

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.506

2 March 1954

ENGLISH

Thirteenth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 2 March 1954, at 2 p.m.

President:

Mr. MUNRO

(New Zealand)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.506 and will be subject to representative's corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

THE TOGOLAND UNIFICATION PROBLEM [agenda item 11]

(a) GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS 750 (VIII) (T/1096; T/PET.6/L.7 to 41; T/COM.6/L.27; T/PET.6 and 7/L.7 to 11, 13 to 19, 30)

(b) HEARING OF PETITIONERS FROM TOGOLAND UNDER BRITISH ADMINISTRATION (T/PET.6/329 and Add.1, 330, 331 and Add.1; T/PET.6/L.42, 43, 44 and Add.1; T/COM.6/L.34; T/PET.6 and 7/L.28, 29) (continued)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. S. Togbe Fleku, representative of the Convention Peoples' Party, Togoland Region, and the Ewes of Southern Togoland under United Kingdom Administration, Mr. Jacob Kwadwo Mensah, petitioner for the Buem-Krachi District of the Southern section of British Togoland, and Mr. J.H. Allassani, petitioner for the Northern section of British Togoland, took places at the Trusteeship Council table.

The PRESIDENT: Before we resume this discussion, the members of the Council will recall that the representative of India asked that the statements made by the petitioners be distributed. That will be done.

The petitioners have completed their statements. They are now available to answer such questions as members of the Council may address to them. I take it that they will arrange among themselves as to which one will answer a particular question.

Is there any member of the Council who desires to address questions to any one of the petitioners?

Mr. ASHA (Syria): I have two questions to put to the petitioners. Yesterday, all of them stated that they represented the majority of the inhabitants of the territories from which they came. In the past, we have heard the views of their opponents. We have heard them on many occasions in the Fourth Committee. How is it that they have not thought, in the past years, to come and tell us their views and have only chosen to do so this year?

My second question is as follows: In view of the sentiments expressed by these representatives with respect to the integration of their Territory with the Gold Coast, I should like to ask them to tell us how they view this integration vis-a-vis the Trusteeship Agreement.

The PRESIDENT: You have heard the two questions. As I understand it, one is why, in view of statements made before the Fourth Committee which are opposite to yours, you have not made your views available before; and the second question is how you reconcile your views with the Trusteeship Agreement. I think that I am setting out the position correctly. Would any one of you care to answer?

Mr. ALLASSANI: As far as the Northern Territories are concerned, we had sent petitions to this Council through the Visiting Missions, expressing our views, and we had thought that those views which we had expressed would be taken into consideration and a decision made on our behalf. We did not consider our case as being connected directly with the Ewe people's affair. Therefore, when the Ewes came here to give their statements, we did not know that they had included us as being supporters of their cause until very recently when we learned what the Fourth Committee was thinking about the whole situation. As a matter of fact, it was the resolution which the Fourth Committee had submitted for adoption by the General Assembly and which was contrary to our wishes that prompted the peoples of my State to ask me to come here and express their views. Until then we did not see any harm to us or any point in coming here to talk about the matter.

Mr. TCGBE FLEKU: I should also like to give my answer to the first question before we continue to the second one. Yesterday, I made it clear in my statement that the British prevented me -- in that wise, I mean the Convention Peoples' Party -- from appearing before the Fourth Committee at its last session. I will explain that further.

When the Convention Peoples' Party, Togoland branch, heard that the Fourth Committee was going to deal with the Togoland case, we thought it fit to send a representative to express our point of view but we were advised by the Administering Authority -- that is, the British -- that it was not the usual practice of the Fourth Committee to hear new petitioners on an issue in the Fourth Committee. In that respect we found that it was going to be a waste of money to come here, and we therefore did not come to the last session. In fact, we had previously considered it to be a waste of money to send representatives regularly to the United Nations, each representative spending about £1,000; if there were four members on the delegation that would mean an expenditure of £4,000, which would conveniently build a clinic in the Territory. We did not want to waste the people's money by coming here when we had made clear already our wishes on the issue. That was why we did not come previously.

