



Monday, 5 December 1955,
at 3.15 p.m.

New York

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Requests for hearings (<i>continued</i>)	381
Agenda item 35:	
The Togoland unification problem and the future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration: report of the Trusteeship Council (<i>continued</i>)	381

**Chairman: Mr. Luciano JOUBLANC RIVAS
(Mexico).**

Requests for hearings (*continued*)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that a telegram had been received from Mrs. Emma Mbem concerning the hearing of petitioners from the Cameroons under French administration. He suggested that, in accordance with the usual practice, the telegram should be circulated to the members of the Committee.

There being no objections, it was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 35

The Togoland unification problem and the future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration: report of the Trusteeship Council (A/3046, T/1206 and Add.1, T/1214, T/1215) (*continued*)

HEARING OF PETITIONERS (*continued*)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. S. G. Antor, Mr. A. K. Odame and Mr. A. A. Chamba, representatives of the Togoland Congress, Mr. J. A. Nagba, representative of the Northern People's Party, Mr. J. Mensah, Mr. F. Y. Asare, Mr. S. T. Fleku and Mr. S. W. Kumah, representatives of the Convention People's Party, Akan-Krachi Constituency, Buem Constituency, Ho District, and Kpandu District, respectively, Mr. S. Olympio, representative of the All-Ewe Conference, Mr. Mama Foussemi, representative of the Union des chefs et des populations du Nord-Togo, Mr. R. Ajavon, representative of the Parti togolais du progrès, Mr. A. I. Santos and Mr. N. Amégah, representatives of Juvento, took places at the Committee table.

2. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) asked Mr. Olympio whether he shared Mr. Antor's optimism regarding the feasibility of holding a plebiscite in Togoland under French administration in the near future.

3. Mr. OLYMPIO (All-Ewe Conference) said he had tried to make it clear that if a plebiscite in Togoland under French administration were to be conditional on the introduction of the reforms proposed in the report (T/1206 and Add. 1) of the United Nations

Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Togoland under British administration and Togoland under French administration, 1955, a very long time might elapse before it could be held. He had, however, made certain suggestions, one of which was that the French Government might be prevailed upon to administer Togoland under French administration no longer as an integral part of the French Republic but as a Trust Territory, in accordance with the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreement. He had made that proposal in view of the fact that the French Government itself had said on several occasions that the present administrative arrangement was merely for convenience.

4. The majority of the members of the Visiting Mission considered that a plebiscite could be held in Togoland under British administration despite the fact that that Territory had no separate institutions. Since Togoland under French administration already possessed certain separate institutions, he submitted that it would be possible to hold a plebiscite in that Territory without waiting for the reforms envisaged in the Visiting Mission's report.

5. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said he was not quite clear about the views of the Togoland Congress regarding the immediate future of Togoland under British administration. Two of the representatives of the Togoland Congress had advocated the immediate granting of independence to that Territory; but Mr. Odame, according to his statement at the 528th meeting, appeared to accept the view in paragraph 107 of the Visiting Mission's report (T/1206), which he called the minority report of the Visiting Mission, and which envisaged a continuation of the trusteeship and implied that Togoland under British administration was not yet prepared to express its opinion in a plebiscite. He would like a clarification of their views on that point.

6. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) recalled that he had said in his statement (528th meeting) that Togoland under British administration had never been given separate institutions in which Togoland could be trained in the management of their own affairs. Hence, although his party demanded immediate independence, it felt that the machinery for independence should be set up first. His party had no wish to remain under trusteeship but it realized that the setting up of such institutions would take a certain time. That was why it had appeared to agree with the minority report.

7. The United Kingdom Government claimed that substantial progress had been made by the people of the Trust Territory and that they were now capable of controlling their own affairs. His party welcomed that pronouncement and maintained that if that were so the Territory's independence should be proclaimed. Once that had been done and the necessary organs to run an independent State had been established, the Togoland would be able to decide whether or not they wished to be associated with an adjacent territory.

8. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) observed that Mr. Odame, in his statement at the 528th meeting, had quoted the views of one of the members of the Visiting Mission, including a suggestion that the problems facing the people of Togoland should be debated in the proposed assembly strictly within the framework of the Trusteeship System. In Mr. Pachachi's opinion that implied a continuation of the Trusteeship System for Togoland under British administration.
9. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) observed that some of the petitioners from Togoland under British administration recommended that the plebiscite should take place before the Gold Coast achieved its independence, apparently foreseeing a decision in favour of integration, which would mean the inclusion of a Trust Territory in a former Non-Self-Governing Territory. He asked whether the people of Togoland had any idea when the Gold Coast would achieve independence.
10. With regard to Togoland under French administration, he asked Mr. Ajavon what role he envisaged for the United Nations in the procedure of termination of the Trusteeship Agreement.
11. Mr. AJAVON (Parti togolais du progrès) said that after the necessary reforms had been introduced in Togoland under French administration the French Government would doubtless inform the Fourth Committee of the fact and the next step to be taken would then be decided by the Fourth Committee in consultation with the Administering Authority.
12. Mr. OLYMPIO (All-Ewe Conference) regretted that Mr. Ajavon had not made his party's position clear with regard to the integration of Togoland under French administration in the French Republic. Mr. Ajavon had stated in the French Parliament that his party had drawn up a resolution, which had later been adopted by the Territorial Assembly of Togoland under French administration, expressing the wish that the Territory's present link with the French Union should be maintained; the resolution had also asked the French Government to do everything in its power to obtain that Togoland should continue to be represented in the parliamentary institutions of metropolitan France. That was pure and simple integration. Only territories which formed part of the French Republic were represented in the French Parliament. Therefore if Mr. Ajavon's party wished such representation to be continued after the termination of the trusteeship, it was clearly asking for integration of Togoland under French administration in the French Republic.
13. Mr. AJAVON (Parti togolais du progrès) explained that in his party's view each French Territory should have its own parliament and its own government. That would be tantamount to internal self-government. His party wished Togoland under French administration to continue to be represented in the metropolitan assemblies as a member of the French Union. There would be a parliament for metropolitan France and a parliament in each Territory, and the whole would form the French Union.
14. Mr. SANTOS (Juvento) pointed out that despite Mr. Ajavon's references to a parliament and a government in each Territory, he still apparently clung to the idea of a metropolitan country and a metropolitan parliament.
15. Mr. AJAVON (Parti togolais du progrès) emphasized that he was speaking of the French Union and not of the French Republic. He had also alluded to the French community. His party wished for integration in the French community but not in the French Republic.
16. Mr. FLEKU (Convention People's Party, Ho District), referring to the question asked by the representative of Yugoslavia, emphasized that in his party's opinion the first of the two questions to be put to the voters in the plebiscite, as proposed by the Visiting Mission (T/1206, para. 105), was absolutely clear and left no room for any ambiguity, whereas the second question was misleading.
17. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), addressing the members of the Convention People's Party (CPP), asked to what extent the peoples of Togoland were acquainted with the nature and scope of the independence to be achieved by the Gold Coast and the projected Constitution and if they knew whether the Gold Coast would be a unitary State or a federation.
18. Mr. ASARE (Convention People's Party, Buem Constituency) said that during 1955 a Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly of the Gold Coast had considered whether the Gold Coast should have a unitary system of government or a federal system. He himself had been a member of that Committee. The Committee had had written and oral evidence from all parts of the Gold Coast and from Togoland under British administration. Its recommendations had been put before the Assembly and fully debated and the vote had been in favour of a unitary form of government.
19. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) said Mr. Asare had omitted to add that when the motion on the appointment of a Select Committee had come before the Legislative Assembly, the Opposition had decided to boycott the Committee and had refrained from participating in the debate on the motion. The Select Committee had therefore been composed entirely of CPP members. The Opposition party and other organizations in the Gold Coast disagreed with the CPP's desire for a unitary government and had submitted comprehensive proposals for a federal constitution. That had been the beginning of the constitutional crisis. The most recent election in the Gold Coast had not been fought on the constitutional issue, and the present majority in the Legislative Assembly did not represent a majority of the people, who wished the United Kingdom Government to set up a constituent assembly or call on the CPP to dissolve the Assembly and go to the country.
20. Mr. FLEKU (Convention People's Party, Ho District) stated that the peoples of the Gold Coast and of Togoland under British administration were well aware of the form of constitution they would have when they had achieved independence. It was true that the Opposition members of the Assembly had protested when the Select Committee was set up and some of them had walked out, but views had been put before the Select Committee by various local councils and district councils in Togoland under British administration and the Committee's recommendations had been made on the basis of those views.
21. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) reminded the Committee that the Togoland Congress had refused to participate in the elections for the local councils, which had appointed the members of the regional and district councils, because it considered that the election was

based on instructions from the Gold Coast. That being so, those councils did not truly represent the views of the people of Togoland.

22. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that, according to the Visiting Mission's report, two main views had been put before the Mission, one in favour of integration with the Gold Coast and the other in favour of unification of the two Togolands and independence. He asked whether Mr. Kumah would confirm that.

23. Mr. KUMAH (Convention People's Party, Kpan-du District) confirmed that there were those two trends in the Territory.

24. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked Mr. Kumah whether he did not consider that in that case the two questions proposed in the Visiting Mission's report should be put to the people in the plebiscite.

25. Mr. KUMAH (Convention People's Party, Kpan-du District) did not think so. If the one simple question "Do you want the integration of Togoland under British administration with an independent Gold Coast?", were asked, and the majority decided in the negative, consideration could then be given to the question whether Togoland under British administration should have separate institutions and be an independent territory or join with Togoland under French administration as a unitary state.

26. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked Mr. Kumah whether in his opinion the people of Togoland were capable of taking a decision as to their future for themselves, without the intervention of a third party.

27. Mr. KUMAH (Convention People's Party, Kpan-du District) considered that the plebiscite should be held under the supervision of the United Nations and the Administering Authority, not because the people were unable to decide for themselves what they wanted, but in order that the world should know that their decision was a genuine expression of their wishes. Since the United Nations had entrusted Togoland to the United Kingdom Government as a Trust Territory, it should be a witness of their choice.

28. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the people of Togoland would not be willing to make their choice through their own institutions without the intervention of the Administering Authority.

29. Mr. KUMAH (Convention People's Party, Kpan-du District) said that in his party's opinion to set up separate institutions for Togoland under British administration immediately before holding the plebiscite would be a waste of time and money, since the decision reached as a result of the plebiscite might be such that the separate institutions in question would be dissolved immediately afterwards.

30. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that Mr. Fleku had said at the 529th meeting that the frontiers between Togoland under French administration and Togoland under British administration were artificial and that his party objected to them. He wondered what was Mr. Fousseini's opinion on that subject.

31. Mr. FOUSSENI (Union des chefs et des populations du Nord-Togo) replied that all frontiers in Africa were artificial; there had been none until the

Europeans had come to Africa. The frontier between Togoland under British administration and the Gold Coast was also artificial, since the two Territories had been administered as a single State and the people had had a similar education. Togoland had been associated with the Gold Coast for many years in the social, economic and cultural fields, whereas since the First World War the people of Togoland under British administration and the people of Togoland under French administration had been cut off from one another.

32. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether, in the opinion of the members of the Convention People's Party, a delay in settling the question of Togoland might result in a delay in the granting of independence to the Gold Coast.

33. Mr. MENSAH (Convention People's Party, Akan-Krachi Constituency) did not really know the answer but thought it was in the negative.

34. Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador) observed that the Visiting Mission had not specified when the plebiscite would be held. He presumed that it would be when the Gold Coast became independent. He wondered whether the petitioners had any idea when that would be.

35. Mr. KUMAH (Convention People's Party, Kpan-du District) said that his party's goal was to attain self-government or independence for the Gold Coast and for Togoland under British administration in 1956. It was working very hard towards that goal. If the People of the Trust Territory were to be given an opportunity to participate in the final arrangements for that independence, the plebiscite should be held as early as possible. His party had suggested March or April 1956.

36. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) explained that he was a member of the Gold Coast Legislative Assembly. He regretted that neither the Administering Authority nor the Gold Coast Government had ever been able to state publicly that the Gold Coast would become independent in 1956. When the Governor had arrived from the United Kingdom earlier in the year, he had said that the Gold Coast might achieve independence in the next two years.

37. Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador) wondered what urgency there was for an immediate plebiscite if the date when the Gold Coast would attain independence was not definitely known.

38. Mr. ASARE (Convention People's Party, Buem Constituency) reiterated that the CPP was working for the attainment of independence in 1956. It was now December 1955. That was why it was urgent to solve the Togoland problem immediately.

39. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) said that the CPP had not taken the Togoland Congress into its counsels. He therefore had no knowledge of the CPP's programme.

40. Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador) asked whether the petitioners from Togoland under British administration thought that, if the plebiscite were postponed for a year, Togoland under French administration would be ready for a plebiscite to be conducted at the same time.

41. Mr. KUMAH (Convention People's Party, Kpan-du District) replied that the issue facing the people

of Togoland under British administration was their political status after the Gold Coast attained independence. That was not a question which Togoland under French administration could decide for them. Consequently, there was no reason why the United Kingdom Trust Territory should wait for its French neighbour to be ready to decide the issue with it.

42. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) said that some of the statements he had heard made him wonder which was the more important, integration or independence. Since the date for the independence of the Gold Coast would be set by the United Kingdom Government rather than by any party, he found it difficult to see why a party programme was the main thing to be considered.

43. Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador) drew attention to a passage in the section entitled "*Cercle of Lomé*" in annex II of the Visiting Mission's report (T/1206), which indicated that Mr. Ajavon and Mr. Grunitzky, the Deputy from the Territory, had advised the Mission against attending any public rallies which might lead to disorders. Had Mr. Ajavon been of the opinion that public meetings always led to disorders or had he meant to imply that his country was not yet ready for such meetings and that they should be suppressed or severely controlled.

44. Mr. AJAVON (Parti togolais du progrès) replied that Lomé was a cosmopolitan, frontier town. Whenever a visiting mission arrived, passions ran high and any meeting could degenerate into a brawl. The Visiting Mission had been free to receive any delegations it wished to, including delegations composed of people from the United Kingdom Trust Territory. It had therefore been unnecessary, and might even have been dangerous, to organize meetings. That was why he had asked the Visiting Mission to receive people privately.

45. Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador) would like to hear from Mr. Olympio something about the part played by Togoland representatives in the French Parliament and the sort of arguments they advanced. For example, in the most recent debate on reforms for Togoland it had apparently been argued that such reforms would hasten the end of trusteeship and bring the Trust Territory into the French community.

46. Mr. OLYMPIO (All-Ewe Conference) explained that Togoland under French administration sent two Senators to the French Parliament: one was a Frenchman; Mr. Ajavon was the other. The Territory had one Deputy, Mr. Grunitzky. Mr. Olympio said that on several occasions he had quoted extracts from statements by Mr. Ajavon and Mr. Foussemi to prove that the Territory's parliamentary representatives were in full agreement with the French Government that the Trust Territory should be integrated into the French Republic, and he used the term "Republic" advisedly. The best way for the Committee to verify his statements was for the Parliamentary debates on the last bill of reforms in Togoland to be laid before it or at least before the Trusteeship Council. Those debates threw a very interesting light, and the only true light, on what the French Government believed should be done in the Trust Territory.

47. He had already referred to the motion submitted by Mr. Ajavon's party to the Territorial Assembly and endorsed by it. During the debate it had become clear that the French Minister for Overseas Territories believed that the reforms would hasten the day when

Togoland could be considered entirely integrated in the French Republic. One Senator had told Mr. Ajavon, during the debate, that he had been very pleased to hear his guarantee to the French Government that once the reforms had been introduced there would be no possibility whatever that the Trust Territory would ever secede from the French Republic. The speaker had quoted, at the 533rd meeting a similar statement made by Mr. Foussemi in the Assembly of the French Union.

48. Mr. AJAVON (Parti togolais du progrès) explained that his party's policy was to obtain by stages complete internal autonomy in the French community. He had therefore been entirely consistent in informing the French Parliament that he wanted Togoland to stay within the French Union. He had been referring not to secession from the French Republic but to secession from the French community. Just as the CPP believed that it was in the interests of Togoland under British administration to be integrated with the Gold Coast, his party believed that it was in the interests of the French Trust Territory to be integrated in the French Union, with complete autonomy within that Union. In due course, the French delegation would submit proposals for Togoland's new status to the United Nations for approval.

49. Mr. FOUSSENI (Union des chefs et des populations du Nord-Togo) was surprised that the question of Togoland's association with the French Union should give rise to so much discussion. He had made his party's position very clear and he endorsed Mr. Ajavon's statement. Togoland under French administration was not part of the French Republic but an Associated Territory. His party wished to lead the Trust Territory to complete independence within the French Union. Under the terms of the United Nations Charter, the people, and the people alone, were entitled to determine their future. The Visiting Mission's report made the aspirations of the majority quite clear. In his consistent opposition Mr. Olympio was demonstrating a lack of objectivity and good faith, since the question of parliamentary representation for Togoland had first been raised by the Comité de l'Unité togolaise (CUT) to which Mr. Olympio belonged. A CUT representative had been in the French Parliament when the first draft had been discussed; it had indeed been co-sponsored by a member of the CUT.

50. It was difficult to see why the will of the people of Togoland under French administration to stay in the French community was systematically opposed, whereas no one challenged the right of other peoples to stay in the British Commonwealth. When the French delegation submitted final proposals for the Trust Territory's future to the Committee, the people of the Trust Territory would be able to decide whether or not to stay in the French Union. In the meantime he and Mr. Ajavon appeared before the Committee to represent the opinions of the majority.

51. Mr. OLYMPIO (All-Ewe Conference) pointed out that the member of the CUT in the Assembly of the French Union and another representative, from the Cameroons under French administration, had submitted a counter-proposal. It was quite different from what had eventually been given to Togoland.

52. Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador) asked Mr. Olympio and Mr. Santos what they thought of Mr. Ajavon's contention, in his opening statement at the 530th meeting, that the metropolitan Power would

have to remain in the Trust Territory for many years, as immediate independence was impossible and assistance from the metropolitan Power would be necessary for a long time to come. It would be interesting to hear whether Mr. Olympio and Mr. Santos felt that Togoland under French administration was self-sufficient, and also their views on the country's agricultural development and the phosphate, bauxite and other mineral deposits.

53. Mr. SANTOS (Juvento) replied by challenging the Visiting Mission's conclusion that Togoland under French administration was not in a position to continue the present rate of social and economic development by itself because it needed subsidies from France to do so (T/1206, para. 123). In his opening statement (530th meeting) he had stressed the importance of such subsidies and the machinery and guiding principles under which they operated. But he had also tried to make it clear that the subsidies would be disadvantageous to the Territory in the long run, as they compromised its economic and therefore its political future. Reference had been made to large subsidies; in fact they amounted to 3,500 million francs CFA¹ over a ten-year period, or at most two years' normal revenue. Furthermore, despite the subsidies, the great increase in the population and the constantly increasing rate of consumption, production had not yet reached the pre-war level. The subsidies were clearly not being used to revitalize the country's economy and make it self-supporting but to camouflage a development trend that would make it difficult for the country to become independent in the future.

