

UNITED NATIONS TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.786

29 April 1957

ENGLISH

Nineteenth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 29 April 1957, at 2 p.m.

President:

Mr. ASHA

(Syria)

1. Examination of the annual report on the administration of the Trust Territory of Togoland under French administration for 1955 [3e] (continued)
2. Examination of the annual report on the administration of the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under French administration for 1955 [3c] and hearings of petitioners from the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under French administration [14]: hearing of the representatives of the "Union des Associations traditionnelles" (continued)
3. Arrangements for a periodic visiting mission to Trust Territories in East Africa in 1957 [5]
4. Organization of the twentieth session

Note:

The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.786 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

EXAMINATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE TRUST TERRITORY OF TOGOLAND UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION FOR 1955 (T/1300, 1304 and Add.1; T/PET.7/520; T/L.740, L.754, L.755) [Agenda item 3e] (continued)

General debate (continued)

Mr. BARGUES (France) (interpretation from French): In a preliminary statement which it made on 16 April, the French delegation, in speaking of the situation in Togoland, stressed the fact that this situation was now in a state of tension since the Territory was undergoing a period of transition which was characterized by the transfer of the fundamental political and administrative powers from the Administering Authority to Togolese bodies -- mainly a legislative assembly and a council of ministers.

In examining the advancement in the Territory during the year 1955, as it appears in the report submitted by the Administering Authority, there is much of interest, but it is of greater interest to the historian than to the diplomat or to the politician.

I must say that practice has enlarged the scope and meaning of articles 72 and 73 of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council, and, in fact, the review undertaken by the Council does not cover only the period of the report submitted by the Administering Authority but, on the contrary, extends far beyond that time period. To the date of the session of the Council. Thus, a review of the situation in Togoland would take into account, in accordance with this practice, the events of 1956 and 1957, namely the implementation of a new statute, the referendum, the recent amendment introduced by the decree of 22 March and the final establishment of the institutions of the autonomous Republic.

On this point, however, we must turn to resolution 1046 (XI) adopted by the General Assembly on 23 January 1957, according to which the Trusteeship Council, in studying the problems of Togoland under French administration, is called upon to take "into account the report of the Commission", which is entrusted with the study of the whole situation in the Territory as it results from the practical application of the new statute.

To examine the situation in the Territory without having before it the report of the Commission would be to bypass the recommendations of the General Assembly and further to deprive the Council of essential information.

The French delegation at the beginning of this debate made a statement which was perfectly clear and without ambiguity. We regret that these logical arguments have not convinced the majority of the members of the Council. The French delegation has participated in every way possible in the debate. Its position of principle, however, cannot be changed.

The Government of the Administering Authority and that of the Republic of Togoland wished to bring to the Commission complete co-operation. It is necessary before adopting any final position to have before us the report of the Commission. We wish to avoid any influence on the opinion of the members of the Commission by any premature official statements.

Now that we have come to the end of our discussion, I shall further abstain from committing my Government or myself by replying to questions in connexion with the implementation of the new statute. However, I cannot leave unanswered certain statements which I find in the remarks made by some of my colleagues and which do not seem to be in accord with the facts. I was surprised by the statement made by the representative of India that the Trusteeship Council has not yet been able to take cognizance of the new statute. It would be far more accurate to say, as the representative of Haiti said, that the statute has been examined twice in the Council and in the General Assembly. The General Assembly, in referring to the transfer of powers in its resolution 1046 (XI), which I have already mentioned, has indicated that it has taken cognizance of the statute, since it has pronounced itself on the statute. It is true that India does not take seriously General Assembly resolutions since it does not implement those which India considers it convenient not to implement.

(Mr. Bargues, France)

Possibly, therefore, the delegation of India, although it denies it, is consistent when it claims to ignore the Statute and its existence. But it is much more difficult to do so when he states that the Council has not taken cognizance of the Statute. One wonders what are the arguments that can be advanced to state that the Autonomous Republic of Togoland is not a republic and that it is not autonomous. Several delegations share his viewpoint on this, and particularly those of Guatemala and Burma. If, by his resort to Latin etymology, the representative of Guatemala wishes to refer to ancient Rome, he has chosen a most contradictory argument. And if he knows Roman history and has read Plato and Cicero -- which I do not doubt -- he must agree that the word "Republic" covers very varied political regimes. Perhaps he could observe the same in making a comparative view of the Republics now in existence. But I feel that the organization of the French Republic, and therefore that of the Republic of Togoland, is far nearer the most widely held concept of the republican system, which is a government to serve the interests of one and all. Now, nobody can doubt that the Government of Lomé is really the government that serves the interests of all the population, including the interests of Mr. Sylvanus Olympio.

As for autonomy, I would not hesitate to resort to etymology -- Greek etymology, this time -- because I do not wish to make any assault on erudition, like my colleague from Guatemala. I merely wish to say that the Republic of Togoland is autonomous because it administers its own affairs by its own laws, as did those Greek cities for which this word was specifically created.

If, as the representative of Burma requests, local bodies should have complete legislative, executive and judicial powers, and if there were no more of all those matters which are now within the purview of the French Republic, Togoland would be no less autonomous, but truly independent. Now, my colleague does not ask for independence for the Territory. He therefore -- involuntarily, I suppose -- confuses autonomy and independence. And yet, the Administering Power has clearly told him that this is a Statute for autonomy.

But possibly one might ask whether the representative of Burma has really made a thorough study of the Statute and has really considered all the provisions. I am rather inclined to wonder when I hear him state that matters such as

(Mr. Bargues, France)

finance are not within the competence of the local powers. Now, it is well known -- or perhaps I should say it should be well known -- that the Legislative Assembly votes with full powers the budget and taxes and has done so for ten years.

Furthermore, may I reassure my colleague that he is not the only one to make such mistakes. I am not sure that those that are made by others are involuntary.

To claim, for example, that the guarantee given by France to maintain the integrity of the territorial frontiers of Togoland establishes a link of co-ordination between the two countries, or even constitutes a characteristic of integration, can but be the result of either ignorance or slander. France, like the majority of the Administering Powers, has on several occasions given this guarantee to weaker nations, which furthermore request such a guarantee, as Togoland itself did -- and I have not yet heard of any integration of these territories into those nations.

To reserve to the French Republic legislation regarding financial assistance, although settlement of the way in which this financial assistance is to be used is to be settled locally, may perhaps place the Territory in a state of subordination. It is the subordination of the borrower from the lender. I do not know whether the representative of Guatemala feels that he is subordinated to his banker if he has at any time requested a loan. The difference which, however, exists between the majority of bankers and France is that the latter, under article 35 of the Statute, has committed itself to continue assistance to Togoland on a long-term basis under FIDES.

As could be expected, recommendations have been made for the organization and holding of elections on the basis of universal suffrage, with a view to renewing the Legislative Assembly. May I point out that the Assembly that is now functioning has been elected by an electoral body of more than 200,000 citizens, whereas the lists prepared for universal suffrage now number more than 400,000 citizens. That means that the electoral body that appointed the Assembly is as large as if Togoland, like other Territories, did not grant the right to vote to women. It is furthermore remarkable that an injunction of this kind should be addressed to France, which has been a first Power and is to this day the only one

(Mr. Bargues, France)

to have started universal suffrage in black Africa. My delegation does not consider that the scruple that guides the representatives who have addressed such an invitation to France are less honourable. But we would have appreciated such a scruple more highly if it had been exercised with a full knowledge of the facts and if therefore the delegations for which universal suffrage seems to be the criterion of independence, and even of autonomy, had subordinated the institution to the suffrage that is freely exercised, as Members of the United Nations in States where this right does not exist.

