



C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
The Ewe and Togoland unification problem: special report of the Trusteeship Council (<i>continued</i>).....	399

Chairman: Mr. Santiago PEREZ PEREZ (Venezuela).

The Ewe and Togoland unification problem: special report of the Trusteeship Council (A/2424, A/C.4/L.308, A/C.4/L.309, A/C.4/L.310/Rev.1, A/C.4/L.311, A/C.4/L.312, A/C.4/L.313, A/C.4/L.314, A/C.4/L.315, A/C.4/L.316) (*continued*)

[Item 31]*

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Antor, Mr. Odame and Mr. Armattoe, representatives of the Joint Togoland Congress, Mr. Olympio, representative of the All-Ewe Conference, and Mr. Brenner, representative of the Parti togolais du progrès, took seats at the Committee table.

1. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) announced that in response to the Yugoslav representative's remarks at the previous meeting, the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.308) had agreed that in the French text of operative paragraph 5 the words "*dans tout le Togo*" should be placed after the words "*exposer librement*".

2. Since operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.310 seemed open to misinterpretation, the sponsors of that draft resolution were submitting a revised version of the paragraph in question (A/C.4/L.310/Rev.1).

3. Replying to various comments on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.309, he pointed out that the fact that universal suffrage had been introduced in Togoland under British administration indicated that there were no insuperable obstacles to its introduction in Togoland under French administration. Some years earlier the French Government had announced its intention of introducing universal suffrage and had in fact made certain reforms in the electoral system. It was regrettable that it had not yet fully carried out its intentions. Apart from any other considerations, the existence of different electoral systems in the two Trust Territories for elections to the Joint Council might mean that, while the views of the various sections of the population in Togoland under British administration were accurately reflected, that was not so in the case of Togoland under French administration. Furthermore, the introduction of universal suffrage in Togoland under French administration would conform to the General Assembly's rec-

ommendations concerning the need to harmonize policies in the two Trust Territories.

4. The General Assembly had already shown its interest in administrative unions by appointing a special Committee to study the matter and asking for a special report from the Trusteeship Council (resolution 563 (VI)). The Assembly's primary concern had been to establish safeguards to preserve the separate identity of the Trust Territories. With regard to the administrative union between Togoland under British administration and the Gold Coast, the 1952 United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, in its report on Togoland under British administration (T/1040), had said that if an appreciable further measure of self-government were to be accorded to the Gold Coast, the Administering Authority would inevitably have to consider whether its responsibilities under the Trusteeship Agreement could be reconciled with the further transfer to the Gold Coast Government of authority in respect of the Trust Territory. It had contended that it might soon be impossible for the Trust Territory to be administered as an integral part of the Gold Coast and simultaneously retain the United Kingdom as its Administrative Authority. It had concluded that the prospect of a further constitutional advance in the Gold Coast might require the position of the Trust Territory to be reviewed with particular care within a relatively short period of time. As the Trusteeship Council had so far indicated no intention of taking up the question, it might be helpful if the General Assembly were to draw particular attention to the problem of the relationship between Togoland under British administration and the Gold Coast so as to ensure that the Trusteeship Council would report thereon to the Assembly at its next session.

5. The Trusteeship Council's special report on administrative unions (A/2151) contained no precise finding on whether or not the position of Togoland in the existing administrative union was compatible with the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement. The Trusteeship Council had apparently preferred to defer the question pending settlement of the unification problem. Recent developments, however, indicated that unless the question of the administrative union was clarified in time, unification would be difficult, if not impossible. Already the frontier between Togoland under British administration and the Gold Coast was merely a line on the map. The Trust Territory had no separate executive or legislative organs. In the North the district councils extended across the frontier and were so constituted as to give major representation to the people of the northern territory of the Gold Coast. The same was true of the Trans-Volta/Togoland Council in the South, where the Gold Coast had sixty votes and Togoland only forty votes. The United Kingdom had already transferred to the Gold Coast Government considerable policy and law-making powers, and the proposed constitutional changes would transfer all

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

internal matters to the Gold Coast; the Governor would retain responsibility only for security and foreign affairs. The General Assembly and the Trusteeship Council should make a thorough study of whether or not the proposed changes were compatible with the Trusteeship Agreement. That was the reason underlying document A/C.4/L.310/Rev.1.

