

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**
FIFTH SESSION



FOURTH COMMITTEE 162nd

MEETING

Tuesday, 31 October 1950, at 3 p.m.

Official Records

Lake Success, New York

CONTENTS

Page

Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/1306 and A/1306/Corr.1) (*continued*) 119

Chairman: Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand).

Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/1306 and A/1306/Corr.1) (*continued*)

[Item 13]*

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to continue consideration of the joint draft resolution submitted by the delegations of India, Indonesia, Iraq, the Philippines and Yugoslavia (A/C.4/L.82/Rev.1).

2. Mr. JUGLAS (France) pointed out that his delegation could have asked for consideration of the petitions upon which the draft resolution was based to be deferred until the next session of the Trusteeship Council, since rule 86 of the Council's rules of procedure expressly stated: "Written petitions will normally be placed on the agenda of a regular session provided that they shall have been received by the Administering Authority concerned either directly or through the Secretary-General at least two months before the date of the next following regular session." His delegation had not, however, wished to invoke those provisions in order to defer consideration of the question, as it had confidence in the justice of its cause and was prepared to provide whatever information was necessary for a clear and well-ordered discussion on the draft resolution.

3. In view of the statements made by the representatives of Brazil and Iraq at the 161st meeting, Mr. Juglas felt it desirable to meet the criticisms which had been advanced by providing additional information.

4. The Iraqi representative had indeed admitted that there were many Ewes in Togoland under French administration who did not agree with the petitioners, but he had attempted to minimize the importance of that fact by stating that the persons who were in favour of maintaining the *status quo* were civil servants or employees of French enterprises who were not completely free to say what they thought. Mr. Juglas pointed out that that would be the first time that anyone had been

unable to express himself freely in any territory under French sovereignty. On the other hand, certain influences were being brought to bear upon the *Unité togolaise*. It was well known that Mr. Sylvanus Olympio was the representative of a large enterprise whose economic interests would perhaps be served if the unity demanded in the petitions were achieved. At Lomé and in some of the principal towns in Togoland, there were commercial establishments and enterprises which represented foreign interests and whose attitude might be influenced by that of their parent companies.

5. The chief criticisms which had been made related, first, to the electoral system and the manner in which it was put into effect, and, secondly, to the arrest of a number of Togolanders.

6. In reply to the Indonesian representative on the first of those points (161st meeting), he observed that the nature of the electoral system was not a secondary consideration; he felt that undoubted progress had been achieved when a new electoral system gave the vote to several hundred thousand persons, whereas the system which it replaced gave the vote to a few thousand only. The new electoral system had just been applied for the first time; the decision to apply it had been taken on 4 September 1950 following a meeting which had been attended by the *Commissaire de la République* and by representatives of the *Unité togolaise* and the Togoland Progress Party. Mr. S. Olympio himself had been present. No objection to the new voting methods had been raised by the *Comité de l'Unité togolaise*, which, moreover, had taken part in the primary elections. It was only after it had seen that the results of the voting were not what it had anticipated that that party had changed its mind and had put pressure upon the electors by every available means.

7. It had been claimed that the village chiefs had been able to use their authority to bring pressure to bear upon the village councils so as to get the Administration's candidates elected in preference to others. The representatives of Indonesia, the Philippines and Iraq had acknowledged the efforts which the French Gov-

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

ernment had made to grant the village chiefs the highest possible degree of independence, but they had asserted that the present chiefs were the very ones who had been in office before publication of the decree of 2 December 1949. They had therefore concluded that those chiefs represented the Administration and not the people. The decree referred to was undoubtedly of very recent date, but earlier orders relating to the question also made it possible for the village communities to play an important part in the appointment of chiefs; the final choice lay, in theory, with the *commandants de cercle*, but the latter were required to select one of the three candidates nominated by the villages.

8. He felt that the criticism which had been advanced evidenced a clear desire to minimize the efforts which his country had made in the African territories placed under its administration.

