



C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Report of the Trusteeship Council (<i>continued</i>).....	519
The Ewe and Togoland unification problem: special report of the Trusteeship Council (<i>concluded</i>).....	523

Chairman: Mr. Santiago PEREZ PEREZ (Venezuela).

Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/2427)
(continued)
[Item 13]*

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TO THE COMMITTEE (A/C.4/L.319, A/C.4/L.320, A/C.4/L.321 and Add.1 and Rev.1, A/C.4/L.322, A/C.4/L.323/Rev.1, A/C.4/L.324, A/C.4/L.325/Rev.1, A/C.4/L.326, A/C.4/L.327/Rev.1, A/C.4/L.328/Rev.1, A/C.4/L.329) (*continued*)

1. U ON SEIN (Burma) said that he would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.319, of which his delegation was a co-sponsor, and against the Belgian amendments (A/C.4/L.325/Rev.1). He would also vote for draft resolution A/C.4/L.320, because a people's aspiration to independence would be discouraged unless some target date were set for its attainment. He would support draft resolution A/C.4/L.321 and Add.1, because its adoption would help the peoples of the Trust Territories to obtain the higher educational facilities they needed; and also the Dominican draft resolution (A/C.4/L.322). He would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.323/Rev.1, of which his delegation was a co-sponsor, and of the amendments thereto (A/C.4/L.328/Rev.1 and A/C.4/L.329). On draft resolution A/C.4/L.324 he would, regretfully, abstain because, though he appreciated its intention as explained by the Pakistan representative, he felt that the Charter's provisions for visits to the Trust Territories were sufficient. His vote would be cast in favour of the Danish draft resolution (A/C.4/L.326) and of draft resolution A/C.4/L.327/Rev.1; with regard to the latter, he commended the French representative and the draft resolution's sponsors for the conciliatory spirit they had shown in reaching agreement on the revised text.

2. Mr. QUINTEROS (Chile), who had announced his intention to abstain from voting on draft resolution A/C.4/L.324 because of its legal implications and had proposed that the question of means of improving the functioning of the Trusteeship System should be referred to the Sixth Committee, had not been satisfied by the Pakistan representative's suggestion that the Trusteeship Council could refer the question to the

Sixth Committee itself. It was not for the Trusteeship Council, as a subordinate body, to take such a step. The General Assembly would have to consider the legal implications of the matter, through its Sixth Committee, before it was taken up by the Council.

3. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) was appreciative of the spirit of the remarks made by the Pakistan representative at the previous meeting on draft resolution A/C.4/L.324, but still thought that its adoption would put the Trusteeship Council in a difficult position, for to appoint a United Nations representative for the Trust Territories was contrary to Article 87 of the Charter and to the trusteeship agreements. Any proposal the General Assembly adopted concerning such a representative ought to take the form of a modification of the trusteeship agreements, negotiated with the Administering Authorities.

4. He had been sorry to hear one of the members of the Committee suggest, at a recent meeting, that visiting missions should be abolished. The visiting missions, representing all the Member States, were the United Nations instrument for exercising international supervision over the Trust Territories. International supervision of that type had been an important new idea that should not be abandoned. It had been gratifying to hear the United Kingdom representative speak in favour of supervision through the visiting missions. The abolition of the missions would play into the hands of those inside and outside the Trust Territories who did not want their hostile activities against the United Nations in the Territories exposed to international inquiry. At the present stage it would be premature to attempt to replace the system of visiting missions by any other, and he would accordingly vote against draft resolution A/C.4/L.324.

5. Mr. NAJAR (Israel) said that he would vote in favour both of draft resolution A/C.4/L.319 and of the Belgian amendments thereto (A/C.4/L.325/Rev.1); the amendments would make the proposal to revise the Questionnaire more likely to be accepted by the Administering Authorities. He would also vote for draft resolution A/C.4/L.320. He supported the principle of draft resolution A/C.4/L.321 and Add.1 since the development of education was an essential foundation for the independence of nations and for the peace of the world in general, but he would be able to vote in favour of paragraphs 6 and 7 only if it were made clear that they would not involve any conflict between the Secretary-General and the Administering Authorities in the matter of applications for study and training facilities.