6. Operative paragraph 3 of that revised draft resolution had been included for a slightly different purpose. The "most secret" document included in document T/Pet.6/L.11, of which the Committee had been informed, had been disowned by the Administering Authority and the Gold Coast Government, but it nevertheless indicated a full-fledged plan to annex Togoland to the Gold Coast. Furthermore, a systematic campaign was obviously being conducted by the Convention People's Party to win the people of Togoland under British administration over to the cause of integration. The "Extract from the White Paper of the Gold Coast Government" (A/C.4/249) categorically stated that the people of Northern Togoland were unanimous in demanding integration with the Gold Coast and that there was a growing opinion in Southern Togoland in favour of integration. Those were controversial statements and no evidence had been adduced to prove them. However, the White Paper also stated that the United Nations would have to sanction the arrangements for integration with the Gold Coast. The sponsors of the revised draft resolution therefore believed that the time had come for the General Assembly to express its opinion on that important question.

7. He agreed with the French representative that any change in the status of the Trust Territory should take into account the freely expressed wishes of the people. Such a change in status should imply that the Trust Territory concerned became self-governing or independent, in which case trusteeship would be at an end and any subsequent association between the Territory and a neighbouring State would no longer concern the United Nations. To integrate the Trust Territory into another State before the objectives of Article 76 of the Charter had been achieved would be contrary to the purposes and principles of the International Trusteeship System. The provisions of operative paragraph 3 would not prejudice the special study called for in operative paragraph 4. Paragraph 3 dealt with the intended annexation of a Trust Territory to a neighbouring Territory, which would be *ultra vires* and contrary to the Charter, whereas paragraph 4 was concerned with the compatibility of the proposed changes in the Gold Coast Constitution with the Trusteeship Agreement for Togoland under British administration. Examination of the latter question might lead to a revision of the Trusteeship Agreement in one of three ways: first, the United Kingdom might assume direct administration of the Trust Territory; secondly, the Gold Coast might replace the United Kingdom as Administering Authority; or, thirdly, the Trust Territory might be granted self-government or independence, which would put an end to the Trusteeship Agreement. Operative paragraph 3 was not therefore inconsistent with the remainder of the draft resolution and he hoped that in its revised form (A/C.4/L.310/Rev.1), which he presented on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.310), it would meet with the Committee's approval.

8. Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) felt that as it stood operative paragraph 10 of the seven-Power draft res-

olution (A/C.4/L.308) prejudged the issue. The New Zealand amendment (A/C.4/L.313) would remove his doubts and enable him to vote in favour of that paragraph and of the draft resolution as a whole.

9. The draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.309 seemed to be too dictatorial. He wondered whether the wording, particularly of operative paragraph 1, could not be modified. The use of the words "urgently invites" in conjunction with the word "immediately" was not very courteous. He therefore suggested to the sponsors that the word "immediately" should either be deleted or replaced by the words "as rapidly as possible" (A/C.4/L.315).

10. Mr. ABOU-AFIA (Egypt) suggested that the Iraqi amendment (A/C.4/L.311) might be reworded to invite the Administering Authorities of Togoland to take all necessary measures to ensure that full freedom of speech, assembly, association and movement between the two parts of Togoland was enjoyed throughout the whole country by all political parties with regard to the unification question and all national aspirations. A text along those lines would maintain the substance of the Iraqi amendment and would conform more closely to the spirit and intentions of the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.308).

11. Mr. KADRY (Iraq) withdrew his amendment and said that he was prepared to co-sponsor the Egyptian suggestion.

12. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) explained that the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.308) had been submitted after very lengthy consultations between its co-sponsors and represented an attempt to draw up a balanced text which would express the views of all the non-administering Members. Great attention had been paid to the language and tone of the draft resolution. In those circumstances, he would frankly have preferred that no amendments had been submitted, but his delegation was always ready to accept amendments. The Egyptian suggestion was implicit in the word "freely" in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution and he did not feel that there was any need to add an entirely new paragraph. As a compromise, he suggested that the following clause should be added at the end of the existing operative paragraph 5: "and, to this effect, that they take all necessary measures to ensure freedom of speech, movement and assembly in all parts of the Territories".