Mr. MENSAH: In the Buem-Krachi area we have sent resolutions to both the Visiting Missions and to the United Nations, telling them quite frankly that we want to be integrated with the Gold Coast. As we felt that the United Nations would always further the interests of the majority we did not think it necessary to spend large sums of money to come here. In fact, the last resolutions of the Fourth Committee put some fear into us and made it necessary for us to spend quite a large sum of money to bring a representative here to the Trusteeship Council to speak.

The PRESIDENT: I call upon Mr. Fleku to answer the second question.

Mr. FLEKU: On the second question I should like to call the attention of the members of the Council to the fact that integration is nothing new in the history of British Togoland. This has been so since the mandatory stage. In fact for the past forty years British Togoland has been administered as if it were an integral part of the Gold Coast. This was provided for both in the Mandate Agreement and in the Trusteeship Agreement. The Trusteeship Council, furthermore, has supported this opinion in the resolution which I cited yesterday, supplement No. 12 (A/2151 of 1952) which reads inter alia:

"(c) Recalling that, under Article 76 (b) of the Charter, one of the basic objectives of the Trusteeship System shall be 'to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate' -- I repeat 'appropriate' -- 'to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples...'"

Integration, as I have already explained, is nothing new. It is what we find appropriate to our particular circumstances, and it is provided for within the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. ALLASSANI: I regard the second question as being a repetition of the view held by the Fourth Committee when it stated that an integration of British Togoland with the Gold Coast was not likely to be in consonance with the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreement. I pointed out in my speech that, although this might be the case, I thought these issues ought to be based on realistic human considerations because our interests, our well-being and our destiny are concerned in these matters. I suggested that for these reasons the Agreements should not stand in our way. I therefore feel that if our wishes, our desires are not in conformity with the provisions of the Agreements, the Agreements ought to be either waived or readjusted to meet the circumstances.

Mr. ASHA (Syria): My delegation was not fully convinced regarding the answer to the first question as to the waste of money in past sessions in coming here. I should, however, with the President's permission, like to proceed to further questions.

In the statements which were given by the witnesses yesterday we heard them say that they would wish to have immediate integration with the Gold Coast. Would that not, in their view, affect the eventual unification of Togoland under French administration and Togoland under British administration, which is the expressed purpose of the majority of the inhabitants of the two Territories?

The PRESIDENT: As I understand the representative of Syria, he is asking you whether integration in the Gold Coast would not affect unification of both Togolands, which he says is the expressed purpose of the majority of the inhabitants of both those Territories.

Mr. FLEKU: I do not know which of the unifications is referred to by the representative of Syria. I made the claim when I spoke yesterday, that unification has assumed two connotations. By it we mean the removal of frontiers separating homogenous peoples and their administration by a single government. By this same word our opponents appear to mean a separation of the people, the homogenous tribes of British Togoland. Therefore, if I stick to our "unification", we mean the grouping of homogenous people under one administration and the removal of frontiers separating them. Therefore, if we get integrated with the Gold Coast, we have for that matter removed artificial frontiers between the tribes of the Northern section of British Togoland, the Ewes of the Gold Coast and the Ewes of British Togoland. In that way we have achieved unification to some extent.

Mr. ALLASSANI: I do not know from what authentic source the questioner has gained his conviction that the majority of the people in both Territories desires unification. If he is referring to the south, and to the Ewe people there, then I am not competent to challenge his statement, but as far as the northern section is concerned there is no question at all of the majority of the peoples in both Territories desiring unification.

Mr. MENSAH: The two Togolands have been administered separately and have developed on different lines. If the opinions of the people in these two areas are to be sought I think that they should be sought separately and that there should be no generalization at all. We are making it clear here that we in British Togoland want to be integrated with a self-governing Gold Coast. That is what we want. We do not want unification of the two Togolands.

Mr. ASHA (Syria): I should like to have comments on the following. The advocates of unification, as far as we are able to see, do not preclude the possibility of ultimate integration with the Gold Coast. They believe, however, that such an integration must follow and not precede unification. Otherwise, the issue of the possibility of unification of Togoland would be prejudiced. Could the petitioners give me some comments on this observation?