The representative of Guatemala considers that interdiction by the public powers of a political meeting is contrary to the free exercise of the civil rights of the population. I regret that on this point I disagree with my colleague. May I point out in this respect that legislation in Togoland is exactly the same as it is in France. France does not have the reputation of being a country where civil rights are not freely exercised. It is true also that there is no anarchy. It is the duty of the public powers to prohibit a meeting if public order is in danger, and we know that it was in danger at Atakpamé. This obligation, in accordance with the law, also comes under the power of the French Government under article 4, paragraph B of the Trusteeship Agreement, which expressly provides the application of measures that will ensure respect of internal order.

May I now come back for a minute to grammar. That would be in order to tell the representative of Syria that, in establishing a fundamental difference between a referendum and a plebiscite, he gives the French language a subtlety which it does not have in this case. The two words have the same meaning. This is not due to an abuse in usage in the current language, where the term référendum is applied to a consultation on a general law, whereas the word plébiscite should enable the population to pronounce itself on the doctrine of a person. In fact, the term plébiscite was in the first place used by analogy with Togoland under British administration. But, during the tenth session of the General Assembly, arguing that, since more than a hundred years, the plebiscite evoked to Frenchmen the memory of dictatorships or Caesars, I had myself requested the Fourth Committee to adopt the word référendum for the operation to be carried out in Togoland under

(Mr. Bargues, France)

French administration in complete calm, and this was agreed upon without difficulty. It would be hazardous to attribute this change of terminology to the sombre designs of the Administering Authority today. In fact, référendum in French Togoland has been used in the same way as has "plebiscite" in British Togoland.

This does not mean that I believe that there should be a comparison made between the two Territories. And when the representative of India states that Togoland under French administration is, from the point of view of its economic situation, slightly different from Ghana, he merely forgets that the subsoil in the latter State contains large quantities of manganese and that Ghana exports 180,000 tons of cocoa, whereas in 1956 Togoland only exported 4,000 tons.

He has pointed out that a certain number of conventions of the International Labour Organisation which had not yet been ratified by France had not been made applicable to the Territory. That is true.

(Mr. Bargues, France)

May I, however, point out in this respect that France has ratified a greater number of ILO conventions than any of the other countries represented at this table. Furthermore, the Labour Code contains provisions which put into effect the majority of the conventions which have not as yet been formally ratified. I therefore regret to say that I cannot accept the criticisms which have been addressed to the Administering Authority on this point, and I would suggest that the representatives who have made the criticisms should remember the saying about overlooking the beam in your own eye while seeing the mote in your brother's eye.

The representative of India expressed regret at the fact that there was not in the North a general hospital like the one at Lomé. Up to now, however, the Lomé hospital had been criticized for being too large. If the representative of India had examined the problem more carefully, he would have learned that the present trend in countries with a low population density is not to increase the number of hospitals but, rather, to centralize treatment in one large and well-equipped hospital to which, thanks to communication facilities, particularly aeroplanes, all the gravely ill persons are brought.

We are accustomed to seeing the Soviet Union representative play with figures which he knowingly cites incorrectly. Obviously, he has not failed to do so again in respect of Togoland. He alleged, for example, that only 10 per cent of the children of the Territory were receiving primary education. Now, according to the UNESCO report, 62,035 children are attending primary schools. Thus, to use the figure of the Soviet Union delegation, the school-age population of the Territory should be 620,350. Taking the percentage of fifteen recognized as accurate by UNESCO, one would arrive at a total population of the Territory of 4,135,000 -- that is, four times the actual population.

The Soviet Union delegation also demands that religious education should be replaced by a progressive system. If the Soviet Union representative means by a progressive system a communistic system, then I must admit that religious education in Togoland is not progressive. If, however -- as I believe -- the word "progressive" means in favour of progress, I must state that religious teaching, no matter what denomination is involved, is as progressive as lay education.

(Mr. Bargues, France)

I have made these observations in order to clarify certain points that, in my opinion, it was absolutely necessary to clarify. I have also wished to demonstrate that what is a "farce" is not, as the representative of Syria believes, the fact that Togoland is called an autonomous republic, but, on the contrary, the way in which some delegations here understand their duties.

It remains for me now to give some supplementary information on several questions to which I was unable to reply at the time they were asked because I did not have the necessary data before me.

Half of the broadcasts of the radio station at Lomé are given in the various vernacular languages. To that must be added several theatre and variety programmes in the indigenous dialects.

Ninety persons are at present studying in France under scholarships. They are divided up as follows among the various subjects: letters, fourteen; law, twelve; science, nine; medicine, fourteen; pharmacy, six; dentistry, two; midwifery, seven; graduate schools, four; preparation for graduate schools, eleven; technical schools, six; miscellaneous, five.

It is true that there has been a decrease in the number of nurses belonging to the permanent cadres, particularly as a result of retirements. On the other hand, the total number of nurses and other personnel in the health service has considerably increased: from 485 in 1954, to 509 in 1955.

Finally, there are X-ray machines at Lomé, Sokodé, Atakpané and Mango. In those centres there are organized campaigns of radioscopy of school children.

I would not wish to conclude without asking the representative of Haiti, in a friendly spirit, not to take offence at a joke of a newspaperman, despite the fact that the joke was in rather bad taste. This is one of the prices paid for freedom of the Press. An article in a newspaper, however, binds only the author of that article.. It cannot change the feelings of the whole of the population towards a friendly nation.

I should like to take this occasion to thank the Haitian delegation for the objectivity and the understanding which it has shown during this debate. I should also like to thank that delegation for its final statement, which will be of great use to my Government. I must pay the same tribute to the delegation of China, which, as usual, has contributed most constructively to the study of our problems.

(Mr. Bargues, France)

I am also grateful to the delegations of Australia, Italy, New Zealand and the United Kingdom for their enlightened evaluations of France's action in Togoland. I should like to mention in particular the statement of the representative of Belgium, who clearly presented the problems involved in the evolution and termination of the Trusteeship System and who endeavoured to expose a certain deceit in the debates here by saying, rightly in my view, that objective and complete information is no longer the essential element of the discussions of the Council.

Appointment of a drafting committee

The PRESIDENT: With that statement by the representative of France, the Trusteeship Council has concluded its debate on conditions in Togoland under French administration.

In accordance with the Council's usual procedure, we must now appoint a drafting committee. I should like to nominate the following countries for membership of that committee: Guatemala, Haiti, Australia and the United Kingdom.

Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Several days ago, I presented a motion to which I should like to revert today.

I must say that I was somewhat surprised at the reactions of certain members of the Council to the proposals which I made at the Council's 782nd meeting; my proposals were made only out of a very legitimate concern to facilitate the Council's work on a problem so complex as that of Togoland. I recognize, however, that the exchange of views which took place at the Council's 782nd meeting contributed to a large extent to dissipating some misunderstandings and ambiguities about a proposal which is really very simple.

(Mr. Smolderen, Belgium)

I should like to take this opportunity once again to explain, briefly, the scope and meaning of my motion. The motion has only two purposes: first, not to establish, during the present session of the Council, a drafting committee on Togoland under French administration; second, to postpone to a later session the adoption of any resolutions concerning the situation in the Territory, on the understanding that a drafting committee will be established and resolutions will be adopted during a special session which will be held before the twelfth session of the General Assembly. At that time, account will be taken of the statements made and the clarifications given by the representative of France, of the statement of the petitioner, of the observations of the members of the Council and of the remarks of the representatives of the specialized agencies.

My delegation's only purpose is to facilitate the Council's work and to allow the Council to present a more complete report to the General Assembly and adopt resolutions which will be more up to date. It does not seem to me that there is anything in that purpose which could be called a manoeuvre or an attempt to keep the Council from doing its duty. Quite the contrary.

Last Thursday, the representative of India thought it necessary to make a proposal on the subject of scholarships which went much further than the one I am making. His proposal was aimed at postponing, purely and simply, to a later session an item on the agenda of this session -- for the very good reason that some documents to which the representative of India attached importance were not available. No one objected to that proposal.

