



## TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Eighteenth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

734th Meeting

Wednesday, 25 July 1956,  
at 2 p.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
The future of Togoland under British administration (T/L.712) ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(i) Report of the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner (T/1258 and Add.1);	
(ii) Report of the Plebiscite Administrator (T/1269 and Add.1);	
(iii) Memorandum by the Administering Authority (T/1270);	
(iv) Petitions circulated under rule 85, paragraph 2, and communications circulated under rule 24 of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council (T/COM.6/L.60 to 69, T/PET.6 and 7/L.48).....	281
Examination of petitions ( <i>continued</i> ):	
Addition of petitions to the agenda (T/PET.9/15 to 19) .....	283
One hundred and sixty-seventh report of the Standing Committee on Petitions: petitions concerning Somaliland under Italian administration (T/L.693) ( <i>concluded</i> ) .....	283
One hundred and sixty-ninth report of the Standing Committee on Petitions: petitions concerning Western Samoa (T/L.695).....	284
Hearing of the representatives of Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala People (T/L.689/Rev.1, T/L.700) ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	284

*President: Mr. Rafik ASHA (Syria).*

*Present:*

The representatives of the following States members of the Trusteeship Council: Australia, Belgium, Burma, China, France, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Italy, New Zealand, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; World Health Organization.

**The future of Togoland under British administration (T/L.712) (*continued*):**

- (i) Report of the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner (T/1258 and Add.1);
- (ii) Report of the Plebiscite Administrator (T/1269 and Add.1);
- (iii) Memorandum by the Administering Authority (T/1270);
- (iv) Petitions circulated under rule 85, paragraph 2, and communications circulated under rule 24 of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council (T/COM.6/L.60 to 69, T/PET.6 and 7/L.48)

[Agenda item 12 (a)]

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mead, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Togoland under British adminis-*

*tration, and Mr. Espinosa y Prieto, United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner, took places at the Council table.*

1. Mr. LALL (India), introducing the Indian draft resolution (T/L.712), said it was a striking fact that by 1954, at the ninth session of the General Assembly, within eight years after the conclusion of the Trusteeship Agreement, the United Kingdom Government had been able to seek (A/2660) the termination of the Agreement. In resolution 860 (IX), the General Assembly had noted the Administering Authority's view that when the Gold Coast assumed full responsibility for its own affairs, the people of Togoland under British administration would have reached a stage of development when the objectives of the International Trusteeship System would have been substantially achieved; had decided that, in accordance with Article 76 b of the Charter, steps should be taken to ascertain the wishes of the inhabitants as to their future; and had requested the Trusteeship Council to dispatch a special mission to Togoland. In its special report (T/1218), the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Togoland under British Administration and Togoland under French Administration, 1955, under an Indian Chairman, had recommended a plebiscite, to be conducted by the Administering Authority under international supervision. The General Assembly had accepted that recommendation in resolution 944 (X), and the report of the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner (T/1258 and Add.1) was now before the Council.

2. It was clear from paragraphs 541, 542 and 543 of the report that the wishes of the people had been freely expressed in accordance with Article 76 b of the Charter; and they were in favour of union with an independent Gold Coast. All those concerned were to be congratulated on the remarkably smooth course events had taken in the Trust Territory; that was so because the events themselves were right. The next stage was for the Council to report to the General Assembly that the plebiscite had been fairly conducted and that it now remained to terminate the Trusteeship Agreement. That was the purpose of the Indian draft resolution and it was the only course the Council could properly follow. The draft resolution itself was largely procedural, for under resolution 944 (X), paragraph 5, the General Assembly had reserved to itself the decision on future action.

3. As the Gold Coast was approaching independence, it would be of assistance to the General Assembly at its eleventh session if the United Kingdom representative could outline his Government's plans in that connexion.

4. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) confirmed that the Gold Coast was now on the verge of independence. He was unable to state the exact date on which independence would be attained, as that depended both on the United Kingdom Government and on the will of the Gold Coast people. Once the new Legislative Assembly, which was to meet on 31 July 1956, had passed by a reasonable majority a motion calling for

independence within the Commonwealth, the United Kingdom Government would take immediate steps to give effect to that motion. Such a motion would probably be passed in the immediate future and the steps to give effect to it — the preparation of legislation and the constitutional instruments necessary to legalize independence — should be completed by the middle of 1957.