Mr. ALLASSANI: If there is any fear that the integration of British Togoland with the Gold Coast may, perhaps, have an effect upon our friends in the other Territory belonging to the French, I think that the simplest thing is to unite today and to integrate tomorrow. We do not want to remain under a unified Togoland for more than one day. But if there is anxiety, and if the United Nations feels that it wants both Togolands to integrate with the Gold Coast if they so desire, then we have no objection to its uniting the two Togolands today and integrating them tomorrow. However, as I say, we in the British section will not wait a day longer. We want to have our integration with the Gold Coast as soon as the Gold Coast is independent -- or, rather, together with Gold Coast independence.

Mr. FLEKU: My party does not consider the alliance suggested by the representative of Syria as realistic or as a short course to the solution of the problem. The fact is this: we cannot achieve unification by separation. To unify the two Togolands first would mean separating the peoples of Dagomba, Gonja, Kusasi and the other tribes in the north, and then the Ewes in the south. I do not see how we can set about unification by separating a group of people. That is why we disagree with unification before integration. We believe in integration before any form of unification.

Mr. MENSAH: I challenge the sincerity of the unificationists when they say that they want ultimately to unify or integrate with the Gold Coast. If they really want that why not allow British Togoland, which has developed with the Gold Coast, to integrate with the Gold Coast forthwith? That is why I say that I challenge their sincerity when they make that statement.

Mr. ASHA (Syria): The northern region of Togoland is only a part of the Territory. From what we have read in the various reports of Visiting Missions, and from what we have heard from various petitioners who have appeared before the Fourth Committee, it has been made very clear to us that the desire is for unification. That is how I obtained the conception of unification, although, as I would point out further, no conclusions have been arrived at yet, even by the Visiting Mission. But this point of view -- that is, the new point of view which we heard yesterday and which we have seen expressed in previous petitions -- has come to challenge the earlier view. May I ask, therefore, why those concerned did not press for the view favouring integration as early as those who favoured unification pressed their view?

Mr. ALLASSANI: I explained yesterday that as soon as the First World War was over, and our territories came under British mandate and, later, under British trusteeship, we were automatically reunited with our brothers in the Gold Coast, and we regarded that as a permanent reunion which could be interpreted as meaning, in other words, a complete integration with the Gold Coast. Thus we already considered ourselves as integrated with the Gold Coast, so that there was no need for us to make a new appeal for such integration. That was why we did not bother.

Mr. MENSAH: At the beginning we did not take these unificationists seriously because they were such a tiny minority and we felt that they were just seeking their own interests. We were very sure that the United Nations would not listen to so few people and come to the conclusion that the majority in British Togoland wanted unification with French Togoland. Accordingly, we did not see the need for sending delegations here, but made our views quite plain and also made them well known to the United Nations on paper by sending resolutions.

AW/ich

Mr. FLEKU: I think I made a humble appeal to the members yesterday to keep an historic fact constantly in their minds and I wish to repeat the historic fact. Togoland was a territory arbitrarily carved out of West Africa when imperialism entered our area. The boundary lines which therefore appear on the map separating us, do not mean anything earlier than the advent of imperialism. Therefore, I refuse to agree with any suggestion that we should consider Togoland as a separate Territory first, before we consider anything else. Secondly, we have hitherto supported unification on the firm conviction that we will not be separated from the peoples of the Gold Coast. That is the way in which we understood and, in fact meant, unification. We did not mean by unification separation from the onset. That was why we did not find it necessary to come to oppose unification if it meant the removal of frontiers separating homogeneous peoples.

It is now that we have found that the unificationists are aiming at creating a separate Togoland state which will be separate from the Gold Coast. We therefore have to oppose it vehemently.

Mr. ASHA (Syria): I would like to ask the last witness the following question: What did he mean when he said "when imperialism entered our area"? What kind of imperialism? Which imperialist countries came in?

Mr. FLEKU: The Germans and the British are the imperialists to whom I referred in the first place. Now I include the French. In 1884 the Germans entered our Territory and arbitrarily carved a section of it and named it to suit their own whims and fancies. In fact Togoland was named after a tiny village called "Togo". As history goes, it is said that the chief of that village "Togo" was the first chief to meet the Germans. When he was asked: "Whose land is this?" he said: "It is my land". Then, of course, you have "Togoland". It could have been "Americanland"; it could have been "Flekusland". Therefore, when I talk of imperialism or the days of the imperialists, I mean the Germans and British to start with, and the French to continue with.

