



Thursday, 10 January 1957,
 at 3.15 p.m.

New York

CONTENTS

Agenda item 39:

The Togoland unification problem and the future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration: reports of the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner and of the Trusteeship Council (*continued*)
 General debate on the future of Togoland under French administration (*continued*) 225

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

AGENDA ITEM 39

The Togoland unification problem and the future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration: reports of the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner and of the Trusteeship Council (A/3169 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/C.4/340 and Add.1, A/C.4/341, A/C.4/L.452/Rev.1, A/C.4/L.453/Rev.1 and Add.1) (*continued*)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Nanamale Gbegbeni, representative of the Union des chefs et des populations du Nord-Togo, Mr. Victor Atakpamey, representative of the Parti togolais du progrès, Mr. Michel Ayassou, representative of the Traditional chiefs of the South, Mr. Sambiani Mateyendou, representative of the Traditional chiefs of the North, Mr. André Akakpo, representative of the Mouvement populaire togolais, Mr. A. I. Santos, representative of the Mouvement de la jeunesse togolaise (Juvento), and Mr. Sylvanus Olympio, representative of the All-Ewe Conference, took places at the Committee table.

GENERAL DEBATE OF THE FUTURE OF TOGOLAND UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION (*continued*)

1. Mr. DE SILVA (Ceylon) expressed his appreciation of the valuable contributions to the discussion which had been made by the petitioners, the Minister for Overseas France and the members of the French delegation who were associated with the Government of Togoland. The restraint and objectivity shown by the three petitioners opposing the referendum had made a deep impression on his delegation and the high qualities of statesmanship they had revealed augured well for the future stability of the Territory. Mr. Defferre, the Minister for Overseas France, had shown commendable willingness to answer the questions put to him. Mr. Houphouet-Boigny represented the finest qualities of the African people, and the impassioned appeal he had made at the 590th meeting on behalf of internationalism had been moving. Yet it was precisely because the Ceylonese delegation was itself internationally minded that he disagreed with Mr. Houphouet-Boigny's approach to the problem of Togoland under French administration. The United Nations was an international organization which had contractual obligations to the people of Togoland; as

long as the Territory remained under United Nations trusteeship its affairs were the proper concern of the Organization and no action designed to terminate that trusteeship could be taken without its approval.

2. In the opinion of his delegation the articles in part V of the new Statute of Togoland made nonsense of the very title of the Autonomous Republic of Togoland. Certain delegations, among which it had been surprising to find that of Yugoslavia, had sought to justify the use of the word "autonomous" on the grounds that a certain degree of autonomy had been granted. The delegation of Ceylon maintained that the word could not properly be used unless full autonomy were intended. The disparity of the items grouped together under article 26 showed a lack of consistency, for if the Togoland people were considered capable of initiating any legislation at all it was difficult to see why matters such as the labour code and mineral resources should not be entrusted to them. Again, to argue that they were not ready to assume responsibility for higher and secondary education and the administration of justice because of the lack of teachers and magistrates was to confuse the issue. A distinction must be drawn between the process of making laws and that of their administration: the lack of trained personnel need not prevent the Togoland people from enacting such legislation and employing foreign officials to administer it until such time as there were enough qualified Togolandese to do so. Article 38 did not make it clear whether the evolution referred to could apply to the Statute as a whole or only to its more innocuous sections. The contents of part X made it seem that the Statute was not as susceptible of evolution as would appear from article 38.

3. The Ceylonese delegation questioned the procedure under which the referendum had been conducted, since the United Nations had not been given the opportunity to approve either the questions put to the voters or the manner in which the voting took place. Moreover, the Statute had been enacted in consultation with a legislature which had not been elected on the basis of universal suffrage. The referendum had been held too soon after the promulgation of the Statute to give the people time to observe its application and pass judgement on its merits, a consideration which was the more important in that the alternative offered was termination of the Trusteeship Agreement.

4. In the past the Administering Authority had repeatedly stated that there was no urgent need to change the status of the Territory, yet in the last year events had suddenly begun to move with startling swiftness. Universal suffrage had been introduced, a statute claiming to make the Territory an autonomous republic had been enacted and a referendum had been held in defiance of the Trusteeship Council. Such speed was in marked contrast to the usual tardiness of the colonial Powers and Administering Authorities in introducing much-needed reforms. It was perhaps not surprising,

then, that the Administering Authority had been charged with attempting to give the Trust Territory a colonial status.