The item on our agenda concerning Togoland is similar to the precedent which I have just cited. In fact, the necessity of a postponement is perhaps even greater because, in this case, what we are lacking is not an important document, but the essential document.

Some representatives have objected that the Commission has restricted terms of reference. We must recall that the Government of the Autonomous Republic of Togoland has received very broad powers in all fields -- political, social, economic and cultural. The report of the Commission will give us information which is indispensable if we are really to pass a proper judgement on the situation.

In conclusion, I should like to make a new appeal to representatives so that, in the light of the precision of the remarks which I have just made, they may see their way to reconsider their position. In reality, this is nothing more than to make the work of the Council really objective and factual. We shall not be able, later on, to modify resolutions which we may pass lightly at this time, and we should be forced to adopt new resolutions very soon. Why not realize this at this very moment? I hope that I am not making a vain appeal to the sense of responsibility of my colleagues.

The PRESIDENT: The point which has just been presented by the representative of Belgium was discussed fully at previous meetings. I think that representatives have already expressed their views on this proposal and, if there is no objection, I should like to put it immediately to the vote.

Mr. GRILLO (Italy): I do not recall that I expressed the opinion of my delegation on the proposal and, therefore, with your consent, Mr. President, I shall do so now.

I said in my statement a few days ago that I considered the debate on French Togoland to be utterly unrealistic. I am still of that opinion. I concluded my statement then by saying that my delegation was of the opinion that any further discussion on Togoland under French administration should take into account, first and foremost, the report of the Commission, as indicated by the General Assembly.

Now we are going to appoint a drafting committee. I think that it is unnecessary and useless at this stage to appoint a drafting committee because, in the opinion of my delegation, such a committee could only recall the discussions which had taken place in the Council, but, again, in my opinion, it could not adopt any resolution or draft any recommendation for the reason that the General Assembly decided only three months ago that any further discussion of the situation in Togoland under French administration should take place in the light of the report

of the Commission which is about to be sent to that Territory. Therefore, I shall abstain if this proposal comes to a vote. I shall abstain in any proposal setting up a drafting committee and, of course, I reserve my right to make further remarks on the report itself when it comes to the Council.

The PRESIDENT: The proposal is that no drafting committee on Togoland under French administration shall be appointed.

The proposal was adopted by 5 votes to 4, with 5 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: For the record I should like to make the following statement.

The Council has decided not to appoint any drafting committee for Togoland under French administration and that all resolutions should be left until the Special Commission has presented its report.

Mr. MUFTI (Syria) (interpretation from French): The Council has just taken a decision not to set up a drafting committee on French Togoland for the moment; but it has not taken any decision with regard to the fate of the resolutions which the Council itself might adopt. There is one area in which the Council might, indeed, take a decision. That area concerns the elections, which do not fall within the terms of reference of the special commission. If such a proposal has not been submitted by any other delegation, my delegation would be ready and willing to submit such a draft resolution concerning the elections, in view of the fact that this matter does not fall within the terms of reference of the Special Commission of the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of Syria is correct in his assumption.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I was about to say much the same thing. The decision which the Council has just taken referred only to the setting up of a drafting committee. As you know, Mr. President, there is a draft resolution which has been tabled by the delegations of the United States and India and which, we expect, will be taken up by the current session of the Council.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): I wish to make the position of my delegation clear. The situation has not quite worked out as we had thought it would. The United States delegation would have been in favour of appointing a drafting committee now to cover social, educational and economic matters. We would not have been in favour of such a committee going into the political field, which, we hoped, could be deferred until the special session.

Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) (interpretation from French): In view of the fact that I was the sponsor of the motion, I should like the verbatim record to be perfectly clear regarding my statement. I simply wish to read again the terms of my proposal; this will be the fourth time.

My proposal was just this: first, not to create, during the present session, any drafting committee for Togoland under French administration; secondly, to postpone until a later session the vote on any resolution concerning the situation in that Territory.

The PRESIDENT: What I put to the vote was one simple question: that no drafting committee be established for Togoland under French administration at this session. That was all. Concerning the draft resolution, I must certainly consult the Council. We have taken no decision on that.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I should now like to move that a drafting committee be set up for the restricted purpose of drafting conclusions concerning the economic, social and educational conditions.

The PRESIDENT: The Council has before it a proposal by the representative of India, that a drafting committee be established to consider conclusions on the economic, social and educational advancement of the Territory. I shall put this draft resolution to the vote.

Mr. BARGUES (France) (interpretation from French): It seems to me that we have voted on the question whether a drafting committee is to be established to consider all questions regarding the general situation in Togoland -- political, economic, social and educational.

(Mr. Bargues, F. e)

This is so true that the representative of the United States has said that he would have preferred the resolution to have covered only economic, social and cultural questions. But the resolution which we have adopted included all fields -- political, social, economic and cultural. I do not think that it would be possible now to go back, by a new vote, on a resolution already adopted by the Council.

Mr. MUFTI (Syria) (interpretation from French): After the intervention of the representative of Belgium, my delegation is in a position to contest the result of the vote, in view of the fact that the representative of Belgium had some doubts as to the exact form of the proposal which was put to the vote. If the Council has no objection, I believe that we should proceed to a second vote on the matter.

Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): I believe that in this matter we should use a little common sense and logic. If indeed the Council has taken a decision to the effect that it would not establish any drafting committee to deal with the situation in French Togoland, the fact remains that the whole discussion turned upon political matters. Since the reason given for not establishing a drafting committee was that a special commission of the General Assembly would soon visit the Territory and would have to report back to the Council and the Council would have to meet in special session to consider a report to the General Assembly, and if during this special session of the Council what we are going to deal with is simply the report of the special commission, then it is logical to suppose that economic, social and educational matters will have to be reported on to the General Assembly from this session. Therefore, the logical thing to do would be, as in the past, to establish a drafting committee which would consider these economic, social and educational matters, so that we could issue a report to the General Assembly.

Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) (interpretation from French): May I say that I never had any doubts regarding the scope of my proposal, since I have repeated it four times in the Council. If it is contested, it can only be on the second point, on the vote on the resolution, but not on the first point because that has been decided by vote.

Mr. GRILLO (Italy): I would like to say that the understanding of my delegation is not the same as that of the delegation of Guatemala; so much so that in our statement on this question I said :

(Mr. Grillo, Italy)

"The resolution" -- that is, the General Assembly resolution -- "also provided for the dispatch to the Territory of a Commission 'in order to examine, in the light of the discussions in the Fourth Committee, the entire situation in the Territory resulting from the practical application of the new Statute, and the conditions under which the Statute is being applied'. I emphasize the words: 'the entire situation'." (T/PV.783 page 77)

Therefore, my delegation considers that the resolution, although primarily concerned with the question of political advancement refers also to the economic, social and educational aspects of the situation in French Togoland.

Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) (interpretation from French): Sometimes votes are cast and then the results surprise us. That is what has happened now with the proposal of the representative of Belgium. He has recalled that he made a proposal to the effect that no drafting committee be set up for Togoland under French administration. I recall quite clearly that he made that proposal previously and repeated it this afternoon. But it is a fact that this proposal came at a time when it appears that our minds were not prepared to grasp the exact scope of the proposal he repeated and it is for this reason that my delegation abstained at the time of voting and did not vote in favour or against. In fact, we were just thinking of the exact scope of the proposal; and in truth my delegation, although we fully appreciate the arguments advanced regarding certain aspects of the questions to be reviewed by the drafting committee, was not quite sure that the drafting committee could not consider some fields regarding Togoland under French administration.