Mr. ASHA (Syria): The report of the Visiting Mission did not indicate very clearly to us the final opinion of the people of the Territory. May I ask the witnesses if they would agree to a recommendation for a special Visiting Mission of the United Nations to go to the Territory and ascertain the real wishes of the people and, if necessary, to hold a plebiscite.

Mr. FLEKU: As far as my Party is concerned, we are not opposed to any democratic means which the United Nations will think fit to adopt in order to find out what public opinion in British Togoland is on this issue, provided that means will not hold us back from attaining self-government together with the Gold Coast.

Mr. ALLASSANI: We had always thought that previous Visiting Missions that were sent into our Territories were expected to make sure of the wishes of the people and to inform the Trusteeship Council about it. But if, as I understand it, those Missions have not given a full account of the real wishes of the people, there is no objection whatsoever to this Council finding other means of making sure of the real wishes of the people.

Mr. MENSAH: I would just like to add that we would like these opinions to be sought separately; that is, to have the opinion in British Togoland and then to have the opinion in French Togoland. It should not be jointly but separately.

Mr. ASHA (Syria): I cannot understand exactly what the witness meant by his last statement. What does he mean by the word "separately"? Naturally, if a special Visiting Mission should go to the Territory, it will go first to one Territory and then to the other. Or does he mean that we should have two separate Visiting Missions?

Mr. MENSAH: I did not imply that we should have two separate Visiting Missions. I meant that the plebiscite should be conducted separately. There should be one plebiscite in British Togoland and another in French Togoland.

AW/ich

Mr. ASHA (Syria): My last question is the following: Would the witness object to the re-establishment and functioning of the Togoland Council?

Mr. FLEKU: My Party and the Ewes of southern Togoland would not object to the re-establishment of a Joint Council for Togoland if it will only consider frontier problems and measures designed to assimilate the policies of the governments concerned. But we would not be prepared to participate in a Joint Council which is capable of jeopardizing our political future; that is to say, if it will have any political powers, we would object to it.

Mr. ALLASSANI: I made it clear yesterday that when that Council was first established, the people of the northern Territories said that they would not participate in its deliberations, and they kept their word and have not done it until now. Therefore, we see no reason why we should support its re-establishment.

Mr. MENSAH: The majority of opinion in Buem-Krachi is just along the same lines as my colleague petitioner has outlined. I must state that in the Krachi area we have made it quite plain that we do not want to have anything to do with a Joint Togoland Council.

Mr. ASHA (Syria): It remains for me only to thank the representatives of the Parties which we have heard today.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): With the exception of the Ewes, are any of the people of your respective tribes found in French Togoland?

Mr. ALLASSANI: With regard to the north, the answer is "no", except as regards the Konkombas who are a wandering race. They are migratory. They come in from the French side to our area for a while; they move out again and they continue, year by year, to go in and out. Except for the Konkombas, the answer is "no".

Mr. MENSAH: With regard to the Buem-Krachi area, the answer is "no", we are all in British Togoland.

The PRESIDENT: Do you care to comment on that Mr. Fleku?

Mr. FLEKU: No, I am an Ewe.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): As far as the Ewes are concerned, if you joined with French Togoland in unification, would there be more Ewes together than there would be if you integrate with the Gold Coast? You have to lose one way or the other.

Mr. FLEKU: I think my sketch map is a good answer to this question. There are about 300,000 Ewes in the Gold Coast and about 137,000 Ewes in British Togoland. If these two groups are joined together, we would have about 437,000 Ewes, which is about three-quarters of the total population of Ewes.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): From your point of view then, the issue here is really not unification, but separation.

Mr. S. TOGBE FLEKU: Definitely; that is correct.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): The petitioners have said that in their minds the whole question is dependent, according to the resolutions of the United Nations, upon the issue of self-government in the Gold Coast, and they have said to us today that the Gold Coast was near self-government. Exactly what do they mean by that?