6. His vote would be cast in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.322, and in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.323/Rev.1. In the case of the latter, he did not know whether the people of Somaliland wanted the question of the frontier between the Territory of Somaliland and Ethiopia to be settled before Somaliland

* Indicates the item number on the agenda of the General Assembly.

gained its independence; failing that assurance, he would abstain from voting on paragraph 6 of the draft resolution. He would vote in favour of the amendments to that draft resolution (A/C.4/L.328/Rev.1 and A/C.4/L.329).

7. Although the idea of improving the functioning of the Trusteeship System met with his approval, the means proposed in draft resolution A/C.4/L.324 were likely to have the opposite result, and he would not be able to support it. He wondered what organs precisely the "interested organs of the United Nations" referred to in the second paragraph of the preamble were, and whether the United Nations representative mentioned in operative paragraph 1 would be a representative of the Trusteeship Council, the General Assembly or the Secretariat. Sub-paragraph (a) of operative paragraph 1 did not make it clear just what the representative's functions would be. The Trusteeship System functioned under the control of the General Assembly, and it was not desirable for that body to delegate its direct and fundamental responsibilities. There were practical and constitutional objections to sub-paragraph (b). Sub-paragraph (c) carried the unfortunate implication that relations between the General Assembly, the Administering Authorities and the peoples of the Trust Territories were such as to require the "good offices" of a mediator. Furthermore the representative's annual report to the Secretary-General, provided for by sub-paragraph (f), would overlap with the report of the Trusteeship Council. If the representative was to be appointed by the General Assembly, his report ought to be submitted to the Assembly or to the Trusteeship Council; if he was not to be so appointed, there was no reason for the General Assembly to delegate powers to him.

8. Mr. L. S. BOKHARI (Pakistan) drew the Israel representative's attention to the statement he had made at the previous meeting.

9. Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories) explained that under the existing arrangements applications for study and training facilities were required to be sent by the Administering Authority to the Secretary-General, who passed them on to the offering countries. According to the provisions of paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.321, candidates would be enabled, as an alternative to applying through the local authorities, to apply directly to the Secretary-General, who would transmit their applications to the offering countries. No doubt the Trusteeship Council would also wish the Secretary-General to inform the Administering Authorities of such applications, in order to avoid possible duplication. No conflict between the Secretary-General and the Trusteeship Council would therefore be involved.

10. Mrs. DE LA CAMPA (Cuba) said that she would abstain in the vote on draft resolutions A/C.4/L.319 and A/C.4/L.320. Her delegation had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 558 (VI) but it felt that, in view of the critical period through which many of the Trust Territories were now passing, it would be premature to invite the Administering Authorities to estimate immediately the period of time required for the attainment of self-government or independence. She would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.321 and Add.1, since she felt that educational advancement was a much more practical way to achieve progress than some of the other drastic solu-

tions sometimes advocated. Operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution was not very clear. She would also vote in favour of the Dominican draft resolution (A/C.4/L.322) and draft resolution A/C.4/L.323/Rev.1. If the amendments to draft resolution A/C.4/L.323/Rev.1, (A/C.4/L.328/Rev.1 and A/C.4/L.329) met with the approval of the sponsors of the draft resolution, she would vote in favour of them. She would vote against draft resolution A/C.4/L.324, first, for practical reasons: operative paragraph 1 was not very clear; the phrase "without prejudice to the existing practice of regular visiting missions" left her in some doubt about the respective functions of the proposed United Nations representatives and the visiting missions. Secondly, she agreed with the Chilean representative on the legal implications of the proposal. Thirdly, the proposal would have considerable financial implications, and her delegation had been instructed to vote against any proposals involving additional expenditure. She would vote in favour of the Danish draft resolution (A/C.4/L.326) and draft resolution A/C.4/L.327/Rev.1. She congratulated the French representative on his Government's generous attitude towards the Ngoa-Ekéle Community.

11. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.321 and Add.1, submitted a revised text of that draft (A/C.4/L.321/Rev.1) in which operative paragraph 6 had been changed in order to meet the points raised by various representatives. Applications for scholarships submitted to the Secretary-General would be simultaneously transmitted to the Administering Authorities and the offering States concerned, who could then apply to each other for any further information that might be necessary.

12. Mr. ESFANDIARY (Iran) said that his delegation would vote in favour of all the draft resolutions before the Committee. Its favourable vote in the case of draft resolution A/C.4/L.324 did not prejudice its position on the substance of the matter but indicated that his delegation felt that it would be useful for the Trusteeship Council to study the question of designating United Nations representatives for the Trust Territories and advise the Committee thereon.

13. Mr. FORTEZA (Uruguay) explained that his delegation had associated itself with the original sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.319 since it felt that no general questionnaire could adequately cover all the conditions characteristic of each Trust Territory, which differed widely from one Territory to another. He was well aware of the difficulties involved in preparing separate questionnaires, but felt that the task should be undertaken all the same. The proposal contained in the Belgian amendments (A/C.4/L.325/Rev.1) might be practical but, since his delegation believed that the preparation and drafting of questionnaires was a matter for the Trusteeship Council—which should therefore appoint any sub-committee that might be necessary—he would abstain in the vote on the amendment. His delegation had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 558 (VI) and would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.320. It would also vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.4/L.321/Rev.1, A/C.4/L.322 and A/C.4/L.323/Rev.1. It commended the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.323/Rev.1 on the very balanced and moderate tone of the draft resolution. He would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.324 for the reasons advanced by the Iranian representative.

Lastly, he would vote in favour of the Danish draft resolution (A/C.4/L.326) and draft resolution A/C.4/L.327/Rev.1.

14. Mr. CALLE Y CALLE (Peru) said that he would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.319 if the Belgian amendments (A/C.4/L.325/Rev.1) were adopted. He could not understand why the sponsors of the draft resolution were not prepared to accept the amendments; if separate questionnaires were to be drawn up, someone must obviously undertake a preliminary study of the modifications necessary to adapt the revised Questionnaire (T/1010) to each Trust Territory.

15. His delegation had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 558 (VI) and would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.320. He realized that it was difficult to establish even an approximate time for the attainment of self-government or independence by each Trust Territory, but even an approximate date would be very useful in helping the United Nations to evaluate the measures taken by the Administering Authorities and in helping the United Nations, the Technical Assistance Programme, United Nations Children's Fund and the specialized agencies to plan their programmes with regard to the Territories concerned. He would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.321/Rev.1 and of the Dominican draft resolution (A/C.4/L.322). His delegation had intended to vote against draft resolution A/C.4/L.323 but it was happy to say that it could vote in favour of the revised text (A/C.4/L.323/Rev.1).

16. He pointed out that draft resolution A/C.4/L.324 simply called for a study of the legal and practical implications of designating United Nations representatives for the Trust Territories and that many of the points that had been raised in the Committee would be discussed in the Trusteeship Council. In his delegation's view, such representatives would represent the United Nations and have almost identical functions and powers with those of the visiting missions. Article 87 of the Charter said that the General Assembly or the Trusteeship Council might "provide for periodic visits to the respective Trust Territories". It did not specify that those visits should be carried out by a body of three or four members. There was therefore no reason why a single individual should not visit a Trust Territory. Such an individual could stay for a longer period than a larger visiting mission. The date of his arrival and length of his stay could, in accordance with Article 87, be agreed with the Administering Authority concerned. The purpose underlying Chapters XII and XIII of the Charter was to ensure United Nations supervision of the fulfilment of the trusteeship agreements. The designation of one man to visit the Trust Territories would be just one more way of doing that. He wondered, however, whether it was not rather premature to specify that the representatives should be appointed "for an initial period of two years". It might be preferable to use some more general phrase, such as "an appropriate length of time". His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

17. His delegation would also vote in favour of the Danish draft resolution (A.C.4/L.326) and draft resolution A/C.4/L.327/Rev.1. In connexion with the latter text, he said that he was glad to note the French representative's co-operative attitude.

18. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) was glad that a revised text of the joint amendment contained in document A/

C.4/L.328 had been submitted (A/C.4/L.328/Rev.1). He would have been unable to vote for the original text since, although his delegation was opposed to collective sanctions, it was also opposed to asking sovereign States to revise their legislation, as the original text had done. In the revised text, however, the Administering Authority was merely asked to continue its review of legislation. He suggested that the phrase "all legislation" should be replaced by the phrase "all special legislation relating to Somaliland".

19. Mr. ABOU KHADRA (Saudi Arabia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the amendment contained in document A/C.4/L.328/Rev.1, accepted the Venezuelan representative's suggestion. He added that the word "effecting" should be inserted between the words "toward" and "reforms" in the same amendment.

20. Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom) suggested that the phrase "with a view toward effecting reforms in legislation" should be replaced by the phrase "with a view to revising legislation".

21. Mr. ABOU KHADRA (Saudi Arabia) and Mr. L. S. BOKHARI (Pakistan) accepted that suggestion.

22. In reply to a question by Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia), Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) explained that since the laws in force in Somaliland were enacted by the Italian Parliament, the term "special legislation relating to Somaliland" would differentiate such legislation from the general legislation enacted by the Italian Parliament.

23. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that unless the Venezuelan representative stated otherwise, it was his understanding that the Venezuelan amendment meant that the Administering Authority would be recommended to revise all the legislation relating to Somaliland found to be inconsistent with the letter or the spirit of the Trusteeship Agreement and not only the legislation concerning certain specific matters. Subject to that proviso, he would vote in favour of the amendment.

24. Mrs. SKOTTSBERG-AHMAN (Sweden) asked that the three operative paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.4/L.320 should be put to the vote separately. She would vote in favour of paragraph 2, since she felt that it was only right that the great advances achieved in Western Samoa should be recognized. New Zealand had certainly set an example of the pattern to be followed in the other Trust Territories. On the other hand, the very different conditions prevailing in the various Trust Territories made it impossible automatically and uniformly to apply all the measures for constitutional development listed in paragraph 3 to all the Trust Territories. She would therefore vote against that paragraph.

25. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) drew attention to a substantive difference between the English and French texts of operative paragraph 3 of the Dominican draft resolution (A/C.4/L.322). While he would abstain in the vote on the English text, with the words "on the basis of", he would be compelled to vote against the French text, with the words "*en tenant compte des*". He would like to know which text was authoritative.

26. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) said that the French text more accurately represented his intentions. The phrase "on the basis of" was too mandatory.

27. The CHAIRMAN called on the Committee to vote on the draft resolutions before it.

28. He put to the vote first the Belgian amendments (A/C.4/L.325/Rev.1) to draft resolution A/C.4/L.319.

At the request of the representative of the Dominican Republic, a vote was taken by roll-call.

Venezuela, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, India, Israel, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Sweden, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: Burma, Haiti, Indonesia.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

The amendments were adopted by 32 votes to 3, with 17 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.319, as amended, was adopted by 43 votes to 4, with 5 abstentions.

29. The CHAIRMAN put draft resolution A/C.4/L.320 to the vote in parts. He observed that the representatives of Czechoslovakia and Sweden had asked that the three paragraphs of the operative part should be voted on separately.

The first two paragraphs of the preamble were adopted by 39 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

The third paragraph was adopted by 28 votes to 10, with 14 abstentions.

The fourth paragraph was adopted by 40 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

Paragraph 1 of the operative part was adopted by 39 votes to 8, with 4 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 32 votes to 2, with 16 abstentions.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 35 votes to 7, with 10 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 35 votes to 9, with 7 abstentions.

30. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution A/C.4/L.321/Rev.1. He observed that the Czechoslovak representative had requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 2.

The three paragraphs of the preamble were adopted by 49 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 of the operative part was adopted by 36 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.

Paragraph 6 of the operative part was adopted by 43 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions.