Many delegations have, in fact, pronounced themselves on some aspects -- the economic, social and educational aspects -- if not on the political aspect of the situation. My delegation said that it was not ready to consider the political situation in the Territory at this time. We have examined the Statute twice in the past and we reserve the right to examine it in the light of the report of the special commission which is to go to Togoland. It is our view that a drafting committee might have been appointed by the Council in order to consider the three fields I have mentioned, as was done previously for the Cameroons under French administration. The case is not quite the same because

(Mr. Dorsinville, Haiti)

the drafting committee for the Cameroons will, during the present session, have to prepare recommendations in the political field, but as regards the political aspect of the situation, the problem of Togoland under French administration would be deferred until a later session. For the other three fields, the drafting committee could have prepared recommendations and conclusions and it is for that reason that my delegation would be in favour of the Council reconsidering its decision and would support the proposal made by the representative of India, which seems to agree substantially with what the representative of the United States said : namely, that as far as his delegation was concerned it would have no objection to having a drafting committee to consider the economic, social and educational fields.

As for the second part of the proposal made by the representative of Belgium, here again it would appear that not everybody properly grasped the scope of the proposal. The representative of Belgium has underlined that in his proposal no decision could be taken on Togoland under French administration which would seem to indicate that the draft resolution to be submitted by the delegations of India and, I believe the United States, regarding elections, should not be considered by the Council.

I do not think that the proposal of the representative of Belgium should cover that specific case. As he has stated, his proposal is not based on the terms of reference given by the General Assembly, since the resolution adopted by the Fourth Committee already contains a proposal to this effect.

In conclusion, my delegation would be in favour of having a drafting committee to consider the economic, social and educational fields. We consider that the question of a resolution on elections to be held in the Territory, which is the subject of a draft resolution to be submitted, is outside the scope of the proposal made by the representative of Belgium.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Now that the proposal made by the delegation of Belgium has been adopted, the Council has certainly acted in an unusual manner. It has departed from its normal custom during the present session. The situation in French Togoland will therefore remain in suspense.

What has been the purpose of the Council's examination of the question? Why have we met? Why have we devoted much time to these debates if they are not to result in recommendations?

The Council examined the annual report of the Administering Authority as has always been done in the case of every other Territory. The Council has full power to adopt a decision after this discussion. When the Committee appointed by the General Assembly submits its report, the Council will consider that report, arrive at its own conclusions and submit an additional report to the General Assembly as is in fact contemplated in the General Assembly resolution. Therefore my delegation considers that the Council should send a report to the General Assembly without any omissions, as has always been done in the case of every other Territory. That is why once again we wish to request that the Council reconsider its decision to appoint a drafting committee and to submit recommendations on the situation in French Togoland. For that reason we support the proposal made by the representative of Syria that the Council reconsider its decision. Otherwise the vote just cast might create a dangerous precedent for the future, since some delegations did not clearly understand the proposal on which they voted.

If the Council cannot accept the very reasonable proposal made by the delegation of Syria, the delegation of the Soviet Union will warmly support the proposal made by the delegation of India.

The PRESIDENT: I think you are all familiar with the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council. The rules of procedure of the General Assembly have a provision for reconsideration. Unfortunately, the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council do not have such a provision. However, in the view of the Chair, the proposal of the representative of India is admissible. If there is no objection, I shall put it to the vote. The proposal is that a drafting committee be established to consider economic, social and educational advancement in the Territory.

The proposal was adopted by 7 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I propose the following as members of the Committee: Guatemala, Haiti, Australia and the United Kingdom. As there is no objection, these members will constitute the Committee.

It was so decided.

Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti)(interpretation from French): A second point was raised, namely, the scope of the proposal made by the representative of Belgium. I should like to know, Mr. President, whether you are going to take up the second point of the proposal of the representative of Belgium who stated that his proposal was designed to have the effect that no decision should be taken by the Council regarding the situation in French Togoland.

The PRESIDENT: I was coming to this point after the appointment of the Committee. I thank the representative of Haiti for bringing it up.

There is before the Council an Indian-United States draft resolution. The question is: Should the Council discuss this at the present meeting?

Mr. JAIPAL (India): Mr. President, as you and the other members know the normal procedure here is for a resolution to be tabled and circulated. Then the sponsors introduce it. After they have done so, the Council takes a decision on whether to adopt it, reject it or postpone it. Surely it is premature at this stage to bring up the question of the resolution at all. It seems to me completely unusual to be discussing this resolution when the sponsors have not even introduced it.

The PRESIDENT: I did so as a matter of courtesy. The representative of Haiti asked for a clarification. This also has a bearing on the statement of the representative of Belgium. However, I am in the hands of the Council. If it is not prepared to deal with this draft resolution today, I shall not press it at all. We can leave it to another time. I propose that we leave it and proceed to our next item of business.

Mr. MUFTI (Syria)(interpretation from French): This is quite clear, but we must add the following clarification. The Council has taken no decision. The only decision which the Council has taken concerns the Drafting Committee.

Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium)(interpretation from French): I am compelled to oppose such an interpretation. May I merely refer members of the Council to the summary records of the 782nd and 786th meetings.

Mr. MUFTI (Syria)(interpretation from French): After the statement which has just been made, my delegation feels that a vote should also be taken on the second part of the Belgian proposal.

The PRESIDENT: I would like to remind the representative of Belgium -- and I think the records will bear me out; I repeated it twice -- that the Belgian proposal was to establish or not to establish a drafting committee. We have not taken a decision on the second point. I do hope that this matter could be left to another meeting for consideration.

U TAW HTIN (Burma): Mr. President, as you stated very clearly when you were putting the Belgian proposal to a vote, we understood that we were voting for the formation of a drafting committee. On this understanding, my delegation cast a negative vote.

The PRESIDENT: If you insist that I put the second part of the proposal to the vote, I shall certainly be glad to do that.

Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium)(interpretation from French): I presented a single motion in two parts. Then no one asked for a separate vote.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): It does not matter how a representative of this Council presents his proposals. He may present a comprehensive proposal which may contain more than one aspect. What does matter, however, is what the

President puts to the vote. If you were to check the records of this meeting or the tape record you would find that you said that what you put to the vote was the formation of a drafting committee. It is that upon which we voted, and nothing else.

Mr. MUFTI (Syria)(interpretation from French): The second part of the Belgian proposal states that no resolution is to be adopted by the Council during this session. The Council has just decided to establish a drafting committee for social, economic and cultural questions. Therefore, it is understood that this drafting committee is empowered to present draft recommendations in these three fields to the Council. Consequently, the second part of the Belgian proposal no longer stands.

Mr. HAMILTON (Australia): I do not see any particular need to commit myself on what exactly was put to the vote. Tomorrow morning the record will show what was proposed by the representative of Belgium and what was put to the vote by the President. The President has suggested that we postpone the discussion. I take it that the discussion will be postponed until after the record is available. I entirely agree with his suggestion that the discussion be postponed immediately.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): Mr. President, you are still presiding over this meeting. Surely you can guide us now as to what you actually put to the vote and what we decided upon. The talk that we have been having now about postponement of discussion relates to the second aspect of the Belgian proposal.

The PRESIDENT: I have repeated, I think, three times, and this is the fourth time, that what I put to the vote was the Belgian proposal to the effect that no drafting committee for Togoland under French administration be appointed. That is all I put to the vote. I am sure that members will agree with me that that is all I put to the vote. I have never put the second part of the Belgian proposal to the vote.

Now the situation is as follows. Since the Council has decided to appoint a drafting committee, and a drafting committee has been appointed, and since we still have before us the draft resolution proposed by India and the United States, I propose that the matter be deferred until a later meeting.

It was so decided.

Mr. BARGUES (France) (interpretation from French): I believe I heard the representative of Australia make a formal proposal to the effect that we postpone this discussion until we have the verbatim record.