13. He was surprised that operative paragraph 10 of the draft resolution should have given rise to discussion. That paragraph merely spoke of facilitating the unification of the two Trust Territories, not of achieving it. He would therefore abstain from voting on the New Zealand amendment (A/C.4/L.313).

14. He would vote in favour of the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.4/L.309 and A/C.4/L.310/Rev.1. He reserved his right to speak on any amendments that might subsequently be submitted.

15. Mr. ABOU-AFIA (Egypt) and Mr. KADRY (Iraq) accepted the Venezuelan representative's suggestion with regard to operative paragraph 5 and said that they would co-sponsor an amendment to that effect (A/C.4/L.314).

16. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) would be unable to vote in favour of operative paragraph 5 of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.308). It went without saying that the Administering Authorities should

allow the political parties freely to express their views, through freedom of assembly and movement, but to recommend that they should "assist" those parties might imply positive governmental assistance and justify complaints from some parties if such assistance was not forthcoming. He would have preferred the Egyptian-Iraqi amendment (A/C.4/L.314) to be withdrawn altogether; it was already implied in the word "freely", and any additional form of words would be discourteous to the French Government, at whom they were obviously directed, and would be misunderstood in the Trust Territory.

17. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) wished to make it quite clear that in accepting the Egyptian-Iraqi amendment (A/C.4/L.314) he did not have in mind that it should be directed specifically at one Administering Authority; it applied equally to both.

18. Mrs. BOLTON (United States of America) said that if the New Zealand amendment (A/C.4/L.313) to the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.308) were adopted, her delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole; if the amendment were not adopted, it would abstain. She would vote in favour of the Egyptian-Iraqi amendment (A/C.4/L.314).

19. Her delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.309, as amended by the Danish representative (A/C.4/L.315).

20. Operative paragraph 3 of the revised draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.310/Rev.1. went too far. The purpose of the International Trusteeship System was to bring the Trust Territories to self-government or independence. She did not see how the achievement of self-government by Togoland under British administration in association with the Gold Coast would be contrary to that purpose. She would therefore vote in favour of the Colombian amendment (A/C.4/L.316) and, if that amendment were adopted, in favour of the revised draft resolution as a whole.

21. Mr. QUINTEROS (Chile) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.308), since it was in favour of any measures to implement the Principles of the Charter with regard to the International Trusteeship System and promote the unification of the two Togolands and the reconstitution of the Joint Council.

22. His delegation felt that operative paragraph 1 of the revised draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.310/Rev.1, was too sweeping. It was not the actual measures already taken which were open to doubt in themselves, but their scope and implications. His delegation, together with the Chinese delegation, had therefore submitted an amendment (A/C.4/L.312). He reserved his delegation's right to speak on the revised text of operative paragraph 3 and any other amendments that might be introduced.

23. Mr. S. S. LIU (China) said that his delegation had always maintained that the reconstitution of the Joint Council was very important, since only through the establishment of such machinery could the views of inhabitants of the two Trust Territories be ascertained. He would therefore support the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.308).

24. The draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.309 merely elaborated the main proposal in operative paragraph 2 of the seven-Power draft res-

olution and was therefore acceptable to his delegation. It was moreover regrettable that the electoral procedure recommended in General Assembly resolution 652 (VII) had not been fully adopted by the Administering Authorities. The General Assembly should take a stronger stand on the question.