The operative part as a whole was adopted by 47 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 48 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

31. The CHAIRMAN put draft resolution A/C.4/L.322 to the vote.

32. Mr. BUNCHE (Secretary of the Committee) pointed out that the Yugoslav representative had sub-

mitted a verbal amendment to paragraph 3 of the operative part, to the effect that the word "and" should be replaced by "or".

The Yugoslav amendment was adopted by 29 votes to 16, with 6 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.322, as amended, was adopted by 43 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

33. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) observed that he had several times pointed out a discrepancy between the English and French texts of paragraph 3 of the operative part and had asked the Chairman on which of those texts the Committee would vote. Since he had received no reply, he had been unable to take part in the vote.

34. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) reserved the right to propose a deletion in paragraph 3 of the operative part when the draft resolution came before the General Assembly.

35. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the revised amendment submitted by Pakistan and Saudi Arabia (A/C.4/L.328/Rev.1) to the revised draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.323/Rev.1.

The amendment was adopted by 33 votes to 2, with 15 abstentions.

36. Mr. CALLE Y CALLE (Peru) said that he had not participated in the vote since, as a result of the amendments that had been submitted, the text was not clear to him.

37. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment submitted by Brazil (A/C.4/L.329) to draft resolution A/C.4/L.323/Rev.1.

The amendment was adopted by 30 votes to 8, with 11 abstentions.

38. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution A/C.4/L.323/Rev.1, as amended. He observed that the representative of Czechoslovakia had requested that paragraphs 1 and 3 of the operative part should be voted on separately.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 41 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 38 votes to 1, with 12 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Colombia, a vote was taken by roll-call on the draft resolution as a whole.

Yugoslavia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen.

Against: Belgium.

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, France, Greece, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Thailand, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Present but not voting: Ethiopia.

The draft resolution was adopted by 38 votes to 1, with 12 abstentions.

39. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) had understood the changes suggested by the United Kingdom representative to be merely drafting amendments. In view, however, of what the Peruvian representative had said, he suggested that the Secretariat should consider whether it was necessary to change the Spanish text.

40. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution A/C.4/L.324.

At the request of the representative of Pakistan, a vote was taken by roll-call.

Haiti, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Haiti, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, Guatemala.

Against: Israel, New Zealand, Sweden, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Cuba, France.

Abstaining: India, Indonesia, Nicaragua, Norway, Burma, Chile, China, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece.

The draft resolution was adopted by 28 votes to 11, with 13 abstentions.

41. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution A/C.4/L.326. He observed that the representative of Czechoslovakia had requested that the two paragraphs should be voted on separately.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 43 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 49 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 45 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

42. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution A/C.4/L.327/Rev.1. He observed that the representative of Czechoslovakia had requested a separate vote on paragraph 1 of the operative part.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 45 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 49 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

43. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said he had abstained because, at the 318th meeting, he had voted against the granting of an oral hearing by the Fourth Committee to the petitioner from the Ngoa-Ekéle Community. The matter was not one for the Fourth Committee but for the Trusteeship Council. That did not mean, however, that he disagreed with the solution adopted by the Committee. He thought the Trusteeship Council would have recommended the same solution after hearing the petitioner.

44. The CHAIRMAN said that Mr. Issa, representative of the Somali Youth League, had sent him a letter amplifying his statement to the Committee at the 377th meeting. He suggested that the letter should be circulated to members of the Committee.

It was so decided.¹

The Ewe and Togoland unification problem: special report of the Trusteeship Council (A/2424) (concluded)

[Item 31]*

DRAFT REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/C.4/L.318)

45. Mr. RIFAI (Syria), Rapporteur, said that it had been suggested to him that the title of the report should be changed in view of the fact that the Committee was now confronted with a demand for the unification of Togoland as a whole and not merely of the Ewe people. He did not feel that the Committee could change the title of the item, since it had been referred to it by the General Assembly, but suggested that the draft resolutions in the report should be headed "The Togoland unification problem".

46. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that if the Rapporteur's proposal were put to the vote he would abstain.

The draft report (A/C.4/L.318), as amended, was approved without objection.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

¹ The text of the letter was subsequently circulated as document A/C.4/260.