5. His delegation was unable to support the revised six-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.453/Rev.1 and Add.1) because the autonomy it referred to was open to question and the phrasing of operative paragraphs 1 and 2 prejudged the consideration of the reforms, which had yet to be studied. The use of the word "decisive" implied that the reforms were definitive and was therefore inconsistent with the primary purpose of the resolution, which was to appoint a commission to study those very reforms. He did not agree with the representative of Canada that they were important reforms, nor could he associate himself with the congratulations paragraph 2 extended to the people of Togoland on the progress it alleged they had made.

6. The revised Indian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.452/Rev.1) was more in keeping with his delegation's views and represented a considerable improvement on the original, which would not have received his delegation's support. While, however, he approved of the terms of reference of the proposed commission, he would prefer its members to be appointed by the President of the General Assembly.

7. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that two points in his statement at the 593rd meeting appeared to have been misinterpreted by the representative of Ceylon. Firstly, he had said that his delegation could state that a forward step had been taken and that while it did not correspond to what he would like to see achieved in both Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories in Africa, it laid a solid basis for the future evolution of the Territory. Secondly, he had concluded by noting that the reforms were a good beginning which should be encouraged and accepted to the extent that they were carried out within the framework of the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement.

8. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) recalled that the United Nations had at first directed its efforts towards unification of the artificially separated parts of Togoland, as the very title of the item under consideration attested. To find a solution to the problem was no easy task and the rapidity with which the recent changes in the administration of the French Trust Territory had taken place had not made it easier. The situation was further complicated by the fact that the Administering Authority had not co-operated with the United Nations in drawing up the new Statute and conducting the referendum. The introduction of universal suffrage and the setting up of a council of ministers with limited powers could be said to represent progress in the political development of the Territory, but those changes did not justify the conclusion that the aims of the Trusteeship System had been attained. Certain stipulations pertaining to the links between France and Togoland, on the other hand, appeared to exceed the scope of the Trusteeship Agreement in that they pointed towards integration. The way in which the new Statute was to be put into practice had not yet been clearly defined. In the circumstances, his delegation was of the opinion that the Territory should remain under the Trusteeship System until the United Nations was in a position to state that the final objectives of that System had been attained. He shared the opinion expressed by earlier speakers that the situation called for further examination.

9. The two draft resolutions before the Committee were based on a common premise, but whereas the language of the six-Power draft resolution might be subject to a variety of interpretations, the Indian was precise in its wording and did not in any way prejudice the final solution of the problem. It would therefore receive the support of the Polish delegation.

10. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) said that he did not propose to follow the example of those delegations which had undertaken to pass judgement on the reforms introduced under the Statute and to expound their views on how they thought it should have been drafted. It was the aspirations of the people of the Trust Territory themselves, and not those of the delegations represented in the Committee, that the Statute was designed to satisfy. Those who had criticized, for example, the dual nationality provision and the fact that the inhabitants of the Territory continued to be represented in the National Assembly in Paris failed to take into account that it was the Territorial Assembly itself which had requested the inclusion of those provisions. The Statute, drawn up jointly by the Administering Authority and the elected representatives of the population, had been approved by an overwhelming vote in a referendum based on the principle of universal suffrage and the secret ballot, as was clear from the report of the Referendum Administrator (A/3169/Add.1, annex II). Any resolution which failed to take that fact into account would be unacceptable, since it would imply an unfavourable attitude with regard to the freely expressed wishes of the people of Togoland. The Belgian delegation, for its part, welcomed the emergence of the new Autonomous Republic of Togoland and congratulated its people on the progress achieved, which would permit them to play a decisive role in the management of their own affairs.