25. He was entirely in favour of the revised draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.310/Rev.1 expressing the General Assembly's opposition to the integration of the Trust Territory into the Gold Coast, an integration which was incompatible with its separate international status as a Trust Territory. He could not challenge the statements of the Gold Coast Prime Minister concerning the sentiments of the people in Togoland under British administration (A/C.4/L.249), but it was important that those sentiments should be thoroughly ascertained before any decision was reached. Operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution did not fully explain, however, why "an increased measure of self-government" might necessitate revision of the Trusteeship Agreement. The increased self-government of the people of Togoland as a separate entity would not call for revision of the Trusteeship Agreement; what was envisaged was the development of self-government in the Gold Coast. That was why his delegation, in consultation with the Chilean delegation, had submitted an amendment (A/C.4/L.312) which would make the purpose of the whole draft resolution much clearer.

26. His delegation had objected to the original text of operative paragraph 3 (A/C.4/L.310), but felt that it could support the revised text (A/C.4/L.310/Rev.1) and therefore withdrew paragraph 2 of the Chilean and Chinese amendment (A/C.4/L.312).

27. Mr. DE HOLTE CASTELLO (Colombia) said that the revised version (A/C.4/L.310/Rev.1.) of operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.310) did not meet his delegation's objection to that paragraph. He therefore reintroduced paragraph 2 of the Chilean and Chinese amendment (A/C.4/L.312) as his own (A/C.4/L.316).

28. Mrs. MENON (India) supported the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.4/L.309 and A/C.4/L.310/Rev.1. The Administering Authorities' argument that the differences between the systems of administration of the two Territories were an obstacle to unification was refuted by the fact that the two Territories had been administered as one by the Germans; unification should be the first step towards independence. In opposing universal adult suffrage the French representative had alleged that identification of voters would be difficult, yet if identification was possible in Togoland under British administration it must obviously be possible in the other Territory. The Administering Authorities' views on what a voter's qualifications should be were not in keeping with modern conceptions or with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Administering Authorities were manifestly searching for obstacles to hinder the solution of the problem.

29. Mr. PIGNON (France) thanked the Egyptian and Venezuelan representatives for their constructive and friendly attitude, and the Iraqi delegation for having abandoned its original amendment (A/C.4/L.311), thereby enabling him to continue to participate in the Committee's deliberations.

30. His delegation would vote for the New Zealand amendment (A/C.4/L.313), the amendment submitted

by Chile and China (A/C.4/L.312) and the Colombian amendment (A/C.4/L.316).

31. He reaffirmed that suffrage under the electoral system of Togoland under French administration was almost universal, and was direct and secret.

32. Mr. CREPAULT (Canada) said that his delegation sympathized with the petitioners' hopes and aspirations and would favour any proposal likely to promote joint consultations in such a body as the Joint Council. He congratulated the sponsors of the very reasonable and appropriate seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.308). Political opinion in the Togolands was still evolving; the Assembly should assist that evolution, but should not impose solutions, which the Togolandese should be allowed to work out for themselves.

33. The principle of universal suffrage, the central issue of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.309, was accepted without reservation by his delegation. The present proposal, however, presented this principle in circumstances which affected its applicability; the Canadian delegation favoured gradual evolution in the constitutional field and was therefore inclined to consider the proposal premature at this stage.

34. The Canadian delegation thought that the revised draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.310/Rev.1 appeared to prejudge the question of Togoland unification as a whole. After asserting that the decision rested with the people of the two Togolands themselves, the draft resolution proceeded to limit that freedom of decision by operative paragraph 3, which stated a principle inadmissible to the Canadian delegation.

35. The statistics furnished on the distribution of the Ewes in the two Togolands and the Gold Coast had led his delegation to feel that the unification of the Ewes might be achieved no less, and perhaps even more, satisfactorily, by the integration of Togoland under British administration to the Gold Coast than by the unification of the two Togolands. His delegation had therefore wanted merely to point out that the heading under which the present draft resolution had been tabled might more appropriately read "The Togoland unification problem", since that question, and not Ewe unification, appeared now to be the point at issue.

36. His delegation would support the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.308) but not the draft resolutions contained respectively in documents A/C.4/L.309 and A/C.4/L.310/Rev.1.

37. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil) said that, though he felt that the Danish amendment (A/C.4/L.315) to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.309 was unnecessary, the objection that the latter text was too abruptly worded might be met by substituting the words "without delay" for "immediately".

