

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

NINTH SESSION
Official Records



FOURTH COMMITTEE, 468th

(CLOSING) MEETING

Monday, 13 December 1954,
at 3.5 p.m.

New York

C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 35: The Togoland unification problem: special report of the Trusteeship Council (<i>concluded</i>)	} 467
Agenda item 52: The future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under United Kingdom trusteeship (<i>concluded</i>)	} 469
Completion of the Committee's work.....	469

Chairman: Mr. Rafik ASHA (Syria).

AGENDA ITEMS 35 AND 52

The Togoland unification problem: special report of the Trusteeship Council (A/2669, A/C.4/L.388) (*concluded*)

The future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under United Kingdom trusteeship (A/2660, A/C.4/L.388) (*concluded*)

CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY INDIA AND AMENDMENTS THERETO (A/C.4/L.370/REV.2, A/C.4/L.384/REV.1, A/C.4/L.385, A/C.4/L.387) (*concluded*)

1. Mr. VIXSEBOXSE (Netherlands) wished to explain his vote at the previous meeting on the Indian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.370/Rev.2) and the amendments thereto.

2. The Netherlands delegation had taken no part in the general debate on the Togoland items because it felt that under the prevailing conditions no substantial contribution could be made towards a solution except that indicated in the original Indian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.370). In the opinion of the Netherlands delegation a new situation had been created by the facts set forth in the United Kingdom memorandum (A/2660) and consequently no fruitful discussion would be possible until the vital information concerning the expressed desires of the population of Togoland under British administration was available. The best way to obtain that information would be to adopt the procedure proposed in the original Indian draft resolution. The additions that had been made to that draft resolution might well delay or even prevent a solution. He had therefore voted against the amendments proposed by various delegations and had abstained on the second part of operative paragraph 1. He had, however, been glad to be able to support the draft resolution as a whole.

3. Mr. ARENALES (Guatemala) had abstained from participating in the general debate and from discussing the various draft resolutions and amendments for a number of reasons.

4. First, his delegation maintained a claim against the United Kingdom concerning the territory of Belize (British Honduras) and would refrain from any action that might prejudice its unshakable determination that the United Kingdom should recognize Guatemala's rights there.

5. Secondly, Guatemala could not admit that an administrative union could be transformed into a political union for any reason whatsoever.

6. Thirdly, it was impossible to separate the problem of Togoland under British administration from that of Togoland as a whole. It was most regrettable that the views of a considerable section of the population, whether they formed a majority or a minority, were being ignored.

7. Fourthly, in view of the above facts his delegation could have participated in the debate only by confining its remarks entirely to the solution of unification, thus taking a unilateral view of the problem which might have been contrary to the true interests of the inhabitants of the two Trust Territories.

8. For all those reasons he had been obliged to abstain in the voting on the second part of operative paragraph 1 and on the draft resolution as a whole.

9. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) said that his delegation had supported the first and second paragraphs of the preamble of the revised Indian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.370/Rev.2) and had abstained on the third, fourth and fifth. He had voted in favour of paragraph 1 of the operative part, of paragraph 2, of paragraph 3 as amended by the Polish delegation, of paragraph 4 and of the additional operative paragraph proposed by the Philippine delegation. He had been unable, however, to vote for the draft resolution as a whole because he considered that the purpose of the text, even in its improved form, was that Togoland under British administration should be integrated with the Gold Coast. In the opinion of the Haitian delegation the policy being pursued by the United Kingdom Government was a danger to the International Trusteeship System.

10. He expressed good wishes for the future of the free and independent Gold Coast.

11. Mr. TRIANTAPHYLLAKOS (Greece) said he had voted in favour of all the amendments proposed by the Polish delegation (A/C.4/L.385) because in his considered opinion they would have improved the original draft resolution. For the same reason he had voted in favour of those Philippine amendments (A/C.4/L.384/Rev.1) which had been put to the vote.

12. He had abstained on the third, fourth and fifth paragraphs of the preamble of the Indian draft resolution and had voted against the words in the fifth paragraph "of its particular circumstances and" and the words "in the light of the particular circumstances of the Territory" in paragraph 1 of the operative part.

13. Despite his view that it should have been amended further, he had voted for the draft resolution as a whole as amended because the matter would come up again for final consideration the following year, and in order to give the populations an opportunity to express their opinions.

14. Mr. JOUBLANC RIVAS (Mexico), referring to the remarks made by the representative of Guatemala, repeated what he had said at the beginning of the session: if at any future time the juridical status of Belize should be changed, his Government reserved its right over a part of that territory.

15. The Mexican delegation had participated in the efforts to obtain a combined text which might not only achieve a two-thirds majority in the plenary meeting but might also be implemented as soon and as successfully as possible by the various parties in Togoland. Perhaps only those representatives who had participated in the negotiations were able fully to appreciate the value of the second revised version of the Indian draft resolution. At one time the Committee had been in danger of approving a draft resolution which could not have been put into practice. Hence, although his delegation had been in agreement with most of the principles embodied in the various amendments proposed, it had felt forced to abstain with regard to some of them and to vote against others.