11. He had noted with astonishment the failure of the Indian draft resolution to mention the Togoland Government's invitation to the United Nations to dispatch a commission of observers to the Territory. That omission seemed to indicate a refusal to recognize a political and legal reality. It would be paradoxical if the very delegations which had for so many years criticized the Administering Authorities for not promoting the political advancement of the Trust Territories fast enough should now complain because those authorities were transferring a large part of their prerogatives to a local government. With regard to the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement, the sole legal basis for the precedent to which attention had been drawn had been the consent of the Administering Authority to the practice followed. He did not think many delegations would agree with the USSR representative that any institutional reform required the prior approval of the United Nations. In reality the development of the Trust Territories was carried out progressively under the supervision of the United Nations and under the sole authority and jurisdiction of the Administering Authority. The culmination of that development was the attainment of the objectives laid down in Article 76 b of the Charter. The trusteeship would properly be terminated when it no longer had any justification or purpose, i.e., when the objectives laid down in the Charter had been achieved. The final destiny of a Territory was to be decided by the wishes of the inhabitants when they had attained maturity.

12. Mr. MAGHERU (Romania) said that the Trusteeship Council's refusal to send a mission to observe

the conduct of the referendum indicated that it had grave reservations regarding the manner in which the consultation was to be carried out and the speed with which it had been prepared. Nevertheless the Administering Authority had proceeded with the referendum and now requested the United Nations to terminate the Trusteeship Agreement on the basis of a procedure with which the Organization had in no way been connected. The pertinent documents and the statements of the petitioners and of the Administering Authority, as also their replies to questions, indicated that the Territory was not yet in a position to govern itself.

13. The Administering Authority maintained that it had been justified in holding the referendum after the promulgation of the Statute because the voters had thus been enabled to understand what they were voting on. A people with so little political experience, however, could scarcely have been expected to gain such understanding in the course of a few weeks. In addition, three-fourths of the voters had only recently been inscribed on the electoral register. The procedure of voting, as well as the substance of the matter to be voted on, had had to be explained to them. Moreover, the question put to them was rather involved. All those circumstances could only have led to confusion.

14. The Administering Authority did not bear sole responsibility for trusteeship over a Territory but shared it with the organs and Member States of the United Nations as a whole. A dangerous precedent would be created if the United Nations were to accept a *fait accompli* placed before it by an Administering Authority, or if it were to accept every *de facto* situation such as the creation of an autonomous republic without examining the extent to which the appellation corresponded to the facts in the case. France, as a Member State sharing responsibility for all the Trust Territories, should agree that such a precedent ought not to be established.

15. The Romanian delegation recognized that the introduction of universal suffrage and certain reforms granted under the Statute would, if put into effect represent a step towards the achievement of the aims of trusteeship. It was for the General Assembly and the Trusteeship Council to appraise the manner in which France was promoting the achievement of those aims. The Indian draft resolution would make it possible to bring the situation back into conformity with the United Nations Charter and to obtain precise information with regard to the Territory's prospects of attaining independence.

16. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt) said that his delegation would support the Indian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.452/Rev.1) since it faithfully reflected the situation. Although the discussion was on "the future of Togoland under French administration" the time had not yet come when the Committee would be called upon to take a decision of substance with regard to the future of the Territory. For that reason he would endeavour to define the present position of the Trust Territory and would appraise the two principal political actions recently undertaken by the Administering Authority, in the light of the purposes and principles of the International Trusteeship System and the role of the United Nations in connexion with every stage of development in a Territory as well as its final status.

17. Since the United Nations had come to no decision on the holding of a popular consultation, or on the date on which it should be held or the arrangements

to be made, the referendum was legally speaking null and void as far as the United Nations was concerned: in other words it could not bind the United Nations or affect in any way the application of the International Trusteeship System in Togoland under French administration. The people of Togoland were still entitled to international protection under the Trusteeship System.

18. Once the referendum had been, legally speaking, eliminated, the recent evolution in the Territory consisted of the promulgation of the Statute by the Administering Authority. The legal and legitimate basis for the granting of that Statute rested in the powers of legislation and administration deriving from the Trusteeship Agreement.

19. His delegation had grave doubts concerning the relationship between the Statute and the principles and purposes of the Trusteeship System. Hence it would support any draft resolution which would lead to a thorough examination of the Statute without prejudging the substance of the question. That examination should be carried out in the light of the legal thesis that the Administering Authority, which provisionally exercised the functions of external and internal sovereignty in the name of the people of Togoland, on behalf of the United Nations, had transferred the exercise of some of those sovereign rights to the organs it had established in the Territory pending their gradual and total transfer to the Togoland people. To regard the Statute as anything more than that or to contemplate the termination of the trusteeship, now or in the future, on the sole basis of the Statute, would be tantamount to asking the United Nations to confirm Togoland's status as that of a decentralized colony or a classic colonial protectorate. What distinguished the Trusteeship System from the classic colonial system was the fact that political development in dependent territories was in the direction of a gradual transfer of the powers exercised by the Administering Authority to the people of the Territories, whereas the object of colonial policy was to maintain the widest possible domination over the dependent peoples for as long as possible.

