



Wednesday, 13 November 1957,
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Tribute to the memory of Mr. Antonin Zapotocky, President of the Czechoslovak Republic	265
Agenda item 35: Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Com- mittee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (continued):	
(a) Information on economic conditions;	
(b) Information on other conditions;	
(c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information;	
(d) Offers of study and training facilities under resolutions 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954 and 931 (X) of 8 November 1955;	
(e) Methods of reproducing summaries of informa- tion concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General	
Draft report of the Fourth Committee (concluded)	265
Requests for hearings (continued)	
Requests concerning agenda item 13 (Report of the Trusteeship Council) (continued)	266
Agenda item 37: The future of Togoland under French administration: report of the Trusteeship Council (continued)	
General debate (continued)	266

Chairman: Mr. Thanat KHOMAN (Thailand).

**Tribute to the memory of Mr. Antonin Zapotocky,
President of the Czechoslovak Republic**

1. The CHAIRMAN extended to the Czechoslovak delegation the condolences of the Committee on the death of President Zapotocky and asked the delegation to transmit them to the Czechoslovak Government and Mr. Zapotocky's family.

The Committee observed a minute's silence in tribute to the memory of Mr. Zapotocky.

2. Mr. SPACIL (Czechoslovakia) thanked the Chairman and the Committee for their expression of sympathy to Czechoslovakia on the loss it had sustained in the death of a man who had fought so hard for the freedom and rights of his country.

AGENDA ITEM 35

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/3601 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/3602, A/3603, A/3604, A/3605, A/3606/Rev.1, A/3607, A/3608, A/3609, A/3647 and Corr.1, A/C.4/360, A/C.4/L.507) (continued):

- (a) Information on economic conditions;
- (b) Information on other conditions;

- (c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information (A/C.4/357/Rev.1, A/C.4/359 and Add.1);
- (d) Offers of study and training facilities under resolutions 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954 and 931 (X) of 8 November 1955 (A/3618 and Add.1);
- (e) Methods of reproducing summaries of information concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/3619)

DRAFT REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/C.4/L.507) (concluded)

3. Mr. JAIPAL (India) referred to the Belgian representative's proposal at the previous meeting to the effect that consideration of the draft report (A/C.4/L.507) should be suspended pending a reply from the Sixth Committee to the question asked in the resolution adopted by the Fourth Committee (A/C.4/L.501). That proposal had surprised and disturbed him because it would have the effect of adjourning indefinitely, as it were, the submission of the Committee's report on agenda item 35 to the General Assembly and would prevent the Committee from concluding its work in the normal way. The question put to the Sixth Committee was a separate matter which should not interfere with the continuity of the General Assembly's work. If the Belgian representative intended to ask for a vote on his proposal, the Indian delegation would vote against it. At most, it would accept the suggestion of the delegation of El Salvador that paragraphs 14 and 15 of the draft report should be deleted and subsequently dealt with in a special report.

4. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) felt that the Belgian proposal was not justified and would interfere with the time-table for the completion of the General Assembly's business. The draft report was an objective statement of the facts and nothing could be deleted from it. The Committee could not wait to receive an answer from the Sixth Committee, which might indeed be unable to deal with the matter at the present session. If necessary, the Committee could adopt the suggestion made at the previous meeting by the representative of El Salvador concerning paragraphs 14 and 15. For those reasons his delegation would vote against the Belgian proposal.

5. Mr. LOIZIDES (Greece) shared those views. Rule 67 of the rules of procedure provided that the General Assembly should not make a final decision upon any item until it had received the report of a committee on that item. As the Sixth Committee needed time to consider the question put to it and might be unable to give a reply at the present session, the Committee should transmit its report on agenda item 35 as it stood, without delay, in order not to impede the work of the General Assembly.

6. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) observed that having voted against the request for an opinion from the Sixth

Committee, he personally would have no objection if the Fourth Committee did not wait for a reply. Nevertheless, it was absurd to send draft resolutions on Non-Self-Governing Territories to the General Assembly for adoption when the majority of the Committee did not know what procedure the Assembly should use in voting and had asked the Sixth Committee to shed some light on the matter. He hoped that the Assembly would have the good sense to say that it could not vote on the report until it received the Sixth Committee's report. The logic of his proposal had seemed so obvious that he had not supposed it could give rise to discussion. In the circumstances, he would, however, withdraw it.

7. In reply to Mr. LOVERA (Venezuela), Mr. QUIROS (El Salvador) said that he withdrew his suggestion.

8. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) pointed out that he strongly favoured keeping paragraphs 14 and 15 in the report so that the General Assembly might realize the irregularity of the situation and know that the Committee, after asking the Sixth Committee a question on voting procedure, had referred the problem to the General Assembly without having received a reply.

9. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) asked that the following corrections should be made in the first sentence of paragraph 4 of the English text: the words "the Falkland Islands" should be inserted between the word "and" and the word "Dependencies", and the words "and the Aden Protectorate" should be added after the word "Aden". He also asked that, in the second sentence of paragraph 4, the order of the word "Belize" and the words "British Honduras" should be inverted, with "Belize" placed in parentheses instead of "British Honduras".

10. Mrs. FLOURET (Argentina) said that she preferred the present wording of the Spanish text to be retained.

11. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) said that his delegation desired the existing order of the word "Belice" and the words "Honduras Británica" to be left unchanged in the Spanish text.

12. Mrs. SKOTTSBERG-AHMAN (Sweden), Rapporteur, explained, with regard to the mistake in paragraph 13 mentioned at the previous meeting, that the Syrian delegation had been absent during the roll-call on the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.497/Rev.2 and had not voted, while the vote of the delegation of Thailand, which had abstained, had not been reported. Syria should be deleted from the list of abstentions and Thailand inserted.

13. Mrs. FLOURET (Argentina) said that she was the "representative" of Argentina referred to in paragraph 27. She asked that the word "representative" be replaced by the word "delegation".

14. Mr. NOGUEIRA (Portugal) said that his delegation, after carefully studying the draft report, asked that a new paragraph should be inserted after paragraph 42 reading: "The Portuguese delegation made a statement reserving the position of its Government in regard to the draft resolution and to its eventual implementation."

15. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said, with reference to paragraph 52, that he had the impression that the Committee had decided not to examine, at the present session, the question of the reproduction and distribution of summaries of information and to take the question up again,

if necessary, at the next session. He did not think that the present wording of the paragraph accurately reflected that decision.

16. Mr. SULTANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that paragraph 52 was not well put and that it would be better to make it clear that the matter would be considered at the next session. He added that the Russian text of the draft report contained a number of material errors which his delegation would draw directly to the attention of the Secretariat.

17. Mrs. SKOTTSBERG-AHMAN (Sweden), Rapporteur, suggested that the end of paragraph 52 should read: "on the understanding that this decision would not in any way prejudice the consideration of the matter at the next session of the General Assembly".

It was so agreed.

18. Mr. KELLY (Australia) reserved his delegation's position as to the competence of the Committee to consider certain draft resolutions which were included in the draft report.

The draft report (A/C.4/L.507), as amended, was adopted.

19. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that if the draft report had been put to the vote he would have abstained because he considered its submission to the General Assembly premature.

20. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) expressed the hope that the report would come before the General Assembly in due course and that no difficulty would be occasioned by the fact that the Sixth Committee had not yet considered the question asked by the Committee.

Requests for hearings (A/C.4/355/Add.5) (continued)

REQUESTS CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 13 (REPORT OF THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL) (A/C.4/355/ADD.5) (continued)

21. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that the French delegation had no objection to the request submitted in document A/C.4/355/Add.5.

22. He asked whether it was the Committee's policy to grant hearings to particular individuals or to organizations, which were then free to designate their representatives. At its 692nd meeting the Committee had agreed to hear Mr. Ouandié as the representative of the Union des populations du Cameroun, but that organization had then designated Mr. Félix Moumié as its representative (A/C.4/355/Add.4).

23. The CHAIRMAN said that he would consult with the Secretariat on the question raised by the French representative and reply to it later.

The Committee decided to grant the hearing requested (A/C.4/355/Add.5).

AGENDA ITEM 37

The future of Togoland under French administration: report of the Trusteeship Council (A/3676 and Corr.1, A/3677, A/C.4/367, T/SR.841-847) (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Anani Ignacio Santos, representative of the Mouvement de la jeunesse

togolaise (Juvento), Mr. Alexandre John Ohin and Mr. André Akakpo, representatives of the Mouvement populaire togolais, and Mr. Sylvanus Olympio, representative of the All-Ewe Conference, took places at the Committee table.

24. Mr. CHAMANDI (Yemen) thought it unfortunate that the representatives of the different Togoland parties should be presenting a divided front to the Committee instead of working together to realize the national aspirations of Togoland. He deplored the repressive and discriminatory measures taken against members of the opposition, who had done nothing more than organize peaceful meetings; mention was made in the report of the United Nations Commission on Togoland under French Administration (A/3677) of the difficulties met with by the opposition parties.

25. His delegation had always supported the idea of the union of the whole Togoland people in a single free and independent State, but the creation of the State of Ghana had prevented the fulfilment of that idea. He noted with appreciation the efforts made by the French authorities and the new plans for the benefit of the Togoland people. The measures taken were encouraging and showed real progress. Nevertheless, after reading the Commission's report and hearing the petitioners, his delegation still had some misgivings.

