



Monday, 14 January 1957,
 at 10.45 a.m.

New York

CONTENTS

Agenda item 39:

The Togoland unification problem and the future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration: reports of the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner and of the Trusteeship Council (*continued*)
 Consideration of draft resolutions on the future of Togoland under French administration 247

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

AGENDA ITEM 39

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

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

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON THE FUTURE OF TOGOLAND UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION (A/C.4/L.452/REV.1, A/C.4/L.453/REV.1 AND ADD.1)

1. Miss SHELTON (Cuba) said that since her delegation had not intervened in the general debate she would now explain its attitude.
2. Unfortunately, owing to circumstances of which all were aware, the referendum in Togoland under French administration had not been conducted in co-operation with the United Nations. Nevertheless the result had been a very large majority in favour of the Statute and a number of delegations had agreed that the Statute represented a step towards the attainment of the objectives of the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement.
3. Her delegation thanked the French delegation for its clear statements and the replies it had given to the questions asked.
4. With regard to the draft resolutions and proposed amendments, she would vote in favour of all the seven-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.454) to the Indian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.452/Rev.1) and was prepared to support that draft if the amendments were incorporated.

5. Mr. LOOMES (Australia) said that he too had refrained from speaking in the general debate. His delegation's position was very similar to that expressed at previous meetings by the representatives of Canada and the United States.

6. To explain his vote he would be obliged to refer to the differences between the two methods of approach shown in the two draft resolutions before the Committee (A/C.4/L.452/Rev.1, A/C.4/L.453/Rev.1 and Add.1). Both those draft resolutions were fundamentally directed towards the same end, i.e., the dispatch of a commission to Togoland under French administration. Neither of them prejudged the issue of the degree of autonomy achieved by the Territory or the question of the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement. The Indian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.452/Rev.1), however, omitted certain important elements, mostly relating to questions of fact, which were included in the six-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.453/Rev.1 and Add.1) and in the joint amendments (A/C.4/L.454) to the Indian text.

7. Firstly, the Indian draft resolution contained no reference to the memorandum by the Government of the Autonomous Republic of Togoland. Since the memorandum had been circulated as an official United Nations document (A/C.4/341) it seemed unnecessarily exclusive not to refer to it. The Committee was not called upon to approve its contents but merely to note the fact that it had been received.

8. Secondly, the Indian draft resolution made no reference to the referendum held on 28 October 1956 and its results. That was an extraordinary omission since the debate had been largely based on the fact that the referendum had taken place and that the people of Togoland had expressed themselves by a substantial majority in favour of the reforms introduced by the Statute.

9. The Indian draft resolution also failed to refer to the invitation extended by the Government of the Autonomous Republic of Togoland to the United Nations to send a commission to the Territory. That again was purely a question of fact and there was no reason why it should not be mentioned.

10. Moreover, the draft resolution failed to recognize the important political developments which had taken place in the Territory: indeed, the Indian representative had strongly opposed the inclusion of any such recognition. The Committee was not called upon to express any opinion on the question of the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement or on the adequacy of the Statute to justify its termination, but the General Assembly should surely show its appreciation of the enormous advances made by the people of Togoland under French administration, particularly in the political field. In that connexion it was significant that all the petitioners, including the representatives of the opposition parties, had recognized that the Statute was a significant step forward.

11. A further important difference lay in the terms of reference to be granted to the commission. The six-Power draft resolution rightly envisaged that the commission should examine the practical application of the Statute and the conditions in which it was being applied. The Indian draft resolution called upon the commission to "examine the entire situation in the Territory". Such an examination would be more appropriate for a regular periodic visiting mission than for the special commission, the very existence of which presupposed the existence of a special situation. Furthermore it would be unnecessary and unrealistic to expect the commission to consider details of administration in all fields, as it would have to do in order to carry out the mandate given to it in the Indian draft resolution.

12. For all those reasons he would vote in favour of the six-Power draft resolution and would also support all the joint amendments to the Indian draft resolution.