20. He would be unable to support the six-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.453/Rev.1 and Add.1).

21. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) said that he felt his position to be somewhat delicate in view of the part he had played in the plebiscite in Togoland under British administration. Nevertheless, he would make a few remarks in the light of his experience in that Territory.

22. He had been one of those who had urged the sponsors of the two draft resolutions before the Committee to try to reach an agreed text. Those draft resolutions were based on the facts, which had become evident in the course of the debate, that the French delegation would not press for the immediate termination of the Trusteeship Agreement, that the representatives of the opposition parties were now ready to co-operate in certain circumstances with the Administration and that the Statute was, in the words of its article 38, susceptible of evolution. He had been inclined to support the six-Power draft resolution, since it provided for a reasonable delay and appeared to be the best means of solving the problem.

23. His delegation, like others, would have felt obliged to criticize the Statute severely had it not been for part X and, in particular, article 39. Like

most of the members of the Committee, he felt that the Statute must develop considerably, but he was convinced that such development would take place, not only because the General Assembly had called for it but also because that would be the natural course of events.

24. His delegation warmly welcomed the suggestion that a commission should visit the Territory, not only as a gesture of courtesy to France but because it would open a fresh stage in the evolution of the problem. It would be idle to pretend that there had not been at times some tension between the French Administration of Togoland and the United Nations. For example, at the tenth session, Mr. Santos had quoted to the Committee (530th meeting) articles from an official newspaper in Togoland which harshly criticized the United Nations.

25. For many years those who from Togoland under French administration had watched developments in Africa had followed with concern the debates in the Fourth Committee regarding the possible unification of the Ewes and of the two Togolands. Since more than half the Ewes lived in the Gold Coast, and since the Gold Coast from 1948 onwards had been moving rapidly towards independence, it was obvious that any programme of unification of the two Togolands or of the Ewes would result in the absorption of the new entity in the Gold Coast, a political unity which undoubtedly had a great future, but which, in eastern Togoland, was regarded as a British creation.

26. He had already paid a tribute to the political freedom which existed in Togoland under British administration and to many other achievements of that Territory. At the 584th meeting the Minister for Overseas France had said that no one could maintain that the social advancement of the people of Togoland under French administration lagged behind that of the people of Togoland under British administration. The French Administration had, indeed, many great achievements to its credit. It had been wisely said in the Fourth Committee that the political development of West Africa would one day surprise the world. The post-war world would see the end of the old colonial struggle for zones of influence and protection. Instead the Powers would vie with each other in recognizing the will of the peoples and granting them self-government. The rapid development of the peoples of West Africa and the growth of civic consciousness were obvious to any visitor to the area. Whether they chose independence or free association with other States, he was convinced that the people of Togoland under French administration would not be satisfied with a lesser degree of self-government than that enjoyed by their neighbours.

27. Certain delegations had the impression that there was a systematic resistance in the General Assembly against Togoland's being formally associated with the French Union. He believed that there was unnecessary apprehension on that point. The list of factors indicative of the attainment of independence, adopted by the General Assembly in resolution 742 (VIII), included the free association of a Territory on an equal basis with the metropolitan or other country as an integral part of that country or in any other form.

28. He would not have ventured to mention the possibility of Togoland's being associated with the French Union had it not been for the statements made by Mr. Olympio and Mr. Santos expressing willingness

to help to make the new Statute work and to evolve something better. If such a development was the desire of the people of Togoland, the United Nations would be concerned to see that it followed a line in conformity with the Charter.

29. In his statement at the 584th meeting the Minister for Overseas France had emphasized that there must be perfect equality among groups of peoples or nations and that any idea of racial segregation or even of racial superiority must be abolished. Nevertheless, an analysis of the Statute showed that there was not absolute equality between the French and the Togolandese. He would not repeat the various points that had already been mentioned by a number of representatives, especially since the French delegation was not pressing for immediate termination of the Trusteeship Agreement and since the Statute was likely to develop further.