26. Speaking in the Trusteeship Council, Mr. Rolz-Bennett, the representative of Guatemala and a member of the United Nations Commission on Togoland, had rightly said that the objectives of Article 76 of the Charter had not yet been achieved although the new Statute was an important step forward. Similarly, the petitioners had declared that the Statute was not being applied democratically and that Togoland was not self-governing. His delegation considered that the so-called Autonomous Republic of Togoland was not self-governing because it was headed by a French High Commissioner and the majority of government officials were French, nor was it a republic because it did not possess sovereign power. It might reasonably be asked whether the French Government, in inviting the United Nations to terminate the Trusteeship Agreement, intended that the Togoland people should be completely independent or that they should be absorbed into the French Union.

27. The petitioners, who represented a substantial proportion of the Togoland people, had said time and again that for the moment they wished to remain under the trusteeship of the United Nations, which was protecting the Togoland people until such time as they could govern themselves. There was no denying their right to such protection, and the trusteeship could not be terminated before the population was capable of governing itself.

28. That being so, his delegation considered that the members of the Committee should consider very carefully whether they could properly vote for the termination of trusteeship. They had been told that a referendum had been held in Togoland and that the Togoland people had freely elected the members of the Legislative Assembly but a referendum not held under the supervision of the United Nations could hardly be considered valid. The Committee had heard of the fraudulent practices which had vitiated the referendum and of the political persecution, irregularities and intimidation which had been practised and which were

mentioned in the Commission's report. In the circumstances, it was not surprising that the opposition should call for fresh elections.

29. His delegation would oppose the termination of trusteeship before the objectives of the Trusteeship System had been reached and would also oppose the absorption of Togoland into the French Union. It entirely supported the claims of the Togoland people, who were asking for the restoration of public freedoms and the free election of a new Legislative Assembly under the supervision of the United Nations.

30. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) pointed out that although the United Nations Commission had mentioned in its report the views expressed by the opposition and quoted by the representative of Yemen, it had stressed that, in the absence of specific comment, it should not be assumed that it endorsed them.

31. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) asked whether delegations could exercise their right of reply immediately after the statement in question instead of waiting until the end of the general debate.

32. The CHAIRMAN said it was customary to reply at the end of the debate. He hoped that delegations would comply with that procedure.

33. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) observed that the United Nations Commission on Togoland had been instructed to examine the situation in the Territory and the conditions under which the Statute was being applied. That was primarily a political task, and a very delicate one. As he had been a member of that Commission he would not offer any opinion as to its report but would simply point out that it had been adopted unanimously.

34. The problem, in his view, was not that of determining whether the Statute was sufficiently liberal to warrant the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement. Legal analysis would provide an answer to the question. The problem was how to help the Togoland people to become a single whole, to use their energy and enthusiasm to solve the practical difficulties they were up against, and to implement the Statute, which represented a great step forward in the Territory's political development and one upon which the Administering Authority should be congratulated.

35. In his contacts with the various elements of Togoland society, he had learned that there were four major difficulties—the relations between northern and southern Togoland, the new elections to the Legislative Assembly, the links between Togoland and France, and the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement.

36. As everyone knew there was a certain mistrust between the inhabitants of the North and those of the South of Togoland. The former feared that the latter, who were more advanced, might try to dominate and exploit them. Such an atmosphere could not but hamper the carrying out of reforms, the maintenance of political stability and the progress of the Territory in general. The Yugoslav delegation considered that in order to improve the situation, political and social links must be established between the two regions. He was convinced that that mistrust would then disappear and Togoland would become aware of their common interests and gain a sense of national unity.

37. He considered new elections to the Legislative Assembly a political necessity. As the Commission's

report indicated, elections would clear the air and enable the people to support the political reforms.

38. The new Assembly ought to devote itself first and foremost to examining the Statute and ought, if necessary, to open negotiations with the Administering Authority to amend it or to extend its field of competence. After adopting those provisions in the Statute which related to matters solely within its jurisdiction, the Assembly could negotiate an agreement which would govern relations between France and Togoland. It ought to leave the question of trusteeship until last.

39. If it proceeded thus by stages its work would have more lasting value and would better serve the interests of Togoland and France, for the solutions proposed would be accepted freely and in full knowledge of the facts. Only in that way would there be any chance of relations based on friendship and respect being established between the two countries, and it would be

a mistake to insist on defining them at too early a stage.

40. He considered that the question of the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement was one of the main causes of tension. The opposition would be ready to co-operate in the implementation of the Statute if new elections to the Assembly were held and if the immediate termination of trusteeship were not requested. It would therefore be better to be patient and not to precipitate matters. If it was found that some provisions of the Trusteeship Agreement were incompatible with the Territory's considerable degree of self-government, it would always be possible to find some provisional solution.

41. His delegation was ready to consider any proposal which took account of the basic ideas he had just presented.

The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.