9. With regard to the question of arrests, his delegation had provided information as to where and in what circumstances those incidents had occurred, in a statement to the Committee on 18 October (153rd meeting). Comparing the information supplied by France with the contents of the petitions (T/Pet.7/160-T/Pet.6/194 and Add.1, Add.2, Add.3, Add.4 and Add.5), he felt it appropriate to point out that none of the petitions relating to the arrests gave any precise information as to where and in what circumstances those arrests had been made or the identity of the persons concerned. He quoted several passages from the relevant petitions in support of that statement, and also recalled that some of the persons arrested had been armed with daggers. He stressed the clear contrast between such vagueness and the full and detailed information provided by his delegation, a contrast which was all to the advantage of the latter.

10. The conclusions formulated in the draft resolution did not conflict with the attitude of his government, which was anxious to ensure respect for freedom of expression in the Trust Territories administered by France and in the French Union generally. The draft resolution, however, while quite rightly stressing the importance of the petitions from the *Unité togolaise*, did not take into account the views of other, equally representative bodies, although elementary democratic principles required that should be done.

11. Mr. QUESADA ZAPIOLA (Argentina) recalled that the Trusteeship Council had already studied the important question under discussion and had, at its seventh session, adopted a joint draft resolution submitted by the United States and Argentina after having heard the representatives of the Ewes (Trusteeship Council resolution 250 (VII)). He was of the opinion that any delay in solving the problem would only aggravate the situation, and that if they were put off, the national aspirations of certain peoples could only lead them to adopt attitudes the consequences of which would be felt by the Administering Authorities. The Argentine delegation stood by the position it had taken in the Trusteeship Council: it recognized the need for ascertaining the aspirations of the entire population and for finding an equitable formula permitting the best possible solution of the question. It supported the draft resolution under consideration and hoped that it would be adopted by the Committee.

12. He wished, nevertheless, to submit several amendments as to form, which he considered absolutely necessary. He believed that, in all fairness, consideration should be given to petitions not expressing the same opinion as that of the petition from the *Unité togolaise*. He therefore proposed that the fourth paragraph of the draft resolution should be amended to read:

“Noting the comments to the contrary contained in other related petitions (T/Pet.7/163-T/Pet.6/197, T/Pet.7/165-T/Pet.6/199 and T/Pet.7/165-T/Pet.6/199/Add.1)”.

13. He also proposed that the last paragraph of the draft resolution should be accordingly amended by adding, after the words “the petition of the President of the *Comité de l'Unité togolaise*”, the following phrase:

“(T/Pet.7/160-T/Pet.6/194/Add.1, Add.2 and Add.3), noting the comments to the contrary contained in other related petitions (T/Pet.7/163-T/Pet.6/197, T/Pet.7/165-T/Pet.6/199 and T/Pet.7/165-T/Pet.6/199/Add.1)”.

14. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) thought that the statements made by the authors of the joint draft resolution, and in particular those of the representatives of Iraq and the Philippines, made it unnecessary to review the background of the question in detail.

15. The delegation of Burma recognized that the Ewe problem was complicated and delicate. Nevertheless, the United Nations should not hesitate to examine and try to solve it, for failure to seek a satisfactory solution would mean disregarding one of the Organization's basic duties. The report of the Trusteeship Council had referred to a number of petitions requesting unification of the Ewes in the two Togolands and the Gold Coast, as their separation was an injustice from an economic, political and cultural point of view. It was essential to recognize the opportuneness of the initiative taken by the Administering Authorities to enlarge the Standing Consultative Commission for the purpose of ascertaining the real wishes and interests of the peoples concerned.

16. Nevertheless, account must be taken of the complaints made by Mr. de Souza, President of the *Unité togolaise*, in his petitions to the Secretary-General against the methods of election prescribed by the Administering Authority. It was regrettable that in the present case France had considered it necessary to take certain measures which were contrary to the principles set forth in the Charter. World opinion could not remain indifferent to that fact. There was no need to repeat that the Administering Authorities were bound to respect the aspirations of the indigenous inhabitants and to encourage respect for fundamental human rights. Consequently, measures taken against persons defending those rights were entirely without justification.