13. With regard to the Philippine amendment (A/C.4/L.455), he was not sure what was meant by the phrase "in addition to such further reforms as the Authorities concerned may deem appropriate", and the remainder of the amendment appeared unnecessary since it merely repeated what was already stated in article 6 of the Statute. Moreover, he agreed with the view expressed by the New Zealand representative at the previous meeting that the proposal would be out of place in a resolution which called for study and further consideration of the matter. He would therefore be unable to support the Philippine amendment.

14. He expressed his appreciation of the constructive and co-operative manner in which the members of the French delegation had placed the question before the Committee.

15. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) recalled that when he had spoken in the general debate (594th meeting) he had not referred to any of the draft resolutions before the Committee because the situation at that time had been fluid and he had preferred to wait.

16. In his opinion the Indian draft resolution and the amendments suffered from one serious omission: although the French delegation had stated that it would not press for immediate termination of the Trusteeship Agreement, it had made it clear that it considered the Statute in its present form justified the termination of the trusteeship and that the request had merely been postponed. The majority of speakers in the general debate had expressed the opinion that the Statute could not be regarded as fulfilling the objectives of the Trusteeship System and could not therefore be accepted as a basis for the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement. In view of that widespread sentiment it would have been proper for the General Assembly to express itself formally on that aspect of the question.

17. While it was true that the Statute had not been subjected to the close study it deserved, the questions raised and the answers given by the French representative and the petitioners had helped to clarify one basic fact which was of supreme importance: namely, that it conferred neither independence nor full self-government, but only a limited form of local autonomy which, according to the letter and spirit of the Charter, could not be accepted as a reason for terminating the Trusteeship Agreement. Further study would not materially

affect that fundamental fact; it might reinforce the belief that the Statute fell far short of the objectives of the Trusteeship System. An expression of opinion on those lines would have been welcomed by the Iraqi delegation, but he would not press the point and would be ready to accept the Indian draft resolution as a reasonable compromise. Since the study requested by the General Assembly in resolution 944 (X) following a proposal by the French delegation (A/C.4/L.431, para. 7) had been impossible owing to the obstructive attitude of that delegation, the General Assembly should once again attempt to make a study and the sending of a commission might be of some help. He would therefore vote in favour of the Indian draft resolution as it stood.

18. He had no objection to the first of the joint amendments (A/C.4/L.454).

19. With regard to amendment 2, he was unable to agree with the Canadian representative that there was no need to select any particular passage of General Assembly resolution 944 (X). As he had said during the general debate, paragraph 3 of that resolution was the key paragraph and the only one that called for any definite action. It would therefore be wrong to attribute to paragraphs 1 and 2 the same significance as to paragraph 3. Moreover, since the resolution to be adopted would request the Trusteeship Council to undertake the study which it had been unable to undertake the previous year, paragraph 3 of resolution 944 (X) should be reflected in the preamble. For those reasons he would vote against amendment 2.

20. With reference to the first paragraph proposed in amendment 3, he must reiterate that the memorandum in document A/C.4/341 must be regarded as emanating from the French Government. Moreover, if the document was a request for the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement, the matter was already covered by the third paragraph of the preamble of the Indian draft resolution; if it contained a notification of the termination of the trusteeship, it was obviously not receivable by the General Assembly, since such a question could not be decided unilaterally. For those reasons, the proposed paragraph was either superfluous or entirely out of order, and he would vote against it.

21. The second paragraph proposed in amendment 3 was objectionable on two counts: firstly, the United Nations could not accept the assumption that the majority in Togoland under French administration had approved the Statute; he did not intend to suggest that the referendum had not been conducted freely or impartially, but in the absence of United Nations observers the Fourth Committee could not commit itself. Secondly, the results of the vote were incorrectly stated. The Referendum Administrator had not said that the population had voted in favour of certain reforms. That was a secondary matter. The people had been told that the Statute was tantamount to termination of the trusteeship, and the conclusion of the proposed paragraph was therefore unfair to the Referendum Administrator and to the United Nations itself.

22. With regard to amendment 4, so far as the United Nations was concerned the only Government it could recognize was the Government of the French Republic, which was the Administering Authority. When the question of Togoland under British administration had been before the Committee, the Minister of Finance of the Gold Coast had never been described as other than a member of the United Kingdom delegation.