5. Mr. DAVIN (New Zealand) said his delegation attached great importance to the first provision of paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 944 (X), under which the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner was requested to report to the Trusteeship Council. The Council had played a valuable role in negotiations on the future of Togoland, and it was fitting that it should inform the General Assembly of its views, which would be based on nearly ten years' close study of the Territory and on the excellent documentation contained in the Administering Authority's memorandum (T/1270) and the reports of the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner (T/1258 and Add.1) and the Plebiscite Administrator (T/1269 and Add.1). Those two officers and the Commissioner's staff had worked hard and ably. It reflected great credit on the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner and the Plebiscite Administrator that members of the Council had not found it necessary to ask questions.

6. His delegation had favoured the Territory's being treated as a single plebiscite area so that the wishes of the over-all majority might be ascertained. The results which had emerged in individual districts were, however, reassuring. A careful study of the excellent plebiscite atlas annexed to the Plebiscite Administrator's report had strengthened his delegation's conviction that Togoland's interests would be best served if the Council and the General Assembly accepted the results of the plebiscite as a clear expression of the wishes of the people. The margin of 16 per cent between the vote for union and the vote for separation was more than sufficient to justify support for unification and a recommendation that the Trusteeship Agreement should be terminated. Such a recommendation was also justified on the grounds of the Territory's small size, long frontiers and lack of viability as an economic unit, and by the advice of the Administering Authority, whose experience in Togoland and long association with the progress and development of Africa made it specially qualified to offer a judgement.

7. His delegation had never doubted that the Administering Authority would consult the people of Togoland with complete sympathy and objectivity, and had regarded United Nations supervision rather as a symbol of legitimate concern with the Trust Territory's affairs than as a safeguard of the people's rights and interests. It was plain from the Plebiscite Commissioner's report, especially paragraphs 525 and 527, that the joint aims of the General Assembly and the Administering Authority had been achieved. The information given by the United Kingdom representative as to the Gold Coast's prospects for independence was very welcome.

8. His delegation associated itself wholeheartedly with the views of the Indian delegation and would gladly support the draft resolution.

9. Mr. MULCAHY (United States of America) said that his delegation regarded a vote by 58 per cent of the people of Togoland for union with the Gold Coast as clearly decisive, and could not support any action liable to nullify the wishes of the huge majorities in the north which had voted for unification with the Gold

Coast. Nor could it support the separation of the southern minority from the rest of the Territory, for that, by setting a precedent for fragmentation in other Trust Territories in Africa, would inevitably delay their progress towards self-government or independence. At the Council's 730th meeting his delegation had accordingly expressed the hope that the election held on 17 July 1956 would be regarded as confirmation of the recent plebiscite, and that the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement would be approved by the United Nations. His delegation's unreserved support of the Indian draft resolution reflected its pleasure at the outcome of recent events in the Trust Territory and the Gold Coast.

10. He paid tribute to the work of the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner and the Plebiscite Administrator.

11. U MYA SEIN (Burma) noted that the situation was unusual, in that a Trust Territory was about to share the destiny of a Non-Self-Governing Territory now approaching independence. At the same time it was simple, because the plebiscite held under General Assembly resolution 944 (X) had been conducted freely and fairly, and the picture had been completed by the latest elections in the Gold Coast. The majority will of the people of Togoland under British administration had been clearly expressed in favour of union with an independent Gold Coast, and the supreme consideration was that they should decide their future for themselves. In the present circumstances, as the Indian representative had indicated, there was no other course to take, and his delegation supported the Indian draft resolution as a logical sequel to the General Assembly's previous decisions and the subsequent events.

12. Mr. KIANG (China) paid tribute to the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner and his staff for their work in the Trust Territory and for the Commissioner's well-documented report.

13. His observations concerning the future of Togoland under British administration were not intended to prejudice the General Assembly's action arising out of the results of the plebiscite. A plebiscite was the most direct democratic method of ascertaining the wishes of the people on a matter of fundamental importance.

14. The Togoland plebiscite had resolved the complicated situation with which the United Nations had been attempting to deal since 1947. The shift in the Ewe position from support for Ewe unification to support for the unification of the two Trust Territories of Togoland had complicated the problem almost beyond solution; the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, 1952, had found that the majority of the people favoured unification of the two Togolands but did not agree as to how it was to be effected, and by the end of the General Assembly's eighth session a solution had seemed more remote than ever.