17. The delegation of Burma would support the draft resolution under discussion.

18. Mr. LIU (China) said that the delegation of China was keenly interested in the draft resolution because it dealt with an important question, and in view of its intrinsic value, the delegation of China would support it. As the representative of the United States had pointed out at the 161st meeting, the question was

complicated, for there was a conflict between various elements of the problem.

19. With respect to the electoral procedure, the Administering Authority claimed that the elections had been held in a democratic manner and that the electors (*grands électeurs*), who chose the members of the Standing Consultative Commission, had been elected. The petitioners, however, claimed that the village chiefs had appointed the electors. The petitions of Mr. de Souza, in particular, drew attention to the instructions given by the Administration that the village chiefs should choose the electors with the assistance of the customary councils. The petitioner added that those councils did not exist except in theory.

20. With regard to the question of arrests, the delegation of France had stated (153rd meeting) that they had been carried out because a regulation requiring previous notice of any political meeting had been contravened. The letter which had been read by the representative of the Philippines at the 161st meeting indicated on the contrary that the arrests had been made because a certain meeting had not been authorized. In other cases, persons had been arrested because they had objected to the voting methods.

21. The Administering Authority could be given the benefit of the doubt in the case of such contradictions. It was none the less true that a more detailed inquiry was obviously becoming necessary. The delegation of China supported the draft resolution in so far as it took account of that need. It was of the opinion, however, that the draft did not go far enough to give complete satisfaction to all parties concerned. A recommendation that an inquiry should be undertaken and a report made to the Trusteeship Council was not enough; there must be an assurance that the Council would take definite measures in the light of the results of such an inquiry. A paragraph should therefore be added to the draft resolution, inviting the Council to study the methods and results of the voting and to send a special mission to make a first-hand inquiry if it was of the opinion that the information or explanations provided by the Administering Authority were not adequate. He was submitting an amendment to that effect.

22. In conclusion he said that his delegation commended the delegation of France for the spirit in which it had provided the Committee with explanations, but he did not believe that the explanations could be considered as a satisfactory reply to the criticism that had been made.

23. Mr. KERNKAMP (Netherlands) did not intend to discuss the substance of the Ewe question, because he was of the opinion that the material available to the Committee at the time did not permit a settlement of the problem. The report of the Trusteeship Council stated (page 168) that the majority of the inhabitants seemed—and he emphasized that word—to favour unification, but an important sector of those inhabitants was opposed thereto. Quite fortunately, the draft resolution under discussion did not require the Committee to come to a decision on the substance of the matter but merely provided for an inquiry and impressed upon the Administering Authorities the necessity of actively seeking a solution to the problem.

24. With respect to the petitions themselves, he did not think that the Committee was in a position to pass judgment on the merits of the petitioners. It was quite possible, of course, that the electoral laws had been contravened. Furthermore, the arrests in themselves proved nothing.

25. Undoubtedly, however, the complaints dealt with in the petitions raised serious questions. The delegation of the Netherlands could therefore see no objection to a more detailed inquiry into the situation, and it would accordingly vote in favour of the draft resolution on account of the merit of that text. It could not, however, vote in favour of the Chinese amendment, owing to the lack of established facts.

26. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland) was of the opinion that certain important arguments in favour of the draft resolution had been omitted in the course of the discussion. The Committee should obviously be concerned above all with the circumstances of the arrests. At the 153rd meeting, the representative of France had said that the persons arrested had engaged in boisterous demonstrations during a meeting. At the present meeting, he had said that a certain number of them had been armed with daggers. If the discussion continued, he would soon say that they were criminals. Mr. Winiewicz therefore asked the representative of France what had become of the persons arrested. For its part, the delegation of Poland was convinced that those persons had been arrested because of their political opinions.

27. Moreover, the Committee was faced with the general question of the Ewes, which was a striking example of the kind of situation to which the colonial system could lead. That system was the cause of the administrative division from which the entire Ewe population was suffering. That division was of assistance to the Administering Authorities in destroying the national identity of the population, whose cultural bonds had already been weakened. In the general debate, the delegation of Poland had stated (147th meeting) that it was the policy of the Administering Authorities in the Trust Territories to destroy the cultural, political and economic identity of the indigenous populations. The situation of the Ewes was proof of that.