16. The draft resolution as approved by the Fourth Committee did not completely satisfy the Mexican delegation, but he was convinced that it was the maximum that could be obtained at the present time and had therefore voted for it.

17. Mr. PIGNON (France) confirmed his previous statements, particularly his statement with regard to the special visiting mission (465th meeting).

18. He had abstained in the vote on the additional final paragraph proposed by the Philippine delegation (A/C.4/L.384/Rev.1, para. 5), first because he had not been satisfied by the Philippine representative's explanation (466th meeting) of the meaning of the expression "the greater interests of the United Nations" and, secondly, because a paragraph couched in such general terms was out of place in a resolution dealing with a specific subject.

19. Mr. BOURDILLON (United Kingdom), in reply to the representatives of Guatemala and Mexico, would merely say that he had made the position of the United Kingdom clear at an early stage of the debate on the report of the Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories (411th meeting) and that it had not changed during the past two months.

20. His delegation had said that it would vote for the original draft resolution proposed by the Indian delegation (A/C.4/L.370). Despite the various changes made, his delegation had been able to vote for the draft resolution as a whole in its final form, though not for all the individual parts.

21. He paid a tribute to the various delegations which had worked hard to produce a text that had received a very wide measure of support.

22. A difficult task now faced the Trusteeship Council. He would once again emphasize that it was essential that the choice to be put to the people of Togoland under British administration should be a clear and real one. The United Kingdom Government could not agree, for example, to an interpretation of paragraph 1 which would amount to an *a priori* proposition that it

would not be possible to consult the people of Togoland under British administration unless all the various alternatives were put to them simultaneously, since one of the alternatives was clearly impracticable at the present time.

23. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that when the Indian draft resolution as finally amended had been put to the vote, he had abstained for a number of basic reasons.

24. The draft resolution as amended was a procedural step to countenance the annexation of a Trust Territory by an Administering Authority. In his delegation's view, any such annexation was a negation of the fundamental principles that underlay the International Trusteeship System.

25. He had abstained on the draft resolution as a whole because it did not contain any provision for a thorough study of the various constitutional, moral and international aspects of whatever decisions the United Nations might take on the future of Togoland under British administration.

26. He had also objected to the fact that the draft resolution as finally approved ignored many of the important resolutions adopted by the General Assembly in the past.

27. He considered that the plebiscite envisaged in the Indian draft resolution would be a mockery in view of the present laws in the Gold Coast whereby citizens of the Gold Coast would be able to vote in Togoland under British administration in favour of annexation.

28. The draft resolution also ignored all requests for the re-establishment of the Joint Council for Togoland Affairs, obviously because the Administering Authorities were preparing for the outright annexation of the Trust Territory into the Gold Coast.

29. His delegation had decided to abstain on the draft resolution as a whole rather than to oppose it, as it would normally have done, because it believed in the principle that the will of the majority must prevail.

30. Mr. QUIROS (El Salvador) felt that, despite the efforts of the Indian and other delegations, the draft resolution was not clear, and that the Trusteeship Council would have many difficulties in deciding what its true scope and meaning were. His delegation had abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole in order not to commit itself, so that it would be able in the Trusteeship Council to propose such measures as it believed to be appropriate for the implementation of the resolution. Its vote should not be interpreted as an indication of a definite stand on any of the substantive problems involved.

31. Mr. APUNTE (Ecuador) said that in the general debate his delegation had expressed its intention not to vote for the Indian draft resolution; with the modifications that had been introduced, however, it had been in a position to vote in favour of the resolution as a whole.

32. He made a formal reservation, however, with regard to the third and fourth paragraphs of the preamble, which appeared to justify the policy of annexation of Trust Territories. The delegation of Ecuador could not agree to such policy. Nevertheless, it had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole because, despite its reservations, it agreed with the fundamental objective of the resolution, which was to ascertain the opinion of the populations of Togoland on what their future should be.

33. Mr. VERGARA (Chile) said that his delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution had been based on its attitude toward colonial problems, which was already known to the Committee. It could hardly have adopted any other stand after subscribing to the resolutions adopted at the Ninth and Tenth International Conferences of American States held in Bogotá and Caracas, concerning colonial problems in the western hemisphere.

34. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it considered that steps should be taken to ascertain the opinion of the population. His delegation would express its views when the desires of the population of Togoland under British administration, which was most directly concerned, were known.

DRAFT REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE

35. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia), Rapporteur, introduced the draft report of the Fourth Committee on item 35, "The Togoland unification problem" and item 52, "The future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under United Kingdom trusteeship" (A/C.4/L.388).