30. The debate had been most instructive and its various features should be borne in mind in seeking a solution of the question. He could not forbear to mention, for example, the painful impression caused by the inability of the four petitioners representing parties which supported the Administration to reply to the questions put to them. While congratulating those four representatives on the degree of autonomy which their country had achieved, he would point out how much the Government of Togoland would gain by the collaboration of men like Mr. Olympio, Mr. Santos and Mr. Akakpo.

31. The debate had shown that there was no real conflict on the matter before the Committee. All the members hoped that the Statute would function and that it would develop. By sending a commission to observe the application of the Statute the United Nations would be making a gesture of good will to which he hoped the people of the Territory would respond with equal good will. When listening to the statements on foreign affairs made by Mr. Ajavon and Mr. Apedo-Amah on behalf of the Autonomous Republic of Togoland, he had wondered whether an advanced stage of evolution had not already been reached and whether the Autonomous Republic of Togoland was not already being granted the powers which had been reserved by the Administering Authority. On the other hand he did not feel that to use those powers to exert pressure on the General Assembly would be a wise move. The Administration of Togoland had no reason to fear a debate in the General Assembly. It was a mistake to think that trusteeship was a sign of inferiority or that because they were under trusteeship the Togolandese would be despised by their neighbours. The replies to questions asked by members of the Committee showed that the Statute was far from perfect in many respects, and nothing would do the cause of Togoland more harm than to claim that the Statute gave them full autonomy when in fact it did not do so. The French delegation was making a great effort, together with other delegations, to produce a resolution which would be fair and generally acceptable and he hoped that the representatives of Togoland would co-operate with the delegation and refrain from pressing demands which would make negotiation difficult.

32. He realized that the Administering Authority had the power, and even the obligation, to carry out a popular consultation, but any such consultation whose object was to put an end to a trusteeship agreement must be authorized by the General Assembly and supervised by the United Nations. The recent experience

in Togoland under British administration had shown that such a proceeding had many advantages. Many of the problems that had arisen in Togoland under French administration would have been avoided if the referendum had been supervised by United Nations observers. The resolution to be adopted might mention the referendum, but in such a way as not to prejudice the position of the United Nations with regard to the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement.

33. The main fact that had emerged from the debate was that there was general agreement on the dispatch of a commission to the Territory. The Committee should await its report and should not give way to impatience. He felt sure that France would not waste the intervening time and that a more favourable situation would soon be achieved. If at that time the Togolandians wished to be associated with the French Union on a footing of complete and genuine self-government, the Mexican delegation would whole-heartedly vote in favour of that course of action.

34. Mr. SOWARD (Canada) observed that, as several representatives had remarked, the aims of the Indian draft resolution and of the six-Power draft resolution were not far apart. Since it might be of value to try to harmonize the two draft resolutions and produce a joint text, he was presenting some amendments to the Indian draft resolution, proposed by his own delegation and the delegations of Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Liberia, Peru, Thailand and the United States (A/C.4/L.454).

35. The amendment in paragraph 1 had been thought desirable since part I of General Assembly resolution 944 (X) dealt exclusively with Togoland under British administration. The amendment in paragraph 2 was prompted by the feeling that it was sufficient to refer to the resolution in question without attempting to sum up its contents.

36. The second and third paragraphs of the preamble of the Indian draft resolution were acceptable as they stood.

37. The two new paragraphs proposed in paragraph 3 of the amendments virtually reproduced the third and fourth paragraphs of the six-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.453/Rev.1 and Add.1), with a few unimportant variations. Whatever views might be held concerning the nature of the referendum or the auspices under which it had been held, it remained a fact that the population of Togoland under French administration had expressed itself by a substantial majority in favour of the reforms, and the proposed amendment merely took note of that fact.

38. The sponsors of the amendments felt that the proposed new wording for the fourth paragraph of the preamble of the Indian draft resolution was more courteous; representatives of the Government of Togoland had in fact taken part in the debate and there seemed no reason why note should not be taken of their presence.

39. The amendment to the sixth paragraph of the preamble seemed desirable since it was with the application of the reforms that the Trusteeship Council and the Fourth Committee were primarily concerned and it was upon that point that the proposed commission would presumably concentrate its attention.