54. Expenditure on development was met almost entirely from FIDES² funds, the ordinary budget being reserved for expenditure on administrative services. The indigenous producers were neglected, their income was falling and the mercantile system was being maintained, so that continued exploitation was possible. In addition, while the people of the Trust Territory had no control over the budget, they were forced to pay back some of the money they received in the form of subsidies. Their future was therefore mortgaged to pay off loans over which they had no control and which, given the existing economy, could not be paid off in the near future. The money being lavished on social advances did not benefit the producers. For instance, subsidies amounting to 445 million francs had been allocated to the health services, 345 million francs of which had been spent on the hospital at Lomé. That hospital had less than 400 beds and its facilities were not available to the country's producers, who would one day have to pay the money back.

55. In brief, the subsidies increased the Territory's subjugation rather than helping it towards independence. It would be better for the Territory to forego the subsidies and to finance development from its own resources and with its own money.

56. Mr. AJAVON (Parti togolais du progrès) pointed out that Mr. Santos had been voicing only his personal opinions. Fortunately they were not shared by the Visiting Mission.

57. Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador) asked the petitioner from Togoland under French administration whether the Visiting Mission's report had been officially published in the Territory.

58. Mr. SANTOS (Juvento) said that up to the time of his departure from the Territory no information whatever had appeared in the official or semi-official Press to the effect that a report had been prepared as the result of the Visiting Mission's visit.

59. Mr. AJAVON (Parti togolais du progrès) said that the report had not arrived at Lomé on 20 November 1955, when he had left.

60. Mr. AMEGAH (Juvento) said that he had left the Territory two weeks after the other petitioners and only ten days ago, when there had still been no information.

61. Mr. S. M. KHAN (Pakistan) said he understood from the statements of the CPP petitioners that they were in favour of integration because they did not want to delay the attainment of independence, which seemed imminent. It would be interesting to hear what their reaction would be if they could attain independence through unification with Togoland under French administration, retaining the facilities and privileges that they hoped to receive from integration with the Gold Coast. His question was, of course, hypothetical as there could be no guarantee that the French Government would change its attitude. He would also like to hear the petitioners' reaction to immediate independence for Togoland under British administration as a separate entity, leaving aside considerations of economic viability.

62. Mr. KUMAH (Convention People's Party, Kpandu District) said that his party was in favour of integration with an independent Gold Coast because it felt that from an economic and political point of view, nothing would benefit the Trust Territory more.

63. Mr. S. M. KHAN (Pakistan) recalled that Mr. Fleku had said at the 533rd meeting that Togoland under British administration would not be viable by itself. He would like to know whether a separate budget was prepared for Togoland under British administration and whether any of the petitioners could give him an idea of the annual budget for the Territory. If not, could the petitioners from the various districts give a rough idea of revenue and expenditure in their districts?

64. Mr. FLEKU (Convention People's Party, Ho District) referred the Pakistani representative to the Trusteeship Council's special report on administrative unions (A/2151) in which the Council endorsed the view that Togoland under British administration would not be economically viable alone.

65. Mr. S. M. KHAN (Pakistan) objected that that did not answer his question about a separate budget.

66. Mr. KUMAH (Convention People's Party, Kpandu District) replied that as the Trust Territory formed an integral part of the Gold Coast, there was no occasion for the Administering Authority to publish a separate budget. In its annual reports to the United Nations, the Administering Authority attempted to show how much the Territory could produce and what was spent on its development.

67. Mr. S. M. KHAN (Pakistan) drew Mr. Nagba's attention to the Administering Authority's annual reports. The report for 1954³ gave the actual budget

³ Report by Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the General Assembly of the United Nations on Togoland under United Kingdom Administration for the year 1954, London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1955, Colonial No. 319.

¹ One franc CFA equals two French francs.

² *Fonds d'investissement pour le développement économique et social des territoires d'outre-mer.*

for the year. Before making statements about the Territory's non-viability, the petitioner should study the relevant documents.

68. Mr ASARE (Convention People's Party, Buem Constituency) replied that the petitioners were not unaware of the pertinent section of the annual report. It was only because of the cocoa boom, which had greatly raised the Trust Territory's contribution to the economy of the Gold Coast, that the Trust Territory appeared to be self-supporting. The boom might well be temporary; indeed the New York price for cocoa had fallen very low, and cocoa was the only significant product of the Trust Territory. Had the annual report been written recently, it would have been different.

69. Mr. S. M. KHAN (Pakistan) retorted that, if the petitioner was acquainted with the Trust Territory's financial position, he should have mentioned the appropriate section of the annual report immediately.