36. Mr. JOUBLANC RIVAS (Mexico), referring to paragraph 17, pointed out that his delegation had withdrawn its amendment (A/C.4/L.383) because the Indian delegation had incorporated it in draft resolution A/C.4/L.370/Rev.1. He asked the Rapporteur to delete the final sentence of paragraph 17 and to insert at the end of paragraph 19 the following sentence: "Thereafter Mexico withdrew its amendment (A/C.4/L.383)."

In the absence of any objection, the draft report (A/C.4/L.388) was adopted, subject to the amendment suggested by the representative of Mexico.

Completion of the Committee's work

37. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) expressed his deep regret that Mr. Pignon, who had represented France so long and so well in the Fourth Committee and in the Trusteeship Council, would be leaving shortly to take up new duties in Paris. Mr. Pignon would take with him the good wishes of the entire Committee.

38. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela), Mr. DE HOLTE CASTELLO (Colombia), Mr. S. S. LIU (China), Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq), Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) on behalf of the Scandinavian countries, Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil), Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti), Mr. JOUBLANC RIVAS (Mexico), Mr. BOURDILLON (United Kingdom) on behalf of the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada and New Zealand, Mr. KUCHKAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. TRIANTAPHYLLAKOS (Greece), Mr. ROBBINS (United States of America), Mr. APUNTE (Ecuador) on behalf of the remaining Latin-American countries, Mr. ITANI (Lebanon), Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland), Miss BROOKS (Liberia), Mr. STUPKA (Czechoslovakia), Mr. AZIZ (Afghanistan), Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) and Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) associated themselves with the tribute paid to Mr. Pignon.

39. Mr. PIGNON (France) thanked the members of the Committee for their good wishes.

40. Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) paid a tribute to the courtesy, tact and efficiency of the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur.

41. Mr. VERGARA (Chile), Mr. BOURDILLON (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the United

Kingdom, Australia, Canada and New Zealand, Mr. KUCHKAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. TRIANTAPHYLLAKOS (Greece), Mr. ROBBINS (United States of America), Mr. APUNTE (Ecuador), speaking on behalf of the Latin-American States, Mr. ITANI (Lebanon) speaking on behalf of the Arab States, Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland), Miss BROOKS (Liberia) U HLA AUNG (Burma), Mr. LYNKOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. VIXSEBOXSE (Netherlands), Ato YIFRU (Ethiopia), Mr. STUPKA (Czechoslovakia), Mr. S. S. LIU (China), Mr. AZIZ (Afghanistan), Mr. CARPIO (Philippines), Mr. SINGH (India) and Mr. PIGNON (France) associated themselves with the Danish representative's remarks.

42. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela), speaking as Vice-Chairman, and Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia), speaking as Rapporteur, thanked the previous speakers for their kind remarks and joined in the tributes to the Chairman.

43. Mr. PIGNON (France), supported by Mr. ITANI (Lebanon) and Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela), felt that, as Mr. Hoo, Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, and Mr. Ralph J. Bunche, Principal Director in the same Department, would soon be leaving the Department, it would be appropriate for the Committee to adopt a formal motion of appreciation for the services they had rendered.

The motion was unanimously adopted.

44. Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories) thanked the members of the Committee. The members of the Secretariat felt that they were serving the same cause as the members of the Committee, that they too were working for the well-being and advancement of the non-self-governing peoples. He was leaving the Fourth Committee and the Department of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories with regret but without apprehension. He had had the privilege of organizing the Department and the good fortune to find excellent colleagues, to whom he paid a tribute.

45. The CHAIRMAN thanked the members of the Committee for their expressions of appreciation. He stressed the tremendous responsibilities incumbent on the Committee. Its decisions were not academic; they directly affected the lives and welfare of over 170 million people in the Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories.

46. During the past three months the Committee had dealt with a number of very difficult and delicate issues. The high level of the debate reflected great credit on its members. Its discussions had been closely followed by millions of peoples living in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories throughout the world, and the presence of the large group of petitioners strikingly illustrated the trust which those peoples placed in it. The recent debate on the Togoland items showed that the Committee was imbued with a deep sense of responsibility, and he was sure that the petitioners would return home satisfied that their journey had not been in vain and that their interests were in safe hands. Whatever the final outcome, the discussion on the

future of Togoland had laid the basis for an important step forward towards the fulfilment of Article 76 of the Charter. The Committee would have noted with deep satisfaction the United Kingdom representative's statement that the day was not far off when the Gold Coast would take its place as an independent Member of the United Nations. It was to be hoped that other applicants, too, would be with the Committee in the near future.

47. He congratulated the Committee on its achievements. His thanks went to the members of the Committee, the Vice-Chairman, the Rapporteur and the members of the Secretariat.

48. In conclusion, he associated himself with the tributes and good wishes to Mr. Pignon.

49. He declared that the work of the ninth session of the Committee had been completed.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.