23. With regard to amendment 5, he could not understand why the application of the Statute should be regarded as the important matter. A study of the Statute must necessarily include a study of its application; moreover, even if its application were perfect, there would still be serious misgivings about the Statute itself as a justification for the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement.

24. He would vote against the second paragraph proposed in amendment 6 for the same reasons as he had given with regard to the previous mention of the Autonomous Republic of Togoland.

25. With regard to amendment 7, it was as yet too early to appraise the effects of the new reforms. The objectives of Article 76 of the Charter were independence or self-government. The Statute did not contemplate independence, but as a step towards self-government it might be subject to many interpretations. The commission should be left to conduct its inquiries without prejudice. After all, if the Statute was a decisive step, as stated in the amendment, there would be no point in sending a commission; the most important part of the commission's work would be to determine whether it was a decisive step or not. He would therefore vote against that amendment.

26. With reference to amendments 9 and 10, he did not consider that the commission's terms of reference should be restricted. It must be free to study the entire situation and not only to see how the Statute was being applied. He would therefore vote against those amendments.

27. He had no strong views with regard to amendment 8 and would follow the line taken by the majority.

28. He paid a tribute to the petitioners for the manner in which they had presented their views; all the members of the Committee had been impressed by the statesmanlike and mature way in which they had discussed the questions relating to their country. He was also grateful to the French representatives for the manner in which they had expressed their views and responded to the questions put to them.

29. He emphasized that his delegation's stand in no way reflected his Government's difficulties with the French Government; it was firmly convinced that the Statute fell far short of the objectives of Article 76 of the Charter. Nevertheless, in a spirit of compromise it was ready to support the Indian draft resolution in order that the Assembly should have one more chance to study the matter and arrive at an equitable solution of the problem.

30. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said she had endeavoured to be conciliatory and to assist in reaching a solution which would promote the paramount interests of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory. She had therefore agreed to co-sponsor the joint amendments in document A/C.4/L.454. She had, however, certain reservations with regard to amendments 1 and 2 and the first paragraph proposed in amendment 3 and she would abstain in the vote on the second paragraph proposed in that amendment. With reference to the second paragraph in amendment 6, she would be obliged to abstain in the vote on the words "of the Autonomous Republic". In amendment 8, she would vote against the inclusion of the words "the President of" because she thought the proposed commission should be elected by the Members of the General Assembly.

31. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) said that he was glad the French delegation was no longer pressing for the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement and that it had decided to transmit the invitation of the Government of Togoland to the Fourth Committee.

32. With reference to the joint amendments to the Indian draft resolution, he said he would abstain on the second paragraph proposed in amendment 3, not because he had any doubts concerning the conduct of the referendum but because the Trusteeship Council had originally been invited to supervise it and had been unable to do so.

33. With regard to the Philippine amendment (A/C.4/L.455), although in principle he was in favour of the idea of the Legislative Assembly's being elected on the basis of universal suffrage, he felt that that recommendation should be made by the proposed commission.

34. He was glad to note the spirit of conciliation which had been shown in the Committee and hoped that the result of the vote would lead to the triumph of the letter and spirit of Article 76 b of the Charter.

35. Mr. SHAMMAH (Lebanon) said that there were two issues involved in the question of the future of Togoland under French administration. The first was the basic one of whether the reforms granted under the Statute justified the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement. It was his delegation's view that they fell far short of doing so, although they were admittedly a very important step towards preparing the Territory for independence and one on which the people of Togoland and the Administering Authority were to be congratulated. The second and more immediate issue concerned the sending of a commission to Togoland. His delegation considered that the commission's terms of reference should be wide enough to enable it to study any aspects of the problem which might help the General Assembly reach a decision as to the termination of the trusteeship. His delegation considered that the draft resolution finally adopted by the Committee should exclude any term which might prejudice those two issues and it would vote accordingly.

36. Mr. LARAKI (Morocco) said that he had been surprised to hear the French representative state at the previous meeting that the situation in the two Togolands was not comparable. Their situation had been exactly the same when the League of Nations had divided the administration of Togoland between France and the United Kingdom and had still been identical when the United Nations had assumed the functions of the League. Moreover it had been considered identical even during the previous session of the General Assembly, since a referendum, to be held under exactly the same conditions, had been envisaged for both Territories.

