



**Monday, 19 November 1956,
at 10.40 a.m.**

New York

CONTENTS

	Page
Statement by the Chairman	3
Election of the Vice-Chairman	3
Election of the Rapporteur	3
Order of discussion of agenda items	3
Requests for hearings	6

Chairman: Mr. Enrique de MARCHENA
(Dominican Republic).

Statement by the Chairman

1. The CHAIRMAN thanked representatives for the honour they had done to his country and himself by electing him Chairman. He felt that his election was a recognition of the Dominican Republic's untiring efforts in the field of trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories. The Fourth Committee's work was well known; it had raised the hopes of millions of individuals, and represented one of the triumphs of the United Nations.

2. The experience he had acquired in the matters with which the Committee dealt would help to guide him in his work, and he would endeavour to discharge his duties impartially. He wished to co-operate closely with all delegations and to serve the Committee to the best of his ability.

Election of the Vice-Chairman

3. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) congratulated the Chairman on his election and noted with satisfaction that once again a Latin-American country had been called upon to preside over the Committee's work.

4. He nominated Miss Brooks, the representative of Liberia, as Vice-Chairman. He hoped that his colleagues would unanimously support the nomination, and thus pay a tribute to Miss Brooks' competence and devotion to the cause of the Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories.

5. Mr. RAMAIAH (India), Mr. NASH (United States of America), Mr. BALAY (Uruguay), Mr. LARREA (Ecuador), ATO YIFRU (Ethiopia), Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq), Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) and Mr. CHHATARI (Pakistan) associated themselves with the Venezuelan representative's remarks.

Miss Brooks (Liberia) was elected Vice-Chairman by acclamation.

6. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) thanked the members of the Committee for their demonstration of confidence in her.

Election of the Rapporteur

7. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) nominated Mr. Soward (Canada) as Rapporteur.

8. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) and Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) supported the nomination.

Mr. Soward (Canada) was elected Rapporteur by acclamation.

9. Mr. SOWARD (Canada) thanked members of the Committee for the honour they had done him.

**Order of discussion of agenda items
(A/C.4/328)**

10. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the letter dated 15 November 1956 from the President of the General Assembly to the Chairman of the Fourth Committee (A/C.4/328), concerning the allocation of agenda items to the Committee. He asked whether any member had any comments to make concerning the order of the items as given in the President's letter.

11. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) assumed that item 4 (c) [34 (c)*] would include two important questions, procedures for the consideration of communications relating to the cessation of the transmission of information under Article 73 e of the Charter, and the question whether the territories administered by the sixteen new Members included any Non-Self-Governing Territories within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter. Questions relating to the transmission and examination of information had received special consideration at previous sessions, and the same procedure should be followed at the present session. In that connexion, he asked that the note by the Secretary-General on procedures for the consideration of communications (A/AC.35/L.222) should be made available to members of the Committee. He also suggested that the letter addressed to the sixteen new Members by the Secretary-General asking them whether they administered Non-Self-Governing Territories, as well as any replies that had been received, should be circulated for the information of members of the Committee.¹

12. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) wondered whether the Iraqi representative wished to have a separate general debate on procedures for the consideration of communications. In the past there had been a general debate only on the question of Non-Self-Governing Territories, an arrangement which had certain practical advantages particularly in view of the inclusion of a new item, item 5 [35*], in the agenda of the eleventh session.

13. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) agreed with the Iraqi representative that the procedure for the consideration of communications should be dealt with separately, and was therefore in favour of holding three general debates on the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

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

¹ Subsequently reproduced as document A/C.4/331.

14. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any objection, the Iraqi representative's suggestions would be adopted.

It was so decided.

15. Mr. THORP (New Zealand) said that the Iraqi representative had made his proposal in general terms and had referred to documents which the Committee did not have before it. In accepting that proposal therefore, he reserved his right to formulate objections of a practical character when the Committee began dealing with the question.

16. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela), referring to the Togoland unification problem, asked for further information concerning requests for hearings. If the Committee decided to hear petitioners from the Territory, it should not discuss the Togoland problem before they arrived.

17. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that he also would like information on the subject before taking a decision on the agenda.

18. Mr. WIESCHHOFF (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Secretary-General had received six requests for hearings concerning the Togoland unification problem and the future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration. Five of those requests came from the Togoland Congress, the Convention People's Party, the All-Ewe Conference, the Mouvement de la jeunesse togolaise (JUVENTO) and the Mouvement populaire togolais, respectively. The sixth request had been submitted jointly by the Parti togolais du progrès and the Union des chefs et des populations du Nord-Togo.

19. In reply to a question from Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium), the CHAIRMAN stated that the Trusteeship Council had heard none of the petitioners.

20. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that the Committee could not consider the Togoland problem in detail until it knew the views of all the petitioners concerned. He asked whether the organizations in Togoland under French administration had also asked for hearings on the problem of Togoland under British administration. The two problems were closely connected.

21. Mr. MAURTUA (Peru) suggested that the discussion would become very confused if the Committee began considering requests for hearings before it had even decided how to organize its work.

22. The CHAIRMAN considered that the Committee should have all the necessary information before it before deciding whether to follow the order of items given in the letter from the President of the General Assembly and consider the Togoland problem first. He accordingly suggested that the meeting should be suspended briefly to enable the Secretariat to circulate the list of requests for hearings it had received.

The meeting was suspended at 11.45 a.m. and resumed at noon.

23. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) thought it very important to have precise information as to whether all the organizations could be properly represented when the question of Togoland was discussed. But the Committee had also to decide how it would consider the two aspects of the problem, namely, Togoland under British administration and Togoland under French administration. He therefore wished to know

whether the petitioners could, if they desired, deal with both aspects, and also whether the Committee would consider the problem of the French Trust Territory immediately after that of the British Trust Territory.

24. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the General Assembly, in resolution 944 (X), had already made a distinction and had considered in turn the future of Togoland under British administration and that of Togoland under French administration. The same distinction had also been adopted by the Trusteeship Council in the special report it submitted to the General Assembly (A/3169 and Corr.1). He therefore suggested that the Committee should adopt the same procedure, and study first the problem of Togoland under British administration and then that of Togoland under French administration.

25. Mr. BARGUES (France) said that the Togoland unification problem did in fact concern both Territories, but that in practice the two questions had always been examined separately.

26. The French delegation wished to make it clear that a referendum had been held in Togoland under French administration on 28 October and that the French Government had asked the Secretary-General of the United Nations to convene a special session of the Trusteeship Council (T/1288). That session would probably take place in December. It would therefore be advisable not to take up the problem of Togoland under French administration until after the special session of the Trusteeship Council.

27. Mr. LOIZIDES (Greece) suggested that the Committee should group together all the problems relating to the Non-Self-Governing Territories and begin the general discussion of those problems, after which it could take up all the questions relating to the Trust Territories.

28. Mr. VILLAREAL (Philippines) said that the Fourth Committee did not have to deal with the questions in the order suggested in the letter from the President of the General Assembly. He therefore suggested that the report of the Trusteeship Council (A/3170) should be considered first, since that would enable the representatives of new Member States to familiarize themselves with the work of the Fourth Committee.

29. Mr. MACLAY (United Kingdom) said that the Territory of the Gold Coast was to become independent early in 1957. It was thus necessary for the Fourth Committee to take very early action on Togoland under British administration, so that if it decided to endorse the recommendation made by the Trusteeship Council in its resolution 1496 (XVIII), all the necessary steps could be taken in good time.

30. Mr. YASSEIN (Sudan) thought that the Committee could await the arrival of the petitioners before taking up the problem of Togoland. He therefore proposed that the Committee should begin by examining the report of the Trusteeship Council.

31. Mr. SOLE (Union of South Africa) said that the Fourth Committee had always taken into account the wishes of the parties concerned and that his delegation had been particularly grateful for that evidence of consideration when the problems involved had been those in which the Union of South Africa was concerned. He hoped that the Committee would recognize the cogency of the remarks made by the United King-

dom representative, and, while taking into account the legitimate anxieties of certain representatives, would decide to take up the question of Togoland first.

32. Mr. RAMAIAH (India) agreed with the Chairman that the two aspects of the problem of the unification of Togoland should be considered separately. Moreover, since the question should be settled as a matter of priority, he agreed with the representative of the United Kingdom that the problem of Togoland should be taken up as soon as possible.

33. Mr. LOOMES (Australia) felt he was expressing the views of most of the Committee's members in proposing that the question of Togoland should be examined before the others. The Committee could first study the problem of Togoland under British administration and postpone examination of the problem of Togoland under French administration until the Trusteeship Council had taken a decision. The Committee could decide later on the other items of the agenda; the Australian delegation had no objections to the order as given in the President's letter (A/C.4/328).

34. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela), replying to the doubts expressed by several delegations, submitted that the question he had raised was extremely pertinent. The Fourth Committee could not proceed in conformity with resolution 944 (X) without the presence of the Togoland, who were the principal party concerned.

35. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said he appreciated the urgency of the question for the Gold Coast, as well as the desirability of hearing the petitioners. On the other hand, he thought that there were some drawbacks in having the Committee take up now the items relating to the Non-Self-Governing Territories and the report of the Trusteeship Council. He therefore proposed a compromise. The Fourth Committee would accept all the requests for hearings in connexion with the two Territories of Togoland. The Secretary-General would so inform the petitioners and state that those who wished to comment on the question of Togoland under British administration should arrive within two days. It would then be necessary immediately to request the representative of the United States to take the necessary action so that the petitioners would receive their entry visas for the United States at once. Finally, the Committee would not meet again until Thursday.

36. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) also thought that the Committee would encounter difficulties if it began the examination of item 4 or 7 [34 or 13*], which were very broad subjects, and then interrupted it after two days. He had no objection to the proposal that the Committee should deal first with item 1 [39*], which concerned Togoland, considering the reasons given by the representative of the United Kingdom; but he would like the petitioners to have an opportunity to be heard. He was therefore in favour of the suggestion made by the representative of Yugoslavia, which would give the persons concerned a chance to arrive in New York in time.

37. Mr. THORP (New Zealand) said that the question of Togoland under British administration was the most important question on the Committee's agenda, and the inhabitants of the Trust Territories would find it strange if the Committee did not deal with it as soon as possible. Moreover, in its resolution 1496 (XVIII) the Trusteeship Council had made a recommendation almost unanimously, and its members would

no doubt be prepared to explain their views before the petitioners appeared before the Committee, although that did not mean that there was no point in giving the latter a hearing. Besides, there appeared to be no item which the Committee could conveniently undertake if it was to suspend discussion on it almost immediately. Even if the Committee had to await a few days before beginning its work, it would soon make up the lost time once it had all the facts before it. Finally, as the representative of the Union of South Africa had rightly pointed out, it was customary for the Committee, when deciding upon the order of discussion of its agenda items, to consider the wishes of the delegations chiefly concerned.

38. For all those reasons, the New Zealand delegation considered that priority should be given to item 1. The order of the other items appeared acceptable.

39. Mr. NASH (United States of America), referring to the question raised by the Yugoslav representative, said that measures had already been taken to grant the petitioners the required visas. For the reasons put forward by the United Kingdom, he considered that the Committee should examine item 1 as soon as possible.

40. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) thought that the Committee could examine the report of the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner (A/3173 and Add.1) and the report of the Trusteeship Council (A/3169 and Corr.1) immediately. He wondered whether the petitioners from Togoland under British administration were in a position to supply any new data. They represented all political parties, and all of them had had an opportunity of campaigning before the plebiscite. When it examined the Trusteeship Council's report, the Plebiscite Commissioner's report and the plebiscite figures, the Committee would realize that it had before it all the data it needed to arrive at a decision, and that a hearing of the petitioners could only create confusion. He therefore urged the Committee to deal immediately with item 1.

41. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) supported the Yugoslav representative's compromise suggestion.

42. Mr. GREKOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said it was essential to hear the petitioners. He approved the Yugoslav representative's suggestion.

43. The CHAIRMAN noted the United States representative's assurance that the petitioners would receive their visas in time and that the Secretariat could advise them immediately by telegram that the Committee was dealing with item 1 first. He asked the representatives of Greece and the Philippines if they had any formal proposals to submit.

44. Mr. LOIZIDES (Greece) agreed that the Committee should begin with item 1.

45. Mr. VILLAREAL (Philippines) withdrew his suggestion.

46. The CHAIRMAN said it was desirable for the Committee to examine items 2 and 3 [38 and 37*], which concerned South West Africa, while the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Union of South Africa was in New York. Meanwhile there was no reason why the Committee should not examine item 1, and if none of the representatives objected, that would be done on Thursday, 22 November.

It was so decided.

47. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) thought that the Committee might examine item 5 [35*] while awaiting the arrival of the petitioners.

48. The CHAIRMAN said it was doubtful whether the Committee could complete its examination of item 5 in two days, and he did not think it was desirable to interrupt the examination of the item. He therefore hoped that the Belgian representative would not press his suggestion, so that the Secretariat and the Chairman could make arrangements for the arrival of the petitioners on Thursday, 22 November. He noted that the Committee could at any time decide to change its order of work.

49. The Committee seemed to be in agreement that the agenda items allocated to it should be discussed in the order in which they appeared in document A/C.4/328.

In the absence of any objection, it was so decided.

Requests for hearings

50. The CHAIRMAN noted that the requests for

hearings concerning the Togoland unification problem and the future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration had been circulated in document A/C.4/329. The Committee appeared to be in agreement that all those requests should be granted.

In the absence of any objection, it was so decided.

51. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said he had not asked for the question to be put to the vote; if that had been done, he would have voted against it. The people of Togoland had had ample opportunity to express their will and had done so by casting more than 100,000 votes.

52. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat had received other requests for hearings and proposed that the relevant texts should be distributed to the Committee.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.