15. The United Kingdom's action in informing the United Nations in 1954 that Togoland under British administration could not be administered as a Trust Territory after the Gold Coast achieved its independence had marked a turning-point; and in the existing circumstances the course mapped out by the Administering Authority had been the only course open to the General Assembly. He briefly reviewed the events leading up to the plebiscite and the numerical results obtained.

16. As Togoland under British administration had for the last forty years been administered as an integral

part of the Gold Coast, events in the Colony were of close concern to the Trust Territory, and a clear majority had voted for unification with the Gold Coast. His delegation fully appreciated the views of the minority which had voted for separation from the Gold Coast pending the ultimate determination of the Territory's political future; but the minority would perhaps agree that that future would be jeopardized if the small Trust Territory were to be partitioned and a separate political entity set up. In that connexion the conclusions appearing in paragraphs 527, 542 and 543 of the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner's report were gratifying.

17. His delegation was satisfied with the whole operation and with the results of the plebiscite, and was prepared to accept the people's general verdict as expressed by the majority vote. The United Nations should be proud that one of its Trust Territories was approaching the attainment of the basic objectives of the Trusteeship System.

18. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) said that when the General Assembly had adopted resolution 944 (X) his delegation had abstained, first because it had not wished to support a policy which departed from the provisions of article 76 b of the Charter, and secondly because it had not wished to oppose a solution arrived at in a spirit of reconciliation after arduous debate. Furthermore, the resolution had provided certain safeguards, in that an important role had been assigned to the representative of the United Nations.

19. He joined with other delegations in paying tribute to the successful manner in which the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner had discharged his very difficult task. Chapter IV of the Commissioner's report indicated the almost inevitable consequences of administrative union; but so far as Togoland under British administration was concerned, that vexed question was perhaps a thing of the past. The plebiscite had taken place under conditions which were a credit to the Administering Authority; the vigilance and firmness shown by the Commissioner and the Togolese people's worthy performance of this duty also deserved praise.

20. It was of interest to note from paragraphs 500 to 505 of the Commissioner's report that all nine of the petitions submitted to the Special Court by the Togoland Congress had, assuredly for good reasons, been withdrawn. The ten communications (T/COM.6/L.60 to 69) received by the Council under rule 24 of the rules of procedure dealt with problems which had been duly solved as described in chapter VIII of the Commissioner's report. Petition T/PET.6 and 7/L.48 was of a purely general nature. The Haitian delegation could only conclude that the plebiscite had been conducted in an irreproachable manner.

21. His delegation accepted the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner's conclusions, especially those contained in paragraphs 525, 527 and 540, and noted the statements made by the United Kingdom representative and those contained in paragraphs 7, 8 and 9 of the Administering Authority's memorandum. In the light of paragraphs 129 and 130 of the Commissioner's report, his delegation would support the Indian draft resolution.

22. Mr. BARGUES (France) said that since the Togolese people had on 9 May 1956 expressed their choice as to the political future of their Territory, there remained three things for the Trusteeship Council to do. First, it must assess the manner in which the plebiscite itself had been carried out; and in that respect

it had ample information before it from the Administering Authority, the Plebiscite Commissioner and the Plebiscite Administrator. Secondly, it must record the results of the plebiscite, namely, that the Togolese people had chosen union with the Gold Coast. Thirdly, it must report to the General Assembly that the Territory's new status was incompatible with its status under the Trusteeship Agreement and that the latter ought therefore to be abrogated. The Indian delegation's draft resolution met all three of those requirements, and his delegation would therefore support it.

23. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) said that the report of the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner and the Plebiscite Administrator made it clear beyond the shadow of a doubt that the people of Togoland under British administration had been consulted in a manner ensuring their absolute freedom of choice. A clear majority had pronounced in favour of union with an independent Gold Coast. The appropriate conclusions from that fact would be drawn by the General Assembly and by the Administering Authority; as for the draft resolution submitted by the Indian delegation, the Belgian delegation, like the United Kingdom delegation, would support it.

24. The PRESIDENT proposed that further discussion of the item be deferred to the next meeting.

*It was so decided.*

*Mr. Mead, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration, and Mr. Espinosa y Prieto, United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner, withdrew.*

### Examination of petitions (continued)

[Agenda item 5]

#### ADDITION OF PETITIONS TO THE AGENDA (T/PET.9/15 to 19)

25. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) said that, although in the case of petitions concerning Nauru (T/PET.9/15 to 19), the Administering Authority had not had the two months' interval provided for the study of petitions under rule 86, paragraph 1, of the Council's rules of procedure, his delegation was prepared for them to be examined at the Council's present session in view of the fact that the special representative was available for questioning. He accordingly proposed that those petitions should be placed on the agenda of the present session.