Mr. J. H. ALLASSANI: We say the Gold Coast is nearing self-government because self-government means handing over responsibility to the people themselves to manage their own affairs. To a very large extent, at the present time we are managing our affairs. We are again negotiating with the British Government for further transfers of responsibility to us. Our present Constitution allows ex officio ministers in our government and in our legislation, but we anticipate that in our next Constitution, which might not be long in coming into being -- I should say perhaps even before the middle of this year -- the ex officio ministers will be eliminated and our legislature will be completely African and our government completely African. That is a great measure of self-government.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): In the event that Togoland under French administration would become equally self-governing, what would be the attitude of the petitioners to the question of integration and unification respectively?

Mr. Jacob Kwadwo MENSAH: As far as we in the British Togoland and the Gold Coast are concerned, we have not heard of any movement towards self-government in French Togoland, and it does not come into our minds. We have no attitude towards it.

Mr. S. Togbe FLEKU: If French Togoland ever becomes self-governing, as we are going to be, it would be a very simple matter for the two self-governing countries to decide for themselves how to come together.

Mr. J. H. ALLASSANI: If the French side also obtains self-government, that will make no difference at all to us regarding our desire to integrate with the Gold Coast.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium)(interpretation from French): I should like to ask the petitioners whether they have read the reports of the United Nations Visiting Missions?

Mr. J. H. ALLASSANI: We have read them.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): The special report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa (T/1034), sets out in paragraphs 104 to 109 and the following, the views of the peoples and the chiefs in the North. Do those views as expressed by the Visiting Mission coincide with the feelings of the people?

Mr. J. H. ALLASSANI: As regards paragraph 104 dealing with the Mamprusi-Kusasi, yes, because I myself made the point yesterday exactly as they assert it. As regards paragraph 106 dealing with the Dagomba, yes. As regards paragraph 108 dealing with the Nanumba, yes.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): I asked the question in order to inquire of the petitioners whether, in a general way, their views as expressed by the Visiting Mission represent an accurate expression of what their views really are and of what the Visiting Mission heard and saw in the Territory?

Mr. J. H. ALLASSANI: Yes, that is quite correct; those are our views.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): The Visiting Mission certainly did not state that it found that the majority in the North of both Territories wanted unification.

Mr. J. H. ALLASSANI: That is correct.

The PRESIDENT: As there are no further questions by members of the Trusteeship Council, I should like to thank the petitioners on behalf of the Council for coming before us, for giving their views so fully and for taking such care in their answers. No doubt they will hear from the Council at a later stage.

Mr. S. Togbe Fleku, Mr. J. H. Allassani and Mr. Jacob Kwadwo Mensah withdrew.

The PRESIDENT: The Council has heard the petitioners. Does any representative wish to make any comment or proposal?

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): I was just thinking of what the representative of Syria was trying to bring out in his questions. He was asking about unification, and it seems to me that that is not "out the door". Ultimately, the French will have a plebiscite and French Togoland will have a chance to become free either within the French Union or outside it. If they choose to join their brothers in British Togoland they can do so. Therefore, unification is not outside possibility.

The PRESIDENT: Does the representative of Syria care to make any comment?

Mr. ASHA (Syria): No, I have made my observations and asked questions, but I have not yet reached my conclusions.

Sir ALAN BURNS (United Kingdom): In my opening remarks at the beginning of this debate I suggested that we were not in a position at this stage to make any definite statement or definite recommendations to the Council. I stated very clearly what the position of my Government was with regard to the various resolutions, and the suggestion I made then -- that we should now defer any further consideration of this matter until the next session of the Trusteeship Council -- I am now prepared to present as a formal proposition, if no other proposal comes forward.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): So far as any definitive proposals are concerned, obviously the matter will go to the next session of the Council, or even to the Fourth Committee, but I think that we have an obligation to think aloud, at any rate, concerning this problem, at its present stage of advancement, since the question of political advance -- by which I mean independence -- in the Gold Coast is imminent, as the representative of Syria has repeatedly sought to bring out in his questions.

This point of view has been presented to the Council by witnesses -- and I say particularly "by witnesses" -- only at this stage, although, as I shall try to indicate later, it has been before us in other forms.