28. The Territory of Togoland under French administration was closely bound to France both politically and economically, and an effort was being made to weaken the population in those two respects in order that it could never reach a point at which it would be able to become independent.

29. It must not be forgotten that behind the question of arrests and elections there was hidden the more serious problem of the destruction of the national unity of the Ewes. There was a danger that the fate already suffered by some individuals might be suffered by the entire population.

30. The delegation of Poland supported the draft resolution even though, in its opinion, that draft was not sufficiently forceful; but it wished to reserve its position in case further amendments were presented. It proposed, for its part, the addition, at the end of the text, of the following paragraph:

"Requests the Trusteeship Council to make a special report to the next session of the General Assembly on all the steps undertaken in connexion with the Ewe question."

31. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) recalled that one of the essential duties of the United Nations was to ensure the proper functioning of the Trusteeship System. The question under consideration concerned the political maturity of a Trust Territory. The members of the Committee should therefore think carefully before taking a decision as, in the final analysis, the independence of the population of a Trust Territory was involved.

32. The draft resolution was timely and well justified, as it sought to clarify the question without prejudging it in any way, and he would therefore vote in favour of it. Some of the amendments submitted were of great interest, in particular the Argentine amendment which sought to have all the necessary factors incorporated in the text.

33. The discussion seemed to be drawing to a close. The Committee had been given an excellent analytical and historical survey by the Brazilian representative (161st meeting) and it was clear that all the members of the Committee intended to see that the question was properly thrashed out so as to ensure that the decision taken would be a responsible one. He therefore suggested that the Chairman should consider closing the discussion.

34. In conclusion, he complimented the French delegation on the attitude it had adopted during the discussion.

35. The CHAIRMAN declared the list of speakers closed.

36. Mr. JUGLAS (France) wished to reply to the Polish representative who had asked a specific question. It was not the first time that the incident to which the Polish representative had referred had come up. In his statement on 18 October (153rd meeting) the French representative had already given a full explanation of the incident and had pointed out in particular that the number of persons who had been arrested and imprisoned was very small. The most severe penalty that had been imposed upon the delinquents by the local magistrate had been three months' imprisonment. It was to be hoped that the arrests which were made in certain countries were not followed by more severe penalties than that.

37. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland) wished to thank the French representative for his explanatory statement with regard to the incidents which had occurred in Togoland under French administration at the time of the elections. His only regret was that, in view of the General Assembly's interest in the question, the Administering Authority had not felt it necessary to release the offenders who had been sentenced to terms of imprisonment.

38. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) noted that many speakers had explained their views on the Ewe problem. But representatives who had not taken part in the discussion on that problem in the Trusteeship Council could not appreciate its complexity. The eth-

nic division of Togoland had been effected horizontally, speaking from the geographical point of view, whereas European penetration and economic development had been carried out vertically, from the coast. The fate of the Ewe people was therefore bound up with that of other peoples in the northern part of the Territory, who were not always in agreement with the Ewes. The question therefore arose of the extent to which the economic interests of those peoples could be sacrificed. The Trusteeship Council had been well advised to recommend that, in the matter of representation of the population on the Consultative Commission, the Administering Authorities should take into account all the interests involved.

39. The joint draft resolution did not prejudice the solution of the Ewe problem. It merely asked that in seeking a solution to a problem of such importance and complexity the Administering Authorities should provide the Trusteeship Council with all the necessary information so as to enable it to make a useful study of the matter. His delegation therefore approved the principles expressed in the draft resolution.

40. It also approved the amendment to the draft resolution submitted by Argentina. In view of the fact that petitioners were informed of the discussions to which their petitions gave rise, it was logical that the draft resolution should make specific mention of those petitions of which the General Assembly had taken cognizance.