40. With regard to the amendment in paragraph 6, the seventh paragraph of the preamble of the Indian

draft resolution omitted to mention that the invitation had been initiated by the Government of the Autonomous Republic of Togoland. The sponsors of the amendments felt that mention should be made of that both as a matter of fact and as a matter of courtesy.

41. With regard to the proposed new operative paragraph 1, the sponsors of the amendments thought it reasonable that satisfaction should be recorded. All the petitioners, including the representatives of the opposition parties, had agreed that there had been substantial reforms and many members of the Committee who had spoken had admitted that the Statute was a step forward. Incidentally, he would like to inform the representative of Ceylon that the word "decisive" had been chosen advisedly, because the Statute would be a milestone in the progress of the people of Togoland. There was no question but that other reforms would follow in due course. Such a development was envisaged in article 38 of the Statute.

42. With regard to the proposed new operative paragraph 2, he had noted with appreciation the remarks made by the representative of Mexico concerning Togoland under French administration.

43. With regard to operative paragraph 1 of the Indian draft resolution, the sponsors of the amendments suggested that the commission should be appointed by the President of the General Assembly rather than by the General Assembly itself. The choice of the members of the commission would be an important step requiring careful consideration and it might be advisable to allow time for the purpose. Moreover, the Fourth Committee and the General Assembly would naturally expect that a well-balanced commission would be chosen to represent the various parts of the world and the sponsors of the amendments considered that that fact should be mentioned.

44. The sponsors of the amendments considered that operative paragraph 1 of the Indian draft resolution would be improved by the deletion of the word "entire" and the insertion of the words "resulting from the practical application of the new Statute and the conditions under which it is being applied". That phrase would entrust the commission with a large enough task if it was to report to the twentieth session of the Trusteeship Council and if that body in turn was to report to the twelfth session of the General Assembly.

45. He asked the members of the Committee carefully to consider the reasons for the suggested amendments, which he hoped would receive a wide measure of support.

46. Mr. MATHUR (Nepal) said that the first question which naturally arose in considering recent developments in Togoland under French administration was that of the extent to which conditions in the Territory had improved since 1955. That question could be answered by comparing the report on the Territory (T/1211) submitted by the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Togoland under British Administration and Togoland under French Administration, 1955, with the present situation there. As far as political development was concerned, the 1955 Visiting Mission had stated that universal suffrage did not exist, that local government was at an elementary stage and that political freedom was unknown. It was also evident from the Mission's report that legislative authority was exercised by the French Parliament, that the local legislature had no real power

and that the indigenous inhabitants had no real comprehension of the rules of democracy because authority in Africa was traditionally uncontested. In view of that situation, it might properly be asked how far it was possible to create a democratic outlook in any Territory within a period of six to eight months. The report also stated that no institutions of higher education existed in the Territory and that opportunities for studying abroad were very few. It was difficult to believe that any great change in educational conditions had taken place since that time.

47. With reference to the new Statute, his delegation felt that it neither granted the Territory autonomy nor established a republic—a term which in his delegation's view could only be applied to a State in which supreme power was vested in the citizens, all of whom were entitled to vote and to be represented in the legislature. In Togoland under French administration, however, supreme authority rested with a High Commissioner responsible to the French Government and not to the people of the Territory. Hence, although his delegation had no hesitation in commending the Administering Authority for having made a good beginning, it did not feel that the powers granted under the Statute amounted to self-government or that they were sufficient to justify the termination of trusteeship.

48. The fact that there had been no Africans on the staff which had supervised the referendum and no United Nations observers present at the time was enough to make the validity of the referendum questionable.

49. His delegation felt that further study of the situation was necessary. It accordingly supported the proposal in both draft resolutions that a commission should be sent to Togoland; of the two draft resolutions it preferred that submitted by India.

50. With regard to the amendments to the Indian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.454), his delegation saw no need to delete the word "entire" in operative paragraph 1. It also opposed the sixth amendment, since it felt that to refer to the "Autonomous Republic of Togoland" would be to prejudge the question the commission would be sent to decide. His delegation reserved the right to speak again on the proposed amendments.

51. Mr. NOGUEIRA (Portugal) wished to stress a number of facts which had not been sufficiently emphasized in the discussion and which should be taken into account if a practical solution was to be achieved.