For those reasons I think, while I agree with the representative of the United Kingdom that we could not at the present moment make any definitive proposals; that we ought to examine the question and express our views in the light of present circumstances because that is a process which would assist in the formulation of views at a later stage. For example, to have these views before us and to keep our minds open would be part of the preparation for the next session of the Council. Therefore, I do not think that we should "shut down" at this stage.

The PRESIDENT: I have listened with care to the remarks of the representative of India, and the Council has heard the proposal made by the representative of the United Kingdom. Does the Council wish to debate this subject further? It is clear that the representative of India so desires.

Mr. ASHA (Syria): We heard some very interesting views yesterday and equally interesting replies today. I think that we should be given time to think over these statements and replies and to make our comments thereon. I have no particular objection to the suggestion of the representative of the United Kingdom but I think, as the representative of India has stated, that we must deal with the problem, although not in a lengthy way at the present time. Before voting on the proposal of the representative of the United Kingdom, I think that we ought to express our views on what we have heard.

Sir ALAN BURNS (United Kingdom): I hope it is quite clear that I have no desire to push my proposal through, but when the President asked whether there were any further comments and nobody made any; I thought that the Council had accepted the suggestion in my opening remarks that we would be in a better position, after the elections imminent in the Gold Coast and Togoland, to know where we stand and that we should defer the matter to the next session. However, if representatives wish to discuss it, I have no objection.

Mr. FORSYTH (Australia): I would, of course, be delighted to hear the views of other representatives and I might possibly have something to say after I have heard those views, but, speaking for myself, I feel that it is altogether premature at this stage to attempt to discuss this problem on which we are bound to have much fuller information at the next session. I think that we ought to get the record and note what has been said and study it, and then wait for the further information which is coming to us, I believe, before the next session. For my part, I would have no contribution of any value to make at present if we were to discuss this problem, in view of the important questions which are still pending and on which we shall not be informed until the next session.

The PRESIDENT: Two representatives have expressed a desire to discuss this report before the proposal of the representative of the United Kingdom is put to the vote, and I understood that the representative of Syria, at any rate, is not ready to do so today. When we have concluded this discussion the Council will have to adjourn, and my idea would be to proceed with this discussion tomorrow when we should be in a position -- those who wish to do so -- to state our views. Having done so, I shall then put to the Council the one proposal that has been made.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The Belgian delegation has no responsibility for the resolutions of the last session of the General Assembly in this matter; we voted in favour of none of them. We have always felt that change can be effected only if there is some assurance that such change would improve a situation. A frontier can be moved provided the demarcation of the new frontier would not create new discontent.

The Belgian delegation has no misgivings or fears regarding a discussion under this heading, but it might be preferable, before setting forth any views on the situation, to let events take their course -- particularly the elections which are scheduled and which should give us some clear idea about the will of the majority of the population.

MW/mlw

T/PV.506

29-30

I am afraid that if we continue this debate, some of us may say things which, later, we shall regret having said when we have available some elements of judgment as to the opinion of the people. However, if some representatives wish to speak, I have no objection and will not, myself, propose closure of the debate.

Mr. ASHA (Syria): I have only two observations to make.

In connexion with the statement of the representative of Australia to the effect that the Council does not have available sufficient information to enable it to discuss the problem, may I ask: what information do we need, and how and when can we get it?

With respect to the remarks of the representative of Belgium, I am sure he was not referring to those who wish to speak. For its part, my delegation does not at all regret what it has said when making a statement.

So far, we have not expressed our views on this matter. We have merely been seeking the facts and have not, as I have said, expressed any definitive views.

The PRESIDENT: I have heard nothing which would make me change my mind about the course of action which we should pursue now.

I propose that the present item should be placed on the agenda for tomorrow's meeting. Members of the Council who desire to comment on the matters which we have discussed this afternoon will be able to do so at tomorrow's meeting.

There is one formal proposal before the Council -- that is, the proposal of the United Kingdom representative. In the normal course of events, I shall put that proposal to the vote, after discussion.

I would hope that it would be possible, tomorrow, to begin the discussion of the annual report on Tanganyika. I cannot be absolutely sure that we shall be able to do so, because there is some question whether the special representative will be here in time.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): It had been my hope that we should be ready by tomorrow to start the consideration of the annual report on Tanganyika. Unfortunately, however, the steamer on which the special representative is arriving is not due in New York, I understand, until late tonight. I shall do my best to have him ready for a discussion tomorrow, but, if he is not, I hope that the Council will excuse the delay.