41. On the other hand, a number of drafting amendments would have to be made to the sixth paragraph of the draft resolution. It was not possible to find a solution to the Ewe problem which would be both adequate and in full accordance with the wishes and interests of the people concerned. It would be more realistic to seek the solution which was the most adequate possible and which was most in accordance with those wishes and interests. That was the most that could be hoped for.

42. Lastly, the seventh paragraph of the joint draft resolution asked the Administering Authorities to conduct elections to the Consultative Commission in a democratic manner; but those elections had already been held, as was indicated, moreover, in the eighth paragraph. If the Trusteeship Council felt that those elections had not been conducted satisfactorily, it would assume its responsibilities and would make the necessary recommendations to the Administering Authorities. His delegation therefore felt that the seventh paragraph of the draft resolution might well be deleted.

43. Mr. S. RAO (India) thought that the considerations which had prompted the Chinese representative's amendment could be met by adding the following words to the last paragraph of the draft resolution: "for such action as it may consider appropriate in the light of the relevant discussions in the Fourth Committee and of the results of the investigations of the Administering Authority of Togoland under French administration". That would not, as did the Chinese amendment, prejudice the results of the investigation which the Administering Authority was being asked to carry out.

44. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq), referring to the Argentine amendment to the fourth paragraph of the draft

resolution, said he was not much in favour of the words "to the contrary", but would vote for the amendment as it fully met the wishes of the French representative.

45. He thought addenda 4 and 5 to the petition from the *Comité de l'Unité togolaise* (T/Pet.7/160-T/Pet.6/194) should be mentioned in the third paragraph of the draft resolution, in the list of addenda to that petition.

46. Mr. MACAPAGAL (Philippines) agreed that addenda 4 and 5 should be mentioned in the third paragraph of the draft resolution as they, too, contained complaints against the electoral methods of the Administering Authorities and should be taken into account if a proper balance was to be struck between the various petitions.

47. Mr. QUESADA ZAPIOLA (Argentina) pointed out that the words in question provided a necessary clarification of the text.

48. Mr. MACAPAGAL (Philippines) also supported the Argentine amendment, saying that the draft resolution should be given as wide a basis as possible by referring in it not only to the petitions from the *Unité togolaise*, but also to the other petitions.

49. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) thought that a better way to meet the wishes of the Argentine representative would be to delete from the third paragraph of the draft resolution the details concerning the petitions from the *Unité togolaise* and to do no more than mention those petitions.

50. Mr. PRICA (Yugoslavia) pointed out that the fourth paragraph of the draft resolution referred to "other related petitions". Since there was no reason to restrict the scope of that paragraph, he felt that the Argentine amendment was superfluous and asked the Argentine representative to withdraw it.

51. Mr. QUESADA ZAPIOLA (Argentina) wished to know the views of the other authors of the draft resolution. For his part, he felt that his amendment struck a balance between the third and fourth paragraphs and gave the draft resolution the impartial character that was so essential to any document submitted by the Fourth Committee.

52. Mr. S. RAO (India) thought that it would be sufficient to say "noting the various comments contained in other related petitions".

53. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) supported the original text of the Argentine amendment, which was based on the idea of justice. It did not prejudge the petitions but merely indicated that there were two conflicting types of petitions.

54. Mr. TAJIBNAPIS (Indonesia) was not opposed to the Argentine amendment as it was only fair to the Administering Authorities.

55. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) proposed that the fourth paragraph of the draft resolution should be amended to read: "Noting the opinions to the contrary contained in other related petitions". That would make the Argentine amendment unnecessary. In any case the considerations which had prompted it were met by the Indian amendment.

56. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that if the fourth paragraph were amended in that way, the eighth paragraph of the draft resolution would have to be amended accordingly. For his part he thought it better to put the Argentine amendment to the vote.

57. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) said that all the members of the Committee agreed that the draft resolution should include the references to the petitions, but that certain members did not agree to the words "to the contrary" contained in the Argentine amendment.

58. He did not question the intentions of the Belgian representative in suggesting a drafting amendment to the sixth paragraph of the draft resolution, but regretted that he could not accept that suggestion. If it were maintained, it might have serious political consequences. The terms proposed by the Belgian representative might be used to defeat the very purpose of the draft resolution.

59. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that, provided his suggestion was included in the record of the meeting, he would not insist further on the amendment he had proposed to the sixth paragraph of the draft resolution.

60. The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of Iraq whether he accepted the Belgian representative's proposal that the seventh paragraph of the draft resolution should be deleted.

61. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) replied that he was definitely opposed to the deletion. Nor could he accept the Argentine amendment to the last paragraph of the draft resolution, since that amendment complicated the paragraph to no purpose. All the petitions had been mentioned already in the preceding paragraphs.

62. Mr. QUESADA ZAPIOLA (Argentina) asked that the fourth paragraph of the draft resolution and his amendment to it should first be put to the vote. The decision as to what should be done about the reference to petitions in the eighth paragraph could be taken subsequently.

63. Mr. PRICA (Yugoslavia) did not share the view of some representatives that it would be unfair to the Administering Authority not to mention petitions which contradicted the petitions submitted by the *Unité togolaise*. The text of the fourth paragraph of the draft resolution showed plainly enough that the General Assembly took account of all petitions on the subject.

64. Mr. JUGLAS (France) said he had examined the joint draft resolution in a spirit of understanding and goodwill, and would like to pay a tribute to the democratic sentiments which had inspired it. However, in a true democracy, all parties should be treated equally. For that reason he urged the authors of the joint draft resolution to take account of the observations submitted by Argentina, Cuba and other delegations.

65. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) pointed out that the fourth and last paragraphs of the joint draft resolution were inspired by the same feeling. The General Assembly must place all petitions on the same level, either by omitting all reference to petitions from the various paragraphs of the draft resolution, or by mentioning all the petitions by name of number; it would thus evince its impartiality.

66. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) thought a compromise solution could be adopted which would satisfy all those concerned: the Argentine amendment to the fourth paragraph could be adopted and the eighth paragraph left untouched.

67. Mr. QUESADA ZAPIOLA (Argentina) said he accepted that proposal, which he considered fair.

68. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) proposed a similar solution: that the fourth paragraph should be amended as proposed by the representative of Argentina, and the eighth paragraph modified by replacing the expression "investigate promptly the practices complained of in the petition of the President of the *Comité de l'Unité togolaise* and other like petitions with a view of ascertaining whether the methods of election which have been applied ensure . . ." by the expression: "investigate promptly the methods of election which have been applied and ascertain whether those methods ensure . . .".

69. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) regretted he could not accept the Belgian representative's proposal. The draft resolution before the Committee was a revised text, adopted only after lengthy discussion and in a spirit of conciliation. A modification such as that proposed by the Belgian representative would weaken the text, whereas some delegations would have liked it to be much stronger. He thought the eighth paragraph would lose all its usefulness and importance if it were truncated as had been suggested by Belgium.

70. Mr. UDOVICHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that if the authors of the draft resolution accepted the amendment to the fourth paragraph proposed by the Argentine delegation, he would submit the present text of that paragraph as an amendment by his delegation.

71. The CHAIRMAN stated that the present text of the fourth paragraph of the draft resolution would be put to the vote as an amendment submitted by the Ukrainian delegation.

72. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) thought the words "and other like petitions" in the eighth paragraph might lead to confusion. They might create the impression that all the petitions received were like the petitions from the *Unité togolaise*. The words in question should therefore be replaced by the expression "and other petitions on the subject".

73. The CHAIRMAN observed that the authors of the draft resolution accepted the amendment just proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom.

74. He asked the representative of China whether, in view of the suggestion made by the Indian representative, he would agree to withdraw his amendment.

75. Mr. LIU (China) pointed out that the amendment proposed by the Indian representative dealt only partially with the idea expressed in the Chinese amendment, for it did not allow for the possibility of sending a special mission to the area to make an investigation if necessary.

76. He was in no way prejudging the issue; he was merely suggesting a measure which the Trusteeship Council might adopt at need, and which would seem justified in view of the importance of the question. In

its present form, the operative part of the draft resolution was much too weak; the action contemplated was not adequate for a proper solution of the problem.