The PRESIDENT: What I said conforms exactly with the proposal of the representative of Australia. I said "until a later meeting". We have no later meeting before Friday, according to our time-table. By that time, I am sure, the verbatim record will be in the hands of members of the Council.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I am afraid I do not quite understand what it is that we are deferring until Friday. As far as I can see, we are postponing until Friday consideration of the Indian and United States draft resolution. We have already decided to set up a drafting committee which has certain limited terms of reference.

The PRESIDENT: That is very clear. I did not say that we had gone back on that. I think it was stated here that, since the Council has accepted a drafting committee, certainly the drafting committee will have to present draft recommendations to the Council.

EXAMINATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE CAMEROONS UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION FOR 1955 [Agenda item 3c] AND HEARINGS OF PETITIONERS FROM THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE CAMEROONS UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION [General Assembly resolution 1067 (XI)] [Agenda item 14]: HEARING OF THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE "UNION DES ASSOCIATIONS TRADITIONNELLES" (A/RES/500; T/1284, 1304, 1307; T/PET.5/L.433; T/L.736) (continued)

At the invitation of the President, Messrs Anjembé Menye, Kingué Jong, Philippe Mbarga and Gustave Ngomba took places at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: Now I should like to consult the members of the Council as to whether any of them would like to put questions to the petitioners.

Mr. MUFTI (Syria) (interpretation from French): My delegation would like to ask the petitioners for further information concerning the claims which were made in relation to the latest elections which took place in the Territory.

Mention was made at our last meeting of the fact that seventeen protests had been made concerning seventeen regions. My delegation would like to have further information concerning the nature of these protests.

Mr. KINGUE JONG (Union des Associations Traditionnelles du Cameroun) (interpretation from French): These protests referred mainly to the nature of the elections and the manner in which they were held. Obviously, there were frauds and alterations of votes which took place during the election. These cases were brought before the courts. The courts have already pronounced themselves on two cases and the fake elections in two cases have been annulled.

Mr. MUFTI (Syria) (interpretation from French): My delegation would have liked greater details as to the nature of the protests. We have been told that the protests concerned the manner in which the elections were held. But could we not be told what exactly were the objectives of these protests, as regards the ballot papers themselves and the people in charge of the voting booths or polls? Could we be told more about these protests?

Mr. KINGUE JONG (interpretation from French): I replied a few minutes ago to the representative of Syria that these protests referred to the tricked or faked elections; that is to say, the ballot boxes were filled before votes were cast and there were indications of persons having voted who should not have done so. We read yesterday that in our Territory and in certain other places persons who were no longer alive were shown as having voted. They were included in the electoral lists. It is for that reason that we contested the elections and protested.

I can give some further explanations. The Administration is undoubtedly well aware of the situation and the manner in which these elections were held since it has to testify before the court at the same time as those who formulated the protests.

Mr. MUFTI (Syria) (interpretation from French): When the Council was called upon to examine the annual report, it was able to note the great percentage of those who participated in the voting in regions which are characterized by the density of jungle, and so forth. On the other hand, the petitioner made reference the other day to a question relating to the boxes placed out in the brush. I wonder if there is not a relationship between this

(Mr. Mufti, Syria)

high percentage of votes cast in the brush and the jungle region and the remark made by the petitioner concerning the fact that these boxes were placed out in the brush or jungle. Consequently, I would like to know whether the petitioner would be in a position to elaborate further upon the aspects of the question.

Mr. KINGUE JONG (interpretation from French): The representative of Syria has himself replied to the question. May I say that there is a direct relationship between the elections held in the brush area and the elections held in the cities. In the former areas there is much more fraud, because many persons vote without exactly knowing what they are voting for. I can reply by stating that these protests particularly concern the brush areas, where the voting was carried on in a very disorderly way.

Mr. MUFTI (Syria) (interpretation from French): The petitioner mentioned in one of his statements that the indigenous population was not entirely responsible for the incidents of May 1955. My delegation would like to know who then were the other persons responsible for those incidents, in the judgement of the petitioner, having seen how those incidents occurred? We know that others are responsible, but we would like to have further details with regard to that matter.

Mr. KINGUE JONG (interpretation from French): We have already stated in this Council that we do not wish to take too great a responsibility regarding our own position. But we must state our views. As long as there are disorders in the Territory, there are people, of course, who foment troubles, and there are those whose function it is to repress disorders.

There have been those who fomented trouble and others have repressed disorders. I will merely stop at that and leave it to you to reply to the only question to which I would have replied, namely that troubles are not self-generated; they are created by certain persons. They are not self-repressed; some people have to repress the disorders. As you know, there were disorders in

(Mr. Kingué Jong)

1955. We have learned the origin of these troubles and we have been told that it was only the UPC that was responsible. That is not my view; it is perhaps not the view of all Cameroonians. But I cannot state that here. All I can say is that there were disorders in the Cameroons and that an investigation could not be carried out because of the French Administering Authority, for if an investigation had been carried out the true authors and those responsible for the disorders would have been found out. Now you ask me to replace your Council and to tell you who has created the troubles when you had sufficient and necessary means to find out exactly who were responsible for these disorders.

I apologize once again for having to make a remark in order to indicate the bitterness of the Cameroons, because the Council does not yet know who was responsible for the disorders which took place in the Cameroons in May 1955.

Mr. MUFTI (Syria) (interpretation from French): My delegation realizes this difficulty in which the petitioner finds himself. But we would like to put a further question. We would like to know whether Frenchmen, other than the personnel in charge of public order, participated in the repression of the disturbances of May 1955.

Mr. KINGUE JONG (interpretation from French): I have not had any real knowledge of this. I know that some Frenchmen were armed intentionally to protect themselves and they were obliged to use their weapons. I therefore leave it to the representative of Syria to arrive at his own conclusions regarding the significance of the fact that the Frenchmen did use their weapons, which were placed in their hands by the French Administering Authority.

Mr. MUFTI (Syria) (interpretation from French): My delegation has no further questions. We should like to thank the petitioner for the information which he was kind enough to supply.

Mr. BARGUES (France) (interpretation from French): May I correct the statement made by the petitioner who is not correctly informed. The local authorities never armed isolated individuals, whatever their ethnical origin, whether they were Cameroonians or Frenchmen. There were armed forces, civil or military, to re-establish order. When I say "armed forces, civil or military", what I am speaking of by mentioning civil armed forces is the police, but certainly not individuals who received weapons.

Mr. MUFTI (Syria) (interpretation from French): This request for clarification was addressed more to the French delegation. The term "pacification" has just been mentioned by the delegation of France. My delegation would like to know what the term "pacification" really means in view of the fact that this term is often used. But it leads to results which are not always in favour of the Administering Authority. I would also like to know whether the carrying of arms in the Territory is regulated, whether these indigenous inhabitants bearing arms were arrested, or whether any such measure was invoked.

Mr. BARGUES (France) (interpretation from French): Pacification means re-establishing peace. That is a reply to the first question. As to the second, if individuals are found carrying weapons without having an administrative authorization, they are prosecuted before the courts.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): We have listened very carefully to the statements of the petitioners and their replies to the questions put by the representatives of France, the USSR and Syria. I think that we have a fairly accurate picture of their grievances and it is therefore not very necessary for us to put any additional questions. Furthermore, I may recall that the petitioner has said more than once that he finds it difficult to answer some of the questions put to him because of possible victimization.

Having heard the petitioners, it seems to us that they have attempted to make three main points. Firstly, I think they have said that in their opinion elections recently held there were not fairly held. Secondly, they consider the scope of the present Statute to be inadequate. Thirdly, they demand independence for this Trust Territory and they would like to see a target date established for that purpose. I would like to know from the petitioners whether my understanding of their three main requests is correct.

Mr. MBANGA (interpretation from French): We agree entirely with the representative of India. That is mainly the clarification that we wished to make when the question of weapons was raised. As we have stated before, we have not come here to start a proceeding against France. We represent a tradition, and by tradition we mean to build and we cannot build when we destroy. We have come here to give the members of the Council some information.