37. His delegation was convinced that the reforms introduced by the Statute would be continued and expanded, especially if the present Minister for Overseas France, whose liberalism and goodwill were acknowledged by all, remained in office. It was wrong, however, to compare the situation in Togoland with the case of Morocco, since his country's position had been that of an independent country which had merely entrusted its defence and foreign affairs to another nation.

38. His delegation would support any resolution which, while taking note of the reforms embodied in the Statute, did not prejudice the situation in the Terri-

tory. It would therefore vote in favour of the Indian draft resolution. France was, however, to be congratulated on the spirit of conciliation it had displayed during the discussion, and in the same spirit his delegation would vote in favour of the amendments submitted by the seven-Powers to the extent that those amendments did not prejudice the future development of the Territory. It would vote against the second paragraph proposed in amendment 3, because the referendum had been organized against the advice of the Trusteeship Council; and would abstain in the vote on the second paragraph proposed in amendment 6, because it would be premature to refer to the Autonomous Republic of Togoland before the proposed commission had reported on the situation. It would also vote against amendment 8.

39. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) said that, at the 596th meeting, his delegation had expressed its support in principle of the amendments submitted by the seven Powers and would vote in favour of them, with certain reservations. In voting in favour of amendment 3 it did not wish to imply that the establishment of the Autonomous Republic of Togoland was enough to justify the termination of trusteeship; moreover its attitude was partly based on the fact that further reforms had been introduced after the decree of 24 August 1956. His delegation would have preferred the fourth paragraph of the preamble to read "...the delegation of France, which included representatives from Togoland"; it would however vote in favour of amendment 4 as it stood because it did not think the sponsors of the amendments had intended any pre-judgement of the Autonomous Republic of Togoland.

40. In voting in favour of the second paragraph proposed in amendment 6, his delegation did not mean to imply that it would be necessary in future to obtain the permission of the Government of Togoland as well as the Administering Authority before sending a visiting mission to the Territory. The Trusteeship Council continued to have the right to send such missions.

41. In connexion with amendment 9, his delegation had suggested that the commission should be asked also to take into account the discussion in the Fourth Committee. If that suggestion was adopted, his delegation would vote in favour of the amendments and of the amended Indian draft resolution.

42. Mr. TSUCHIYA (Japan) thanked the petitioners and the representatives of France for their explanations. His delegation had listened with interest to the discussion and was now more eager than ever to learn what was the precise situation in the Territory. It felt that any new decision on the issue would have important consequences for other Trust Territories and that the General Assembly should therefore proceed cautiously even if that meant delaying its decision for a time.

43. His delegation would support a draft resolution recommending the sending of an impartial commission, appointed by the General Assembly, to observe and examine not only the application of the Statute but any other matters which might have a bearing on the future of Togoland. Japan hoped, moreover, that in accomplishing its work the commission would pay special attention to the aspirations and welfare of the people of Togoland as well as to the steps taken by the French Government.

44. Mr. MASOOD (Pakistan) said his delegation would vote in favour of the six-Power draft resolution

and the seven-Power amendments submitted to the Indian draft resolution. It considered the two draft resolutions before the Committee to be essentially identical in substance, the main difference being that the joint draft resolution took cognizance of the reforms introduced by the Administering Authority and of the co-operation of the Autonomous Republic of Togoland. In voting in favour of the joint draft resolution, his delegation did not intend to express any judgement of the referendum or the adequacy of the reforms. It wished only to acknowledge that a step in the right direction had been taken, for it was confident that the democratic forces released by that first step could not but gather momentum, to culminate eventually in the emergence of yet another freedom-loving nation. It was his delegation's view that the United Nations should be utilized to further the spirit of co-operation among countries rather than as a forum for exacerbating the feelings of one country or group against another. Evolution invariably took time and it was the aim of the United Nations to expedite and stabilize the process of evolution.

45. His Government would follow developments in Togoland with the keenest interest and it wished to assure the people and the Government of that Territory that, were any step taken which was likely to retard the fulfilment of their national aspirations, it would not hesitate to raise its voice in support of their cause.