77. Mr. TAJIBNAPIS (Indonesia) and Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) thought that, though his intentions were excellent, the Chinese representative was prejudging the Trusteeship Council's opinion on the matter. They would therefore prefer the amendment to the eighth paragraph proposed by the representative of India.

78. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) observed that the authors of the draft resolution seemed inclined to accept the amendment proposed by the representative of India. He would like to know their opinion on the Polish representative's amendment. He, for his part, preferred the latter. He pointed out, however, that it did not seem to him advisable to ask the Trusteeship Council to submit a special report on the Ewe question. As the Council submitted an annual report to the General Assembly in which all matters were dealt with, the Ewe problem might very well be made the subject of a special chapter in the general report by the Council.

79. Mr. TAJIBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought there was no need for him to explain his delegation's position with regard to the draft resolution. The USSR delegation would vote for that resolution. It would also vote for the amendment submitted by the Polish delegation, for it was of the opinion that the Trusteeship Council should inform the General Assembly of the results of the measures taken under the resolution under consideration, which the Committee would certainly approve.

80. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland) was of the opinion that the Trusteeship Council should be asked to submit a special report, in view of the importance of the problem.

81. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) accepted the Polish amendment as it had been submitted.

82. Mr. LIU (China) and Mr. S. RAO (India) urged that their respective amendments should be put to the vote.

83. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) recalled that the Trusteeship Council had misinterpreted certain General Assembly resolutions containing provisions relating to the form of the Council's annual report. The present text of the Polish amendment might give rise to a further misinterpretation; he therefore thought it better to replace the text of the Polish amendment by the following: "Requests the Trusteeship Council to devote a special chapter or sub-chapter of its annual report to the next session of the General Assembly . . .".

84. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland) could not accept the amendment proposed by the representative of Cuba. The text he had submitted could not be misinterpreted; the Trusteeship Council was asked in very clear terms to submit a special report, that was to say, a report distinct from its annual report.

85. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) observed that, as had been pointed out by the Belgian representative, the Trusteeship Council submitted a single annual report which covered all the matters it had considered. The Cuban representative's amendment was therefore very logical, for it indicated the importance the question

under discussion should have in the annual report. He asked that his amendment should be put to the vote.

86. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) said he would vote for the amendment submitted by the Polish delegation. He saw no reason for the Cuban delegation's amendment since, if the question were dealt with in the Trusteeship Council's annual report, it would obviously be made the subject of a chapter or sub-chapter. If the Committee really wanted the Ewe problem to be made the subject of a special report, the text proposed by the delegation of Poland must be adopted.

87. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) said he had made it clear that his amendment dealt with a matter connected with the form of the report, in view of the Trusteeship Council's attitude to certain previous General Assembly resolutions. It was because of a misinterpretation that had occurred the previous year that he did not use the word "section", though he, for his part, would have preferred to ask that a special section of the report should be devoted to the Ewe problem. Logically, the Ewe question would be dealt with in the Trusteeship Council's annual report to the General Assembly. By asking for a special chapter or sub-chapter, the importance of the question was adequately stressed.

88. Mr. QUESADA ZAPIOLA (Argentina) drew attention to resolution 250 (VII) adopted by the Trusteeship Council on 14 July 1950. That resolution showed that the Council was actively concerning itself with the problem of the Ewes and intended to make a report on the matter to the General Assembly. With regard to the form of the report, he was of the opinion that the most acceptable solution was that proposed by the representative of Cuba.

89. The CHAIRMAN announced that the various amendments proposed during the meeting would be put to the vote in the following order: first, the amendment submitted by the Ukrainian SSR to the effect that the fourth paragraph should be the same as the fourth paragraph in document A/C.4.L.82/Rev.1; secondly, the Belgian amendment to the sixth paragraph to the effect that the expression "an adequate solution . . ." and in full accordance with the real wishes . . ." should be replaced by the words: "the most satisfactory solution possible in fullest possible conformity with the real wishes . . ."; thirdly, the amendment submitted by the delegation of Cuba to the amendment submitted by the delegation of Poland; fourthly, the amendment submitted by India to the effect that, instead of the ninth paragraph proposed by the delegation of China, an addition should be made to the eighth paragraph. If the amendments of Cuba and India were not adopted, the Committee would clearly have to vote on the amendments submitted by Poland and China.

