. So I shall be very brief and say that I wish you very good luck and every success in your new mission in one of the gayest cities of the world.

Mr. ZADOTTI (Italy): I think it is a very easy task for me to associate myself with the various tributes which have been paid to your personal qualities and the able manner in which you have conducted our affairs. It only remains for me to wish you the best of success for your future.

Mr. THORP (New Zealand): It is, as always, particularly when speaking in tribute to a representative of Australia, a pleasure to associate my delegation with the tributes which have been paid to your presidency and to wish you well in the arduous but rewarding tasks which you leave us now to pursue.

The PRESIDENT: May I say, in taking leave of the Council, how much I appreciate the more than kind remarks which have been made, particularly as they would indicate that I have been forgiven for deserting the Council prematurely at the conclusion of the last session.

I have enjoyed greatly the last few months in the Council. I have enjoyed the good co-operation, the real friendliness and the great consideration which has been accorded me as President and I trust also as a friend of all of you. I thank you very much.

I would draw the attention of members of the Council to the fact that an informal meeting will be required, at a date to be fixed, to discuss the affairs of the next session and I will close by expressing my personal thanks to the Under-Secretary, the Secretary of the Council and the staff which has served the Council so well.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.