70. He wished to ask Mr. Olympio for information on prevailing financial conditions in Togoland under French administration and on financial conditions in the unified Togoland at the time of German suzerainty. He wondered whether the unification of the two Togolands would give both Trust Territories a greater revenue and more financial stability than integration of the United Kingdom Trust Territory with the Gold Coast.

71. Mr. OLYMPIO (All-Ewe Conference) said that while he had no figures for German Togoland it was quite clear from various German documents that it had been regarded as a model colony that paid its way and was not dependent on the Metropolitan country. For a number of years Togoland under French administration had also paid its way. During the previous year there had been a budget surplus of 150 million francs for paying the Territory's debt to the metropolitan country. He understood that Togoland under British administration had also been solvent for several years. The Government estimates in the 1954 annual report indicated a deficit of about £100,000 in a budget of approximately £2,600,000. While the United Kingdom Trust Territory was only one-third the size of the French Trust Territory, its budget was over half as large as that of the French Trust Territory. Consequently if the two Territories were unified, their resources should be ample to cover current expenses and pay for further development.

72. There were large-scale projects afoot for the development of the mineral resources, mainly phosphates, in Togoland under French administration. Articles in the French Press claimed that once the phosphate deposits were developed, they would revolutionize not only economic conditions in the Trust Territory but the whole economic concept of West Africa. It was therefore depressing to hear the view that a unified Togoland could not be a viable entity. Similar arguments had been advanced about the Gold Coast ten years previously, which was now said to be the richest colony in West Africa. In brief, he felt that given the resources at its disposal, a unified Togoland should be viable and quite prosperous, apart from any possible association with the Gold Coast. Togoland under British Administration should not be forced by economic reasons to integrate with the Gold Coast.

73. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) said that according to his figures the revenue for Togoland under French administration was approximately £2,700,000. The revenue of Togoland under British

administration, according to the report of the Administering Authority, was approximately £2,600,000. Out of that revenue the Territory paid for all its administrative machinery and also made contributions to development projects in the Territory and in the Gold Coast, including the expenses of the University College at Accra and the harbour facilities at Accra and Tema. He felt that Togoland under British administration could stand alone economically.

74. Mr. S. M. KHAN (Pakistan) understood that while there was universal adult suffrage by secret ballot in Togoland under British administration, suffrage in Togoland under French administration was restricted. He asked Mr. Olympio whether he considered that universal adult suffrage could be secured in Togoland under French administration without violating the Constitution of the Administering Authority. If not, would he urge that Togoland under British administration should wait until Togoland under French administration had universal suffrage before the two Territories were given an opportunity to decide upon unification, despite the view of the other petitioners?

75. Mr. OLYMPIO (All-Ewe Conference) said that the French Parliament would have to act before the electoral laws in Togoland under French administration could be altered. It was unlikely that any such action would be taken in the near future because the French view was that the same electoral laws should apply to all territories in the French Union. He suggested that in the circumstances the Administering Authority should be invited to cease administering Togoland under French administration as an integral part of the French Union, and to administer it instead as a separate Trust Territory not subject to the provisions of the French Constitution. If that was done, the Territory could be granted universal suffrage without difficulty. In regard to the question whether Togoland under British administration should be made to wait upon reforms in Togoland under French administration, he pointed out that the Visiting Mission had considered that a plebiscite could be held in Togoland under British administration although that Territory had no separate institutions. In that case, it ought to be possible to hold a plebiscite in Togoland under French administration without universal suffrage.

76. Mr. BARGUES (France) said that universal suffrage in Togoland under French administration was possible under the present French Constitution. The National Assembly had passed a bill providing for universal suffrage in all French territories including Togoland. The bill had not yet gone before the Council of the Republic.

77. Mr. FLEKU (Convention People's Party, Ho District) said that his party's reasons in favour of integration were not simply economic but also ethnic, cultural and political. As an Ewe himself, he was surprised to hear the representative of the All-Ewe Conference say that the unification of the two Togolands would satisfy them. He was sure that the Ewes in Togoland under British administration would not accept the proposal to separate them from the Gold Coast on grounds of economic stability.

78. Mr. S. M. KHAN (Pakistan) asked Mr. Antor whether it was in order to gain time that he was in favour of the establishment of separate institutions before a plebiscite was held.

79. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) said that it was not simply a question of gaining time. It was

inconceivable that a plebiscite should be held in a Territory where the people themselves were not represented in the organs which would arrange the plebiscite. The Administering Authority would have a voice in the arrangements, and through it the Gold Coast Government, and both of them had an interest in integration. The people of Togoland would have no representation. He did not believe that a plebiscite had ever been held under such conditions.

80. Mr. S. M. KHAN (Pakistan) noted that Mr. Antor feared infiltration into Togoland under British administration from the Gold Coast; he had also said that the Togoland Congress did not possess the means to combat the campaigns of the CPP, which enjoyed external support. He did not understand why, in the circumstances, he should want more time.

81. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) said that much infiltration had already taken place, unchecked by the Administering Authority. The report of the Visiting Mission showed that the two main political parties in favour of integration had headquarters outside the Trust Territory and only individual members inside it. The only national movement in the Trust Territory was the Togoland Congress. One of those outside parties constituted the Government of the Gold Coast, which had given orders to its public servants in the Trust Territory to work against the aspirations of the Togoland nationalists. Mr. Odame had informed the Committee at the 528th meeting that although the United Nations had not yet decided on a plebiscite, official plans had already been made for a campaign in the Territory. It was obvious that with such a degree of officially supported infiltration a plebiscite would not interpret the true opinion of the people of Togoland.

82. Mr. S. M. KHAN (Pakistan) thought that if Mr. Antor feared infiltration, he ought to insist on an earlier plebiscite because further delay would mean more infiltration. He asked whether the Togoland Congress would be satisfied if the question of integration was made an issue in a general election.

83. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) said that his organization would be satisfied if it had an opportunity to elect members to the Legislative Assembly in the Gold Coast in protest against integration.

84. Mr. JAIPAL (India) wished to clear up a number of points that had emerged during the questioning of the petitioners. Emphasis had been laid on the extent of public opinion against integration with the Gold Coast in the southern section of Togoland under British administration. The report of the Visiting Mission had said that opinion was well divided on the issues of unification and integration. He believed there were about 80,000 registered voters in the Ho and Kpandu districts. What were the petitioners' own estimates of the number of voters in the South in favour of integration with the Gold Coast?

85. Mr. KUMAH (Convention People's Party, Kpandu District) said that he thought that over 60 per cent of the voters were at present in favour of integration. When the report of the Visiting Mission had been released in the Trust Territory, many cocoa farmers in the South had realized that by voting against integration they would risk losing their cocoa farms which were located in the Buem-Krachi area. They had therefore decided in favour of integration.

86. Mr. FLEKU (Convention People's Party, Ho District) agreed with Mr. Kumah's estimate.

87. Mr. JAIPAL (India) noted that it had been said that Togoland under British administration could not exist alone. He asked Mr. Kumah whether he regarded union with an independent Gold Coast as meaning that Togoland would enjoy independence on an equal footing with the Gold Coast and thus attain one of the major objectives of the Trusteeship System.

88. Mr. KUMAH (Convention People's Party, Kpandu District) said that he did indeed regard integration as being synonymous with independence.

89. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that in reply to a question by the USSR representative, Mr. Kumah had said that the plebiscite should be conducted by the Administering Authority under the supervision of the United Nations. Was that on the ground that, under the Trusteeship Agreement, the Administering Authority was responsible for the administration of the Trust Territory, and as the conduct of the plebiscite was an administrative matter it was therefore within the competence of the Administering Authority; while United Nations supervision would help to ensure that there was no infiltration?

90. Mr. KUMAH (Convention People's Party, Kpandu District) replied in the affirmative.

91. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that the independence of the Gold Coast was clearly imminent. Since Togoland under British administration was administered as an integral part of the Gold Coast its views on independence should be known so that it could enjoy a proper place in the new independent state. In connexion with a question from the USSR representative, Mr. Mensah had said that a delay in holding the plebiscite need not delay the independence of the Gold Coast. Did he mean that there was no need to delay holding a plebiscite in Togoland under British administration because the objectives of the Trusteeship System had already been substantially achieved in that Territory and that any delay in the plebiscite would mean the continuance of a tutelage which was no longer necessary?

92. Mr. MENSAH (Convention People's Party, Akan-Krachi Constituency) said that that was what he had meant.

93. Mr. JAIPAL (India) asked Mr. Olympio what motives underlay the movement for Ewe unity. He wondered whether in the present circumstances it would be desirable to set up an Ewe State on a tribal basis. The Ewes unlike other tribes, did not seem to have a chief, and the need for unification of the tribe under one paramount chief was therefore absent.

94. Mr. OLYMPIO (All-Ewe Conference) said that the Indian representative seemed to have accepted the Administering Authority's figures for the Ewe population in Togoland under French administration. Those figures were not in accordance with the facts. The Indian representative had noted from the Visiting Mission's report that there were 174,390 Ewes in Togoland under French administration (T/1206, para. 82). However, the report recognized that the Ouatchis and Minas were similar in language and customs to the Ewes and if they were added to the Ewe figures, as they should be, the population was nearly 400,000. In 1947, the Administering Authorities themselves had said that the total Ewe population was in the neighbourhood of 980,000. In 1945 the Governor of Togoland under French administration had said officially that there were 412,000 Ewes in Togoland under French administration. However, in 1947 when the question

of Ewe unification had first come before the United Nations, the special representative of France in the Trusteeship Council had said that there were 290,000 Ewes in Togoland under French administration.⁴ When the 1952 Visiting Mission had gone to Lomé, it had been told that the Ewe population was 175,929 (T/1105, para. 34). In the 1955 report, the figure had sunk to 174,390. It was unfortunate that the Indian representative had accepted those figures without question.