The amendment submitted by the Ukrainian SSR was rejected by 23 votes to 5, with 14 abstentions.

The Belgian amendment was rejected by 22 votes to 16, with 4 abstentions.

The Cuban amendment to the Polish amendment was adopted by 26 votes to 8, with 9 abstentions.

The Indian amendment to the Chinese amendment was adopted by 32 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

90. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) pointed out that, though the Committee had adopted the Cuban amendment to the Polish amendment, it had not voted on the Polish amendment as thus modified. The adoption of the Indian amendment to the eighth paragraph made the modified Polish amendment, which would become the ninth paragraph, useless. It was clear that the Trusteeship Council would have to make a report to the General Assembly on any measures it might adopt.

91. Mr. BUNCHE (Secretary of the Committee) read the draft resolution as it had been amended by the four preceding votes.

92. The CHAIRMAN remarked that the representative of Belgium had asked that the seventh paragraph should be put to the vote separately. Consequently, the Committee would be asked to vote first, on the first six paragraphs; secondly, on the seventh paragraph; thirdly, on the eighth paragraph as amended by the adoption of the Indian amendment; fourthly, on the Polish amendment as modified by the adoption of the Cuban amendment; and fifthly, on the draft resolution as a whole.

93. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) pointed out that the fifth paragraph mentioned declarations made by the representative of France on 18 October 1950. It might also be advisable to mention the declarations made by that delegation at the present meeting.

94. Mr. JUGLAS (France) approved that suggestion, for the declarations he had made at the present meeting were complementary to those which had been made on 18 October (153rd meeting).

95. The CHAIRMAN announced that the authors of the draft resolution had accepted that suggestion and that the fifth paragraph would be worded: "Noting . . . on 18 and 31 October 1950".

96. Mr. TAJIBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the Russian text of the third paragraph was not in conformity with the original, as it referred to an "allegation". He asked why the Belgian representative had asked for a separate vote on the seventh paragraph.

97. The CHAIRMAN said the Russian text of the draft resolution would be corrected to make it accord with the original.

98. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that he had already had occasion to explain why he was asking for a separate vote on the seventh paragraph: the elections to the Consultative Commission had already taken place; it was therefore illogical to ask the Administering Authorities to conduct them.

99. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) would like to recall once more that the present text of the draft resolution had been arrived at after prolonged discussion, and a revision had already been made. The seventh paragraph was very important to the authors of the draft. For its part, the Iraqi delegation might modify its position if that paragraph were deleted. He therefore urged the Committee to retain it.

100. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the various paragraphs of the draft resolution (A/C.44/L.82/Rev.1).

The first six paragraphs as amended were adopted by 40 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The seventh paragraph was adopted by 34 votes to 3, with 5 abstentions.

The eighth paragraph as amended was adopted by 38 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The ninth paragraph (the modified Polish amendment) was adopted by 34 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

101. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) asked that the vote on the draft resolution as a whole should be taken by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

In favour: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 40 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

102. Mr. JUGLAS (France) explained that he had abstained because the French delegation could not at the same time be both judge and party. It could not express its opinion by voting on a matter in connexion with which France had been subjected to severe criticism.

103. Even if the French delegation had thought itself in a position to vote, it would have been its duty to abstain. It would not have voted against the draft resolution, for it recognized the efforts made by the authors of the draft to give satisfaction to its legitimate claims. Nor would it have voted for the resolution, for it noted to its regret that the various opinions voiced by the inhabitants of Togoland under French administration had not been given equal consideration. The resolution should have mentioned the point of view of the Togoland Progress Party. In the form in which it had been adopted, the resolution discriminated in a way which France, a country with a genuinely democratic tradition, could only deplore. The French delegation would have voted for the resolution if such a discrimination had not been made.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.