46. Mrs. MONTEJO (Costa Rica) said that her delegation considered the two draft resolutions to be very similar and regretted that their sponsors had been unable to agree on a joint version. That having proved impossible, it would vote in favour of the seven-Power amendments. It could not, however, vote in favour of any reference to the Autonomous Republic of Togoland, since the status granted to the Territory under the Statute did not remotely approach self-government, nor could it vote in favour of any reference to a referendum which had not been held in co-operation with the United Nations. In connexion with amendment 8, her delegation felt that the commission should be appointed by the General Assembly, for the reasons of democratic procedure mentioned at the previous meeting by the Guatemalan representative. Her delegation could not support any decision on the substance of the question; it would therefore vote against the Philippine amendment (A/C.4/L.455).

47. Those reservations did not, however, mean that Costa Rica wished to withhold from the people and Government of Togoland its congratulations on the progress they had achieved.

48. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said his delegation would have opposed any decision to terminate the Trusteeship Agreement. Since, however, France had withdrawn its request that trusteeship should be terminated, his delegation felt that the General Assembly should take a positive attitude toward the question and that the Statute should be studied further before any decision was taken. It was in the light of those considerations that his delegation had examined the joint amendments.

49. It found amendments 1 and 2 acceptable and had no difficulty in supporting the first paragraph proposed in amendment 3, since it merely stated a fact. The second paragraph, however, might be interpreted as prejudging the decision of the General Assembly, and his delegation accordingly suggested that the first part

should be replaced by the words "*Having received* the report of the Referendum Administrator in Togoland (A/3169/Add.1, annex II), which states that the population of Togoland..."

50. Amendment 4 presented some difficulties for his delegation, which had always felt that the indigenous inhabitants of Trust Territories should be represented in the United Nations not merely by the Administering Authorities but by separate delegations of their own. Nevertheless his delegation felt that it could vote in favour of the amendment without prejudging the decision of the General Assembly.

51. In connexion with amendment 5, it supported the suggestion made at the previous meeting by the Guatemalan representative.

52. It would support amendment 6, because it felt that so long as the Trusteeship Agreement still remained in force it made no difference whether or not mention was made of the Autonomous Republic of Togoland.

53. In the first paragraph proposed in amendment 7 the word "decisive" should be replaced by the word "important"; otherwise his delegation found the paragraph acceptable, since the Statute did represent a step forward. The second paragraph proposed in amendment 7 was also acceptable in that there was nothing in it which could prejudice the question.

54. In connexion with amendment 8, his delegation would prefer the commission to be appointed by the General Assembly; it did not, however, wish its vote to be interpreted as a reflection on the President of the General Assembly, and would therefore abstain in the vote.

55. Amendment 10 made the commission's terms of reference broad enough to include all the relevant factors in the situation; taken together, amendments 9 and 10 were therefore acceptable.

56. His delegation would vote in favour of the amendments as indicated, in the spirit of conciliation which it felt the Committee should adopt.

57. Mr. MATHUR (Nepal) held that the title of the memorandum referred to in the first paragraph proposed in amendment 3 was incorrect since Togoland did not enjoy autonomy and was not a republic. The second paragraph proposed in that amendment seemed to him unnecessary. With regard to amendment 4, he thought that until the commission had made a report it could not be decided whether the term "Government of Togoland" could properly be used; the same argument applied to the reference to the Autonomous Republic of Togoland in the second paragraph proposed in amendment 6. In amendment 7 he would propose that the words "*Considers with satisfaction*" should be replaced by "*Notes*". He presumed that the word "entire" referred to in amendment 9 was intended to indicate that the commission would study all that had happened in Togoland under French administration since the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Togoland under British Administration and Togoland under French Administration, 1955, had been there. He saw no necessity for amendment 10.

58. While the promulgation of the Statute did not in itself realize the objectives set forth in Article 76 of the Charter, it was a step towards self-government and the French Government was to be congratulated on having taken it.

59. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines), replying to the comments of the New Zealand and Australian representatives on the Philippine amendment, said that until such time as the further evolution provided for in article 38 of the Statute had occurred, that instrument could not be considered the basis for termination of the Trusteeship Agreement. His delegation's amendment envisaged a series of further reforms through the evolution of the Statute which might bring about a sufficient degree of autonomy to allow of the General Assembly's considering, at its twelfth session, the possibility of terminating the Trusteeship Agreement.

60. Regarding the second part of his amendment, article 6 of the Statute itself provided for the election of the Legislative Assembly on the basis of universal adult suffrage. The present Legislative Assembly had been elected in 1955 as a deliberative and consultative body by special categories of electors totalling only half as many voters as those now registered under the new system of universal adult suffrage. At that time there had been no indication that termination of the Trusteeship Agreement would be considered and the Assembly had not been elected for the purpose of deciding the future status of the Territory. He did not therefore think that the present Legislative Assembly reflected the true wishes of the people. Under article 13 of the Statute the High Commissioner had the power to dissolve the Assembly and call for a new election. The Philippine delegation thought that that election should be held as quickly as possible. If it was held before the commission visited the Territory, the commission would be in a better position to report on the practical operation of the governmental institutions established by the Statute, as called for in paragraph 3 of the six-Power draft resolution. Those institutions were two in number: the Council of Ministers, which had already been established, and the Legislative Assembly, which had not yet been elected in accordance with the provisions of the Statute. Once the Assembly had been elected on the basis of universal suffrage, its deliberations would bear the stamp of approval of the entire people. He would therefore be willing to embody in the Philippine amendment, should the Committee so decide, the suggestion made by the Guatemalan representative at the previous meeting to the effect that the commission should not be dispatched until after such an election had taken place.

61. Mr. SOWARD (Canada) held that a resolution failing to take into account the feelings of the people of Togoland and their leaders would be justifiably resented by them. It was important that the commission which was to be sent to the Territory should enjoy their complete co-operation. He could not therefore accept the Nepalese suggestion that the words "*Considers with satisfaction*" should be replaced by "*Notes*". He would be willing to accept the Yugoslav and Venezuelan suggestions and any others that might improve the six-Power draft resolution without substantially altering its intent.

62. Mr. TAZHIBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that since France had withdrawn its request for immediate termination of the Trusteeship Agreement and there was general agreement in the Committee that no decision on the substance of the matter should be taken until a commission had reported on the situation in the Territory, the Indian draft resolution was preferable to the six-Power draft resolution, which was at variance with those basic considerations.

63. All the substantive amendments proposed by the seven Powers implied approval of the referendum even though it had been carried out in the absence of United Nations observers. They likewise sought to legitimize the establishment of the Autonomous Republic of Togoland. Since the Committee had decided not to take any final decision at present on the reforms instituted by the Statute, it would be inconsistent to adopt amendments which would in essence constitute a judgement on the referendum and the Statute. His delegation would vote against any such amendments. For the same reasons it would abstain from voting on the Yugoslav suggestions although they were an improvement on the original. With regard to amendment 7, of the joint amendments, no delegation would wish to go on record as not welcoming any progressive developments which the reforms introduced by the Statute might bring about. The people of Togoland were to be congratulated on having attained a certain degree of autonomy which in time would lead to further progress toward self-government. Nevertheless, since the Committee had decided to postpone a final decision until the report of the proposed commission had been studied by the Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly, amendment 7 was unwarranted and

he would therefore vote against it. He would vote in favour of the Philippine amendment if the majority did likewise.

64. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) said that during the previous meeting he had made suggestions on the draft resolutions and amendments in the hope of eliciting the Committee's reactions. He was now ready to present those suggestions in the form of amendments. In the sixth paragraph of the preamble to the Indian draft resolution he proposed the addition of the words "and their application" following the words "24 August 1956". In the first paragraph of amendment 7 proposed by the seven-Powers, he proposed that the word "decisive" should be replaced by "important". He would not support the deletion of the word "entire", as proposed in amendment 9, but would support amendment 10.

65. Since the Philippine representative had left it to the Committee to decide whether to accept the addition to its amendment suggested by the Guatemalan delegation at the previous meeting, he would not present that suggestion as a formal amendment.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.