95. The Ewe people were a tribe of roughly 1 million persons in Togoland under French administration, Togoland under British administration and the south-eastern part of the Gold Coast. After experiencing brutal oppression under a single ruler some 200 years ago, they had instituted a system of democratically elected chiefs who were deposed if they ceased to watch over the welfare of their people. The Ewes had approached the United Nations to seek its intervention with the Administering Authorities to allow the Ewes in the Trust Territories to be united under one administration. Since the Administering Authorities opposed that plan, the Ewe people were now in favour of independence. When the Trust Territories were independent it would be easier for the Ewes to regroup themselves.

96. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that his delegation was naturally obliged to accept the official figures for the Ewe population. Quite apart from the figures, however, he was interested in the motives of the Ewe unification movement. It would seem rather undemocratic for one of the most advanced peoples in West Africa to seek unity on a purely tribal basis. Moreover, the continued association of the Ewes in Togoland under British administration with the Ewes in the Gold Coast would, to a large extent, achieve that unity. If the Ewes in Togoland under British administration were separated from the Gold Coast in the hope of an eventual union with Togoland under French administration, the Gold Coast Ewes would be left outside. Would it not be best to allow the association of the Ewes in the Gold Coast and in Togoland under British administration to develop and to let the Ewes from Togoland under French administration join them after they had achieved independence?

97. Mr. OLYMPIO (All-Ewe Conference) said that his party feared that once Togoland under British administration had been integrated with the Gold Coast, Togoland under French administration would be integrated with the French Republic, thus making it impossible for the Ewes ever to be united. At a meeting of Ewes in the Gold Coast it had been decided that the integration of the Ewes in Togoland under British administration with the Gold Coast would not be in the best interests of the Ewe people as a whole.

98. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) noted that the Ewe figures for the Gold Coast had been inflated by the large number of Ewes from Togoland under British administration who had been forced by the policy of integrated administration to seek employment in the Gold Coast.

99. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that despite the possible economic advantages that would accrue from the unification of the two Togolands, there were certain practical problems involved. It was clear that Togoland under British administration was ready for independence together with an independent Gold Coast,

while Togoland under French administration had not yet reached that point. Thus, unification would mean a delay in the independence of Togoland under British administration. Moreover, there would be difficulties in establishing one administration out of two very different systems. Furthermore, the peoples in the northern part of both Territories were not in favour of unification. He asked Mr. Olympio whether, apart from Ewe unity, there was any good reason for unification. Many people felt that the destiny of Togoland under British administration lay with an independent Gold Coast. On the other hand, Togoland under French administration could be independent on its own. In both cases the Territories would be independent, so why was it so important to secure unification?

100. Mr. OLYMPIO (All-Ewe Conference) said that the chief argument against integration lay in the fact that once Togoland had become part of the Gold Coast, the two Togolands could never be united. The Indian representative assumed that the people of Togoland under British administration were in favour of integration; the plebiscite would prove it one way or another. The Visiting Mission's report recognized that there was also a strong movement for unification based on ethnic ties and on economic and other considerations. Proper steps should be taken to find out what the majority view really was, and the question should not be prejudged in the plebiscite.

101. Mr. JAIPAL (India) agreed that the matter should be determined by a plebiscite. Whatever the arguments in favour of unification had once been, they had changed with the change in the political situation. He could not however agree with the attempt to use the Ewes in Togoland under French administration in order to decide the fate of the Ewes in Togoland under British administration and the Gold Coast.

102. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) said that Mr. Fleku had told the Committee at the 529th meeting that he was opposed to the idea of dividing Togoland under British administration into zones for purposes of the plebiscite on the grounds that it would create a new frontier. Did he mean the temporary frontier created for the purposes of the plebiscite or a new frontier that would arise out of the results of the plebiscite?

103. Mr. FLEKU (Convention People's Party, Ho District) said that if the recommendations of the Visiting Mission's report were accepted, it was possible that people in a particular region would vote differently from those in other regions within Togoland under British administration. Thus a new frontier might arise separating the North and South while the intolerable frontier separating Eastern and Western Togoland, the two Trust Territories, was still unremoved.

104. Mr. SAAB (Lebanon) said that many forms of association had been suggested to the people of Togoland: association with the Gold Coast, association with the French Union, association with each other. He asked Mr. Ajavon whether he did not think that an independent Togoland would be in a better position to choose.

105. Mr. AJAVON (Parti togolais du progrès) said that since the Territories were not independent, he was not prepared to give an opinion.

106. The CHAIRMAN said that the hearing of the petitioners had now been concluded.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

⁴ See *Official Records of the Trusteeship Council, Second Session, First Part, 13th meeting.*