Before proceeding further, might I say to the representative of France that he certainly knows that the Cameroons is grateful to France. The Cameroons is not an ungrateful territory. This was proved during the last World War when we were one of the first territories to respond to the appeal of General de Gaulle. It is not because today we ask for a statute which is in accord with the Charter of the United Nations and the Trusteeship Agreements that the Cameroons thus becomes the enemy of France. Far from it. All we ask is what we have been promised by this high international body. I think that the representative of France will agree that we are not abusing our rights to speak.

The fact that we have protested against some elections does not mean that we are attacking the representative of France or France. All we can say is that those who are now members of the Territorial Assembly are very far from the people. After the vote on the decree for the application of a so-called statute for the Cameroons, the population turned against the sixty members who voted in favour without asking for the views of the population and confusing the application of the decree with the implementation of a statute promised by the United Nations.

The Government distributed revolvers to the sixty members of the Territorial Assembly who voted in favour of the Statute, but not to the eight members who voted against it. These sixty members of the Territorial Assembly are surrounded by armed guards because they are afraid. Can they really represent the population? They know very well that they are far removed from the population which elected them. They have voted in favour of a statute which the population does not like and they are compelled to seek protection from the Administration.

If you do not one day take a decision to re-establish the peace which is desired by the people of the Cameroons, you perhaps might hear that the petitioners who are before you today have been fired upon by the Territorial Councillors or even that they have been killed.

(Mr. Mbarga)

The representative of France has stated that no one can possess weapons except by authorization. But in this case the members of the Territorial Assembly have to carry weapons because they are so far removed from the population which elected them.

We have come here to urge the Council to give us a statute which is in accord with the United Nations Charter, the Trusteeship Agreements and the many resolutions which have been adopted in this high international body.

Mr. KINQUE JONG (interpretation from French): Replying specifically to the intervention of the representative of India, I should like to ask the President's permission to make a statement on behalf of my delegation. At the last meeting we promised the Council to submit the counter-draft of the Statute submitted by the group d'Action Nationale du Cameroun to the Territorial Assembly of the Cameroons and rejected by the Legal Committee of the Assembly. Here is a complete text of the counter-draft which I did not have with me at the meeting on Friday.

TERRITORIAL ASSEMBLY OF THE CAMEROONS

First extraordinary session of January 1957

Draft statute for the recognition of the sovereign State of the Territory of the Cameroons under the Administration of the French Republic, presented by the group d'Action Nationale du Cameroun composed of:

BETOTE AKWA, Ernest	}	Wouri
SOPPO PRISO, Paul		
ASSALE, Charles	}	Ntem
OBAM ELIA, François		
EKWABI EWANE, Jean	}	Moungo
BEHLE LEMBE, Gaston		
NTONGA, Aloys		Kribi
DISSAKE, Hans		Nkam

SECTION I - GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 1

It is understood from the time of the implementation of the present text, the state of sovereignty is recognized for the Territory of the Cameroons which is now under United Nations trusteeship under French administration.

Article 2

The enjoyment of this sovereignty has no restrictions other than those resulting on the one hand from the delegation of the administration or representation freely consented by the Cameroonian State to the French Republic; on the other hand from the specific conventions negotiated by the Cameroonian Government.

Article 3

The Cameroonian State subscribes to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which will be enjoyed by all persons living in the Territory, nationals or foreigners.

SECTION II - POLITICAL SYSTEM

Article 4

The institutions of the Cameroonian State will be defined by a constitutional law which will take into account the provisions of the present Statute.

SECTION III - FRANCO-CAMEROONIAN RELATIONS

Article 5

Bearing in mind the relations which exist between the Cameroons and France and with a view to ensuring and strengthening in the best possible conditions its sovereignty, the Cameroonian State establishes links of friendship, co-operation and assistance with the French Republic, which will be the subject of specific conventions to be concluded for a specified period of time.

(Mr. Kingué Jong)

These conventions, which are subject to revision, guarantee mutual respect of the personality and the sovereignty of the two States and the safeguarding of their common interests. In general, they will be based on the friendship and mutual assistance freely consented to by both parties.

Article 6

In the spirit of the preceding, the Cameroonian State entrusts the French State with, particularly:

a) External defence of the Territory. And France will contribute to the progressive formation of a Cameroonian Army;

b) All its diplomatic representation and especially the diplomatic representation before certain States defined in the convention. The Cameroons will be represented itself before these States.

The Cameroonian States, whenever it needs outside aid, will give preference to French technicians and experts for the establishment of private and public enterprises.

Article 7

Awaiting the establishment of new judicial bodies, the Cameroonian State retains the status quo regarding judicial legislation.

Article 8

The Cameroonian Government will itself be represented before the United Nations and before other international organizations.

Article 9

The Cameroons continues to belong to the free trade area, the free port area, in a convention to be drawn up later.

Article 10

The Cameroonian State adopts the French language as the cultural and official language. English is not considered a foreign language.

(Mr. Kingué Jong)

Article 11

The present Statute will be submitted to the United Nations for approval on the initiative of the French Government. The Cameroonian delegation will participate in the debates.

When the Statute is adopted by the United Nations, then a referendum will be organized under the auspices of the United Nations, bearing on the present Statute, acceptance of which by the Cameroonian peoples will put an end to Trusteeship and proclaim the independence of the Cameroons.

Article 12

The present Statute does not constitute an obstacle to the will for unification of the two Cameroons.

This is the draft submitted by the so-called National Action Group of the Cameroons, a draft that was rejected by the Territorial Assembly on the instigation of the Administering Authority.

The procedure followed for this counter-draft was the following:

"To have a choice

"Either

"A) - The present Assembly, after proclamation of the sovereign State of the Cameroons, will be dissolved in order to hold elections for a Constituent Assembly, with a provisional government;

After the Constitution, the Assembly becomes a regular parliamentary Assembly.

"Or

"B) - After proclamation of the present Cameroonian State into a sovereign State, the Territorial Assembly will be dissolved in order to hold elections for a regular parliamentary Assembly.

"Or

"C) - The institutional reforms advocated by the French Government will be accepted as transitional measures until completion of the procedure for the recognition of the Cameroonian State, as contemplated in Article 11 of the counter-draft."

(Mr. Kingué Jong)

This counter-draft corresponds fully, as we have stated, to the unanimous wish of the Cameroonian population. And now I am replying to the question put a few minutes ago by the representative of India. We are therefore expressing our wish -- that is the mission of our delegation here -- that:

I. Proclamation of the principle of the independence of the Cameroons, establishing a reasonable time limit for complete enjoyment of this independence;

II. Institution of a Cameroonian Legislative Assembly of the entire Territory, to be entrusted with the entire executive branch of the Cameroonian Government. The High Commissioner becomes a Chargé d'Affaires of the Government of the French Republic, and the French Government will be entrusted with:

a) External defence of the Territory,
b) Diplomatic representation, especially in certain States to be defined in specific conventions, as was specified in the Statute, and Cameroonian representation before the United Nations,

c) Money,

d) French laws.

III. A referendum on the desiderata above-mentioned.

The Cameroons under French administration has a political, economic and social evolution that has been far more advanced than that of Italian Somaliland, which is to become independent in 1960. Its economic potential is ten times higher, its social achievements nine times greater than what is to be found in the British Cameroons, which will become independent in 1959.