52. Many speakers had said that a trusteeship agreement could not be terminated unilaterally; that was true but irrelevant, since the question of unilateral termination did not rise. France had come before the other party to the Trusteeship Agreement, which was the United Nations, and asked for its agreement to the termination of trusteeship.

53. Moreover, although the circumstances in which the referendum had been held might be questioned, the fact was that it had been held and that no one had seriously questioned its results. Even the opposition spokesmen had not said or even hinted that the few irregularities they had noted could have altered the results obtained. The Autonomous Republic of Togoland was also a fact and, although many members had criticized the Statute establishing it, all had agreed that it represented a step forward.

54. His delegation felt that the basic criterion for the Committee's decision on the question should be the

best interests of the people of Togoland, and that on the basis of that criterion there could be only one decision: the Togoland people had clearly indicated where they themselves felt their best interests to lie and the United Nations would be shirking its responsibility if it ignored their wishes.

55. It might be argued that the information before the Committee was not enough to form the basis for an immediate decision. The French representative had stated, however, that his Government would accept any revisions of the Statute proposed by the Government of Togoland; it was clear from that statement that France intended to respect the will of the Togoland people.

56. In the light of those considerations, his delegation felt that the amendments submitted to the Indian draft resolution met the needs of the situation. It would examine any other amendments or draft resolutions submitted in the same light.

57. Mr. MERSINI (Albania) said that his delegation considered the question under discussion of great importance not only for the people of Togoland but for other peoples under similar administrations. It did not think that there was at present any justification for a decision to terminate the Trusteeship Agreement, since the objectives of the Trusteeship System, as laid down in the Charter, had not yet been attained. A majority of the Committee shared that view and felt, as did the Albanian delegation, that the new Statute established in the Territory should be examined more thoroughly. His delegation accordingly supported the proposal that a commission should be sent to Togoland. The Committee should avoid any over-hasty decision, which might have grave consequences for the people of Togoland. His delegation did not deny the positive value of the reforms introduced in the new Statute, but it felt that time was needed to see how the Statute operated in practice. That did not mean that his delegation was in favour of postponing the independence of the Territory for a long period; on the contrary, it felt that a date should be set for the granting of independence to every Trust Territory, according to the conditions prevailing in each.

58. His delegation would vote in favour of the Indian draft resolution, which it felt to be in keeping with its views.

59. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that her delegation maintained that all Trust Territories should develop in accordance with the goals laid down in Article 76 b of the Charter; it also felt, however, that the United Nations should not adopt so inflexible a position as to interfere with the attainment of those goals. For that reason, and in the belief that it was necessary to reach a common ground between the two draft resolutions, it had been willing to co-sponsor the amendments in document A/C.4/L.454. It felt that the Statute represented a step forward although it would be unfair to judge how great a step until the proposed commission had visited Togoland and reported to the General Assembly.

60. It did not, however, fully agree with all the amendments. The second paragraph proposed in the third amendment represented an improvement over the version in the original five-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.453), but since her delegation did not wish to deal with the substance of the question, it would have to abstain in the vote on that paragraph. With

regard to the second paragraph proposed in the sixth amendment, her delegation still felt it was premature for the General Assembly to decide in advance on the merits of a situation which it had been invited to study, and therefore could not accept the words "Autonomous Republic", on which it would ask for a separate vote. Her delegation also reserved its position on the eighth amendment, since it felt that the Fourth Committee had a right to know what the composition of the proposed commission would be before the matter went to the General Assembly.

61. Apart from those exceptions, her delegation would vote in favour of the Indian draft resolution as amended by the seven Powers.

62. Mr. TAZHIBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Belgian representative had misinterpreted the statement he had made at the 592nd meeting. He had not said that an Administering Au-

thority was not empowered to carry out reforms in a Trust Territory without the consent of the United Nations, but rather that an Administering Authority was not empowered arbitrarily and without the consent of the United Nations to alter the status of a Territory as long as the goal of self-government had not been attained. Far from opposing such reforms, his delegation had consistently advocated and supported the taking of such action by Administering Authorities.

63. Mr. MEDANI (Sudan) wished to point out that neither of the two men whom Mr. Houphouet-Boigny had referred to as Sudanese in the statement he had made at the 590th meeting was a citizen of his country.

64. Mr. DEFFERRE (France) said that Mr. Houphouet-Boigny had been referring to the French Sudan.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.