*It was so decided.*

#### ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SEVENTH REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS: PETITIONS CONCERNING SOMALILAND UNDER ITALIAN ADMINISTRATION (T/L.693) (concluded)

26. The PRESIDENT observed that the Council had begun considering the one hundred and sixty-seventh report of the Standing Committee on Petitions (T/L.693) at its 732nd meeting, but that in response to a request from the Soviet representative, the representative of Italy had undertaken to seek further information concerning petition T/PET.11/509.

27. Mr. GRILLO (Italy) said that unfortunately he had not immediately available any further information regarding the petition in question, and would have to obtain such information from Mogadiscio, should the Council so decide. He would submit, however, that in taking note of the additional information furnished by

the Administering Authority in response to the Council's resolution 1309 (XVI) and distributed under the symbol T/OBS.11/76, the Standing Committee on Petitions had indicated that the discussion of the petition in question was closed. He therefore questioned whether the Council should at the present stage ask the Administering Authority for further information; it ought perhaps first to reconsider that already provided which, in his delegation's view, fully met the Council's earlier request. If it felt, on reconsideration, that that information was not adequate then it ought, he thought, to make a further request in the same manner as before, namely, in a resolution. His delegation would gladly comply with such a request, but it would be helpful if the Council were to state exactly what additional information it wanted.

28. Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) entirely agreed with the Italian representative: the Council had asked for certain information; the Administering Authority had provided it; and the Council ought certainly to study it before asking for more. His whole point had been precisely that the Standing Committee had failed to examine the information in question; overriding his objections, it had simply taken note of the fact that the information had been submitted. He therefore considered that the item should be deferred pending a full and proper examination of the relevant information together with the petitions by the Standing Committee on Petitions and the submission by the Standing Committee of an appropriate recommendation to the Council.

29. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) proposed that the Council should take note of the one hundred and sixty-seventh report of the Standing Committee on Petitions and of the information provided by the Administering Authority, as mentioned in that report, and should decide that no further information was required in relation to the petitions concerned. All members had had ample time in which to study the information; the Committee had taken a decision, by 4 votes to 2, and it could only be assumed that that decision had been based on a sufficient study of the document.

30. Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that document T/OBS.11/76 had not been studied by any United Nations body. The information in it should have been examined by the Standing Committee on Petitions in the presence of the special representative, in order that questions might, if necessary, be put to him.

31. Mr. JAIPAL (India) wondered whether, in that case, the special representative could not be invited to take a seat at the Council table so that the Soviet representative could put questions to him.

32. Mr. GRILLO (Italy) did not think that that would serve any useful purpose; he had naturally consulted the special representative before coming to the present meeting and could say that he, too, had no additional information to give the Council on the subject at present. His delegation was, however, only too ready to collaborate with the Council, and if a specific request was made in the normal terms it would do its best to meet it.

33. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) proposed that the Council should refer back to the Standing Committee the information furnished by the Administering Authority in relation to the petition under discussion.

34. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) supported that proposal.

*After some discussion it was decided, by 7 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions, to take note of the report and to refer to the Standing Committee on Petitions the examination of the information furnished by the Administering Authority on the petition.*

*The meeting was suspended at 4.5 p.m. and resumed at 4.20 p.m.*

#### ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-NINTH REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS: PETITIONS CONCERNING WESTERN SAMOA (T/L.695)

35. Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew attention to the fact that in the one hundred and sixty-ninth report (T/L.695) the Council was being asked to take note of the fact that the Government of New Zealand had furnished certain information (T/OBS.1/3). That information had been made available two years previously, and it was manifestly absurd at the present late date to note, for instance, that the water supplies in a certain area would be improved in 1954 when the Council had no idea whether that work had in fact been done.

36. Mr. THORP (New Zealand) pointed out that the Administering Authority had furnished the information as soon as possible, that is, in June 1954.

37. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council should take note of the report.

*It was so decided.*

#### HEARING OF THE REPRESENTATIVES OF NGONDO, TRA- DITIONAL ASSEMBLY OF THE DOUALA PEOPLE (T/L.689/REV.1, T/L.700) (continued)

38. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) explained that the revised draft resolution submitted jointly by the Haitian and Syrian delegations (T/L.689/Rev.1) included certain amendments which had been accepted at earlier meetings, and took into account the new and welcome information supplied by the French representative (727th and 728th meetings).