The PRESIDENT: I am sure the Trusteeship Council appreciates that position.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I realize that there is no other item on the agenda for today's meeting. Since, however, we are already behind in our work, would it not be possible to consider some other items -- for instance, one of the reports of the Committee on Petitions?

Have none of the items on the Council's agenda reached the stage where they could be discussed now?

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): As the Council knows, my delegation wishes to expedite the work. It would not, however, be possible for us to discuss Tanganyika tomorrow, because some relevant documents -- for instance, the Secretariat's working paper -- have not as yet been distributed.

The PRESIDENT: I believe that those documents will be distributed today. In any case, I think that the representative of India would agree with me that there would be no objection to hearing the special representative tomorrow -- if, after a long ocean journey, he is in a fit condition to deliver his statement. My general experience in these matters has been that, after hearing the special representative, the Council wishes to adjourn, in order to consider what that representative has said.

In reply to the representative of Belgium, I would say that there is no item with which the Council could now deal.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Of course, since there are no other items on the agenda for today's meeting, members of the Council are probably not prepared to consider any other items. The agenda for the session, however, contains such items as General Assembly resolutions 752, 753, 754, 756, 757, and so forth. Would the Council not be prepared to embark upon the consideration of any of those resolutions?

I make that suggestion so that the Council would not lose time. We are already behind our schedule, and yet it is proposed that this meeting should be adjourned at 3.15 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: With great respect, I would say this to the representative of Belgium: I am quite sure that members of the Council are not prepared now to discuss the items he has mentioned.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): For the benefit of the representative of Belgium, I should like to state that what is at issue now is not the question of losing time. Members of the Council must have time to prepare for the consideration of items with which the Council will be dealing. If this meeting were to continue for another three hours, that would simply mean that members would have three hours less time to prepare for the consideration of subsequent items on the agenda.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): The suggestion which I am about to make is perhaps a little selfish, since I am not a member of the Committees concerned, but I am wondering whether some of those Committees could not meet this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT: It is, of course, very necessary for some of our Committees to continue their deliberations -- during the afternoon, if possible. Perhaps the Committee on Petitions -- with whose activities the leader of the United Kingdom delegation is not entirely unfamiliar -- could meet this afternoon, although I do understand that there are certain physical difficulties in that respect.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I wonder whether the Secretariat could not give some consideration to the observations made by the representative of Belgium. The situation in which we find ourselves today is not new; we find ourselves in similar situations from time to time. It is not that any representatives wishes to delay the Council's work. Some delegations may have something very important to say -- or, at least, may think so -- and may not be quite prepared to speak at a particular meeting, and that meeting may therefore have to be adjourned.

Would it not be possible, for example, to include one or two items in the agenda permanently, so that representatives would be prepared to discuss them and the Council could take them up if there was some spare time? If that were done, the argument of lack of previous notice could not be used. The items concerning the General Assembly resolutions might be put on the agenda

for tomorrow's meeting, on the understanding that the Council would consider them only if it had finished the discussion of other items. In that way, we could at least make a start towards finishing our work. If we do not do that, we may not complete the consideration of all the items on our agenda, and some may have to be discussed at the next session.

The PRESIDENT: I can assure the representative of India that, although we may be a little late, we shall complete the consideration of all the items on our agenda. The difficulty is that various delegations are differently constituted, both from the physical standpoint and from the standpoint of mental approach. Some delegations sometimes feel that they want to have more time to consider certain matters. I make no reproach in that respect; I am merely stating a fact of which other members are as aware as I am.

All members of the Council who have not yet done so are urgently requested to indicate to the Secretariat -- if possible, not later than tomorrow afternoon; this is a matter upon which members could perhaps use some of their spare time -- those of their individual observations on the Cameroons under United Kingdom Administration which they wish to have retained in the report to the General Assembly. I would urge representatives to exercise some economy of choice in this respect.

The Trusteeship Council will meet tomorrow afternoon at two o'clock.

The meeting rose at 3.20 p.m.

94