In accord with the wishes of the Cameroonians, we take the liberty of recalling to the Council what was stated here as well as in the General Assembly during previous sessions. To every man, due honour. Therefore, on the basis of the assurances given by the Administering Authority and in Sub-Committee 1 of the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly, which took note of the assurances given -- these assurances were:

(Mr. Kingué Jong)

"In connexion with the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreements concerning the right of the Administering Authorities to constitute the Trust Territories administered by them into customs, fiscal or administrative unions or federations with adjacent territories under their sovereignty or control ... the delegations of Australia, Belgium, France and the United Kingdom, being the delegations of States submitting the Trusteeship Agreements for the approval of the General Assembly, wish to give assurance that they do not consider the terms of the Articles above quoted as giving powers to the Administering Authority to establish any form of political association between the Trust Territories respectively administered by them and adjacent territories which would involve annexation of the Trust Territories in any sense or would have the effect of extinguishing their status as Trust Territories." (General Assembly, Official Records: Seventh Session, Supplement No. 12 (A/2151), pages 5 and 6)

And it is the representative of Guatemala, Mr. Arenales Catalan, who, on 21 February 1956, mentioned the situation in French Togoland and recalled the assurances given by one of the representatives of France.

(Mr. Kingué Jong)

We agree with the following statement made by the representative of India, Mr. Jaipal, on 16 March 1956:

"As members of the Council know, my delegation has always been in favour of the timetable principle in the development of the Trust Territories. I think we have expressed ourselves fully on the need for development on a planned basis according to a timetable...". (T/PV.687, page 13-15)

We also subscribe to the following words of the United States representative, Mr. Gerig, spoken on that same date:

"Several speakers have ... touched on the question of timetables as they affect the problem of the attainment by the Trust Territories of the objectives of self-government or independence, and on this question we would like to make the United States position clear. We favour, whenever we think it helpful, the establishment of target dates for the achievement of intermediate goals ...

"... to fix intermediate goals even in approximate terms in point of time would often give Trust or Non-Self-Governing Territories ... a stronger sense of purpose and direction in achieving their goals. A series of targets ... will, we believe, tend to induce an atmosphere of understanding and confidence in which the Territories involved will be able to move more rapidly and harmoniously ahead." (Ibid., page 17)

We should like to borrow the following two sentences from a statement made on 26 March 1956 by Mr. Krishna Menon, the representative of India:

"The tragic situation is that in regard to reforms in dependent territories it has frequently been a case of too little and too late... Therefore, we want to point out at this stage that while these pending reforms may have been adequate in the circumstances of 1955, or may have been all that French public opinion would agree to at that time, in the present context they are inadequate ...". (T/PV.684, page 47)

We pass over the statements made at the Council's 671st and 687th meetings by the Soviet Union representative, and we give the crowing place in our expressions of approval to the following warning of Mr. Asha, who is now the very distinguished and eminent President of the Trusteeship Council:

(Mr. Kingué Jong)

"We cannot allow ourselves to think that the peoples of the Trust Territories, whatever may be the social structure of those Territories, will be content to achieve political autonomy under the same slow process which our civilization has been familiar with for centuries. We cannot allow ourselves to think that Africans, whether they be from the West or from the East, will -- any more than the inhabitants of the Pacific Islands -- wait until they are able to read before being given the right to vote. These peoples will not wait to achieve independence until their elected leaders can assume political responsibilities; they will not wish to wait until the Territory's economy is fully developed before managing their own affairs. ...

"Sometimes, modest reforms adopted in time avoid disturbances, discontent and the loss of human lives. We should all learn, and never forget, the American or English proverb that 'a stitch in time saves nine'."

The Cameroonians would have become autonomous in 1952 -- the year when the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted resolution 558 (VI) and when the populations made their first demand -- if a second resolution of the General Assembly, resolution 752 (XIII) of 9 December 1953, had been taken into account. In the latter resolution, the Assembly.

"Commends to the Administering Authorities of the other Trust Territories the example provided by the Administering Authority of Western Samoa in inviting the inhabitants themselves in 1954 to formulate proposals for the establishment of a self-governing State".

This is 1957. We leave it to the Council to form a judgement on the way in which France has shirked its responsibilities, on the way in which France has on two occasions and in a tragic fashion exhausted the patience of the Cameroonians.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I have nothing more to say except to make a few general observations on the hearing granted to the petitioners. We are very sorry to hear the allegations of malpractices in the elections in this Trust Territory, and we hope that it will be possible for those concerned to prefer appeals to the local courts wherever necessary.

As regards the inadequacy of the present statute, we should like to tell the petitioners that when the new statute is made available to this Council, we shall, naturally, examine it very closely with reference to the Trusteeship Agreement and the United Nations Charter; and, while doing so, we shall, of course, keep in mind the observations made by the petitioners.

The petitioners have laid a great deal of emphasis on independence for this Trust Territory. We all know that independence is a cherished Trusteeship objective, and I am sure that it is not France's intention to deny it to this Trust Territory. Apart from that, all subject peoples have a right to independent national existence, which they will attain eventually in their own way regardless of whatever obstacles may be placed in their path.

We hope that the movement for independence in this Trust Territory will be peaceful. That will depend, to a large extent, not only on the United and disciplined behaviour of the people themselves, but also on the policies of France. In our opinion, the larger measure of responsibility inevitably rests on the Administering Authority.

We should like to thank the petitioners for the many interesting observations and statements which they have made before us.

The PRESIDENT: There are still a number of representatives who wish to put questions to the petitioners. I should like to remind the Council that we have also an item before us today relating to arrangements for a periodic visiting mission to East Africa. In order to enable some delegations to make their final decisions, I propose, with their consent, to grant the Council twenty-five minutes of recess.

The meeting was suspended at 4 p.m. and resumed at 4.30 p.m.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR A PERIODIC VISITING MISSION TO TRUST TERRITORIES IN EAST AFRICA
IN 1957 [Agenda item 5]

The PRESIDENT: Subject to the approval of the Council I would like to take the few remaining items on our agenda before completing the hearing of the petitioners from the Cameroons under French administration and I hope members of the Council will support me in this procedure, as I am very anxious that these items should be taken up before we adjourn today.

The first item will be the arrangements for a periodic Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa. In accordance with established practice, each periodic Visiting Mission is composed of four persons nominated respectively by Member States. I would like to invite the Council to select these four Member States.

Regarding the method of selection, I would like to refer to rule 41 of the rules of procedure which reads as follows:

"The election of the President and the Vice-President of the Trusteeship Council shall be taken by secret and separate ballot. The Council may decide that the election to any other office or function established by the Council shall also be taken by secret ballot."

I suggest, with your consent, that this rule be applied to the selection of the members of the Visiting Mission. If I hear no objection, the Council will proceed to take a secret ballot in accordance with rule 43 of our rules of procedure.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to know why you are in such a hurry, Mr. President, to deal with this matter. Is the Mission going to leave tomorrow morning for the Territory? Perhaps we might continue the discussion of the matters left pending. Why should we immediately start a vote on the selection of the members of the Visiting Mission? If I understand the situation correctly, the Visiting Mission will not leave until after the end of this session. This is simply a request for information.

The PRESIDENT: My only reply to the representative of the Soviet Union is that this item has been before us for a long time. If he has any objection and if the Council wishes to postpone it, I have no particular reason for pressing the Council to make a quick decision. I thought that the Council had agreed that we should consider this matter today.

Mr. MUFTI (Syria)(interpretation from French): In view of the fact that this item appears on our agenda, it would seem to my delegation that all members of the Council should be in a position to express an opinion on it, at least they should have that right. If any delegation wishes to voice an opinion they should be allowed to do so and we are ready to listen.

The PRESIDENT: I shall certainly be very happy to recognize any member who wishes to explain his attitude or the attitude of his delegation. I have never refused to allow any member to speak and I shall never do so. Would any member like to express his views on this matter?

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, I did not ask to speak in order to oppose your proposal. I merely wished to know the reason why we were not taking up item 2, for example, which we had not completed. I refer to the examination of the annual report on the administration of the Trust Territory of the French Cameroons. If we had completed item 2, I would have thought it quite reasonable to go on to item 3, "Arrangements for a periodic visiting mission to Trust Territories in East Africa in 1957". But item 2 has been on our agenda just as long as item 3. Why should we go on to item 3 and leave item 2 uncompleted? If the Council decides to take up item 3 now, I have no objection. I merely wish to know what the reason is.