38. At that morning's meeting the United Kingdom representative had expressed surprise at what appeared, in the light of operative paragraphs 1 and 3 of the revised draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.310/Rev.1, of which Brazil was a co-sponsor, to be a reversal of Brazil's attitude since the Trusteeship Council's consideration of the question of administrative unions. His delegation was not opposed to administrative unions, but in the case at issue there was a danger that the United Kingdom's exercise of

the Trusteeship, under the supervision of the United Nations, might be modified in violation of the Trusteeship Agreement and of the rights of the United Nations under Articles 75 and 85 of the Charter.

39. Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would vote for operative paragraph 5—amended in accordance with the Egyptian-Iraqi proposal (A/C.4/L.314)—of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.308), since the United Kingdom had always acted in accordance with the terms of that proposal.

40. He suggested that the sponsors of the revised draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.310/Rev.1 should omit the word "British" before the word "Commonwealth" in the first paragraph of the preamble.

41. His delegation favoured the amendment proposed by the delegations of Chile and China (A/C.4/L.312) to that draft resolution, and stressed that Togoland under British administration was administered under article 5 (a) of the Trusteeship Agreement, which permitted more than a mere administrative union and provided for the Territory's administration "as an integral part" of the Administering Authority's Territory.

42. He welcomed the Colombian amendment (A/C.4/L.316). The Philippine representative had stated that three alternative courses were open to Togoland under British administration: it could be directly administered by the United Kingdom, it could become a Trust Territory with a (self-governing) Gold Coast as the Administering Authority, or the Trust Territory could opt for independence or self-government as a separate entity; yet in paragraph 3, as revised, of the operative part of the revised draft resolution (A/C.4/L.310/Rev.1) the Philippine delegation had already settled on the third solution. According to Article 76 of the Charter, the basic objectives of the Trusteeship System were "to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories, and their progressive development towards self-government . . ." It would not be contrary to the Charter for the inhabitants of Togoland under British administration freely to choose self-government or independence together with the Gold Coast. If the amendment (A/C.4/L.316) was not adopted, the United Kingdom delegation would vote against paragraph 3 of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.310/Rev.1) and if paragraph 3 was retained, it would vote against the draft resolution as a whole.

43. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) referring to the revised draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.310/Rev.1, said that, while no one was opposed to the progress of the Gold Coast towards complete self-government or independence within the Commonwealth, that progress should not affect the status of Togoland under British administration before the peoples of the two Togolands had decided on the future of their joint Territories. He suggested that paragraph 1 of the operative part, as set forth in the Chilean-Chinese amendment (A/C.4/L.312), might be amended as follows: "*Expresses* the opinion that further changes in the Constitution of the Gold Coast, with which Togoland under British administration is administered as an integral part in the administrative respect, may, to the extent that they affect Togoland under British administration, convert the existing administrative union into a political union not provided for in the

Trusteeship Agreement and affect the status of the Trust Territory as a separate international entity”.

44. Mr. S. S. LIU (China) and Mr. QUINTEROS (Chile) regretted that they could not accept the Yugoslav representative's suggestion. They feared that any change in the wording of their proposed amendment (A/C.4/L.312) would jeopardize the support which it had received from the Administering Authorities.

45. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) said, in regard to the Chilean-Chinese amendment (A/C.4/L.312), that further changes in the Constitution of the Gold Coast would necessitate a revision of the Trusteeship Agreement in respect of Togoland under British administration, because any increase in self-government for the Gold Coast would mean a further transfer of the power of supervision over the Trust Territory to the Government of the Gold Coast. When the Gold Coast finally became independent, the United Kingdom would no longer exercise supervision over Togoland under British administration and would therefore have ceased to be its Administering Authority. In effect, the Gold Coast would have become the Administering Authority, which would be contrary to the terms of the Trusteeship Agreement. The Philippine delegation therefore wished to see operative paragraph 1 of the revised draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.310/Rev.1 maintained as it stood.