The PRESIDENT: I think I owe an explanation to the representative of the Soviet Union. First, as you all know, the Council is not meeting until Friday. Secondly, the Visiting Mission is expected to leave on the 10th, 12th or 15th of July. Thirdly, Governments will have to nominate their representatives to the Mission. This is a procedure we must follow. Here we elect member States and not individuals. The individuals also have to be voted upon by the Council and the Council will take action on that.

We interrupted the item before us simply to expedite matters in view of the fact that the Council is not meeting until Friday. We will continue to

(The President)

hear the petitioners as soon as we finish the items now before us. If the representative of the Soviet Union wishes to make a formal proposal to postpone the consideration of this item, I shall certainly put his proposal to the vote.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I know that this item has been before us for a considerable time and that efforts have been made to try to find an agreed panel of members for the Visiting Mission. Apparently there is still some difficulty. I can appreciate the reasons put forward by the representative of the USSR.

If there is no insuperable objection, I suggest that it might be advisable in all the circumstances to defer a decision until our next meeting. Frankly I do not think that the objections are insuperable.

The PRESIDENT: I certainly do not desire to press this matter for consideration today. If one or two or more members wish to have it deferred, if the Council so desires, I shall certainly defer it until Friday. Very well, it is deferred until Friday.

It was so decided.

ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK OF THE TWENTIETH SESSION OF THE COUNCIL

The PRESIDENT: I should like to ask the Council to take certain urgent decisions concerning the organization of its next session. Normally this question would be discussed by the Council only at the very end of the present session, but the Council is now so far behind its schedule that the discussion cannot be further delayed, and I understand now that, according to our present progress, the Council might not be able to adjourn before 12 or 13 May.

First, the Council has to take a decision on the opening date of its next session. In accordance with rule 1 of its rules of procedure, each summer session of the Council should be convened during the month of June, but, as you know, this year the Council will have some difficulty in abiding by the provisions of that rule. Firstly, as a result of its decision to postpone consideration of two very important items, namely, the annual report on Tanganyika and the report of the International Bank's mission to Somaliland, the next session will be much longer than usual. Secondly, during the latter part of July a number of delegations will be engaged in the work of other organs of the United Nations, particularly the Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories.

In view of the foregoing considerations, I suggest that the Council suspend the application of rule 1 of its rules of procedure and decide to convene its next session on 20 May.

Mr. HAMILTON (Australia): This item takes my delegation entirely by surprise. Although I understand that the matter is urgent, I see that it was of insufficient urgency to appear on our agenda. Is it imperative, therefore, that we take a decision on a matter that does not appear on our agenda for today?

The PRESIDENT: Unless the representative of Australia has strong objections, I certainly will later on, of course, if you will allow me to continue, say why it is imperative to take a decision today. I have strong reasons for that. Now, if I may continue my statement, then I will --

Mr. JAIPAL (India): Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt you, of course, but I find myself happily in agreement with the representative of Australia. The statement which you have made, Mr. President, raises a number of points on which my delegation is not in a position at the moment to express its views finally. We should like some opportunity to refer to our Government the points you have put forward and find out what their views are. After all, they concern a rather important matter, the opening date of the next session. We have to get some of our representatives out from India, so that there are complications which I am sure you will see. I should be grateful if you would give us some time to consider the proposal that you have just put forward and not press us to make a decision now.

The PRESIDENT: I shall certainly bow to the will of the Council. I shall not press this, but I hope that by Friday delegations will be in a position to take action to enable the Council to decide finally on the two matters which we have deferred.

Mr. MUFTI (Syria)(interpretation from French): I have three subsidiary questions. Perhaps these questions may not bear directly on the agenda of the coming session of the Council, but nevertheless these questions have a certain amount of importance for my delegation.

We would ask for some information from the Secretariat which might be of assistance to my delegation in taking a decision with regard to the next session of the Council. The three questions are as follows.

Firstly, my delegation would like to know at what date the Commission of the General Assembly is to go to French Togoland. Secondly, we wish to know the date on which the report of that Commission will be ready. Finally, we should like to know on what date the special session of the Council will meet.

Mr. WIESCHHOFF (The Secretary): All we know for certain is that the Togoland mission is going to leave for Europe about 20 May and will be arriving in the Trust Territory of Togoland about 1 June. It is expected that the report of this Commission might be ready for distribution to members of the Council about 20 August. That, of course, depends on the work of the Commission,

but that is the expected date. It is, furthermore, thought at this time that the Council might find it convenient to hold the special session on this particular problem shortly before the opening of the twelfth session of the General Assembly, namely, about 12 September.

Mr. MUFTI (Syria)(interpretation from French): My delegation would like to thank Mr. Wieschhoff for the information that he has been kind enough to supply. It seems, consequently, that no definitive date has yet been established with regard to the special session of the Council.

Mr. WIESCHHOFF (The Secretary): Of course, no specific date can be set until the Council's report is ready, and it has been customary in the Council, with regard to questions of this sort, to decide at the end of the summer session, in this case the twentieth session, to instruct the President to call the meeting at a date when a meeting of the Council might be usefully held.

The PRESIDENT: Now that we have disposed temporarily of these items, I urge members of the Council to be sure that by Friday they will be in a position to take a final decision, because we are certainly behind schedule. I should like also to draw your attention to the fact that, as you all very well know, we must have a provisional agenda for the next session. The Secretary-General also must notify Member States, and we may also have to waive some of the rules of procedure. Therefore, I consider it most important that by Friday the two items be taken up and disposed of.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): Mr. President, you were interrupted while you were making your statement, and I think you were about to give us certain reasons. Would it be possible for you to complete your statement?

The PRESIDENT: I have already done so.

Mr. BARGUES (France)(interpretation from French): I had asked for the floor precisely in order to make the suggestion that has now been made by the representative of India. I believe that it will be desirable for delegations that have asked for postponement of the discussion till Friday to have time to consider the matter and I hope that the debate will not be deferred again by any further suggestions for deferment.

EXAMINATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE CAMEROONS UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION FOR 1955 [Agenda item 3c] AND HEARINGS OF PETITIONERS FROM THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE CAMEROONS UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION [General Assembly resolution 1067 (XI)] [Agenda item 14]: HEARING OF THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE "UNION DES ASSOCIATIONS TRADITIONNELLES" (A/RES/500; T/1284, 1304, 1307; T/PET.5/L.433; T/L.736) (continued)

At the invitation of the President, Messrs Anjembé Menye, Kingué Jong, Philippe Mbarga and Gustave Ngomba took places at the Council table.

U PAW HTIN (Burma): It is not the intention of my delegation to retard the progress of this Council any more. In that respect, I do not think that I have any more questions to put to the petitioners.

The PRESIDENT: As no other member desires to put any further questions to the petitioners, our agenda for today is completed. In that case, I wish to thank the petitioners for their statements and for their replies.

The petitioners withdrew.

The PRESIDENT: Some members expressed the view at previous meetings that they might wish to make observations on the hearing of the petitioners. May I ask whether any member is prepared to do so today or at a later meeting?

As no one wishes to make any observations on the hearing of the petitioners from the Cameroons, the Council has therefore finished its agenda for today. The next meeting will be held on Friday at 2 p.m. and the agenda will be as follows: Reports of the Standing Committee on Petitions; the Soviet Union draft resolution on petitions concerning French Cameroons (T/L.748); appointment of members of Standing Committee on Petitions; British Cameroons: report of Drafting Committee; Ruanda-Urundi: report of Drafting Committee; French Togoland: Indian-United States draft resolution; organization of the work of the twentieth session; and the question of the election of the Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories.

The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.