46. There was yet another objection to the Chilean-Chinese amendment. In referring to the conversion of an existing administrative union into a political union, the amendment was treading on dangerous ground. When the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa, 1951, had been considering the administrative union affecting Tanganyika, it had stated in its report (T/946 and Corr.1) that the administrative union was permissible because it did not present all the elements of a political union. The implication had been that a political union would not be consonant with the Principles of the Charter. The Trusteeship Agreement for Togoland under British administration could not therefore be revised to allow full political union, since that would be against the Principles of the Charter. The Philippine delegation regretted that it would be obliged to vote against the amendment.

47. Mrs. SKOTTSBERG-AHMAN (Sweden) said that her delegation would vote against operative paragraph 3 of the revised draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.310/Rev.1 on the grounds that it prejudged the future of the Trust Territory and implied that the United Nations would refuse to allow the people of Togoland under British administration a free choice on the question of integration with the self-governing Gold Coast. However, the right of peoples to self-determination meant the right to a free choice and must therefore include the right to choose association with another territory. In Article 76, the Charter included among the basic objectives of the Trusteeship System the development of the inhabitants of Trust Territories towards self-government or independence as might be “appropriate to the particular circumstances of each Territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned”. It did not stipulate that such self-government or independence must be as a separate entity. It was therefore difficult to understand why, if a majority of the inhabitants of Togoland under British administration

opted for self-government or independence together with their neighbours in the Gold Coast, it would be contrary to the principles and purposes of the Trusteeship System. Moreover, operative paragraph 4 of the revised draft resolution under consideration asked the Trusteeship Council to make a comprehensive study of the matter, laying particular stress upon the progressive development of the inhabitants of the two Trust Territories towards self-government or independence, with particular regard to the special circumstances created by the constitutional and political situation in the Gold Coast. The adoption of paragraph 3 as it stood would prejudge the conclusions of such a study. Accordingly, unless operative paragraph 3 was deleted, the Swedish delegation would vote against the draft resolution as a whole.

48. The CHAIRMAN said that before he called for a vote on the various draft resolutions proposed and the amendments thereto, he would invite Mr. Odame of the Joint Togoland Congress, who wished to clarify a point raised by the United Kingdom representative, to address the Committee.

49. Mr. ODAME (Joint Togoland Congress) said that the representative of the United Kingdom had indicated at the 371st meeting that 65,000 persons in the district of Buem-Krachi were against unification and in favour of integration in the Gold Coast. According to the last census, the combined population of Buem-Krachi was 71,000, including children. It could therefore be assumed that there were not more than 30,000 persons in the district qualified to vote. The figure quoted by the United Kingdom representative was thus absurd. Moreover, several of the organizations which supported the unification movement, including the Joint Togoland Congress, the Togoland Farmers Association and the Togoland Youth Movement, were headed by important figures from Buem State. It was therefore incorrect to say that Buem-Krachi as a whole was opposed to unification.

50. Mr. KUCHKAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not yet received Russian texts of all the amendments presented, and certain of the texts already available contained inaccuracies of translation. He felt, therefore, that the vote should be postponed to the next meeting.

51. After a brief discussion on the desirability of holding a Saturday meeting, the CHAIRMAN put to the vote the question whether the Committee should vote immediately or whether it should postpone the vote to the next meeting.

The Committee decided to vote immediately by 17 votes to 16, with 12 abstentions.

52. Mr. PIGNON (France) wished to make it clear that he had voted in favour of taking the vote immediately only because he was opposed in principle to the holding of Saturday meetings.

53. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) said that he had voted against taking the vote immediately on the ground that delegations ought not to be required to vote before they had received the relevant texts in the appropriate language.

54. Mr. KUCHKAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) objected that all the possible alternatives had not been placed before the Committee. He suggested, therefore, that the vote should be postponed to the following Monday morning, 23 November.

55. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) and Mrs. BOLTON (United States of America) agreed that the Committee had chosen to vote immediately only because it was opposed to holding Saturday meetings, and therefore supported the proposal that the vote on

the various draft resolutions and the amendments thereto should be taken on Monday

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.