39. The sponsors of the joint draft resolution could not accept the Belgian amendments (T/L.700), which would destroy the whole point of the draft resolution and prevent the Council from taking adequate action on the views submitted by the petitioners' views for which, in his opinion, there was wide support in the Territory. The sponsors of the joint draft resolution would be happy to accept the amendment submitted by the Indian representative at the 728th meeting, which would be inserted between operative paragraphs 3 and 4; operative paragraph 4 would then be renumbered 5.

40. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) pointed out that the preamble and operative paragraphs of the joint draft resolution were not consistent. Whereas the preamble spoke of the Ngondo representatives' desire for independence and unification, operative paragraph 1 noted their request for the immediate establishment of a legislative assembly elected on the basis of universal suffrage. If the Council wanted to adopt so sweeping a resolution, it should bring the text into balance by the addition of another operative paragraph noting that the unification of the two Trust Territories went beyond the scope of the Trusteeship Agreements defining the responsibilities vested in the United Nations.

41. In any event, however, such a sweeping resolution was not appropriate. The petitioners had not submitted specific requests on particular problems. Their general statements relating to the whole policy pursued by the Administering Authority should be considered in con-

nexion with the annual review of conditions in the Territory. Whatever the merit of their ideas or the extent to which they reflected the general views of the people, the Council should not let itself be stampeded into action by a political party or local group. General recommendations should not be formulated in a resolution based on a hearing, because they would then appear to be the result of influence exerted by one particular group of the population and might involve the Council in local political quarrels, which would be contrary to good administration and would distort the Council's role and undermine its prestige.

42. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) endorsed the Haitian representative's remarks. The Belgian amendments made the joint draft resolution useless. They were not really amendments but, rather, an entirely new draft resolution; and they might perhaps be submitted as such.

43. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) proposed that the preamble and first operative paragraph of the draft resolution should be combined by adding the word "and" at the end of the preamble and deleting the words "takes note of their requests for" at the beginning of operative paragraph 1.

44. He would support the Belgian amendments, which were the only proper way of dealing with the question.

45. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Belgian amendments.

*There were 6 votes in favour and 6 against, with 1 abstention.*

*After a brief recess in accordance with rule 38 of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council, a second vote was taken.*

*There were 6 votes in favour and 6 against, with 1 abstention. The amendments were not adopted.*

46. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) pointed out that if the Australian amendment were adopted, paragraph 2 commending "these requests" to the urgent consideration of the Administering Authority would apply to the request for independence and unification as well as to the request for the immediate establishment of a legislative assembly elected on the basis of universal adult suffrage. That was a considerable departure from the original draft resolution.

47. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) observed that the additional operative paragraph which he had suggested would meet the point raised by the United Kingdom representative.

*The Australian amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.*

48. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) asked for a separate vote on each paragraph of the draft resolution, including the preamble, and on the word "urgent" in operative paragraph 2.

*The preamble was adopted by 8 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 1 was adopted by 7 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.*

*The word "urgent" in paragraph 2 was rejected by 7 votes to 6, with 1 abstention.*

*Paragraph 2, as amended, was adopted by 8 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 3 was adopted by 9 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.*

*At the request of the Indian representative a vote was taken by roll call on the new paragraph 4, formerly the Indian amendment.*

*The United Kingdom, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Burma, China, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

*Against:* United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, France, Italy, New Zealand.

*There were 7 votes in favour and 7 against.*

*After a brief recess in accordance with rule 38 of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council, a second vote was taken.*

*There were 7 votes in favour and 7 against. Paragraph 4 was not adopted.*

49. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) explained that although his delegation had voted against the new paragraph 4 it was not, of course, opposed to the election of a legislative assembly on the basis of universal suffrage, or even to the Council's making a recommendation to that effect, in the proper circumstances, which might well have been during the consideration of the annual report. There was no justification for the Council making such a recommendation on the basis of the hearing of the Ngondo petitioners.

50. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on paragraph 4 of the draft resolution (T/L.689/Rev.1).

*There were 7 votes in favour and 7 against.*

*After a brief recess in accordance with rule 38 of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council, a second vote was taken.*

*There were 7 votes in favour and 7 against. The paragraph was not adopted.*

*A vote was taken on the draft resolution as a whole, as amended.*

*There were 5 votes in favour and 5 against, with 4 abstentions.*

*After a brief recess in accordance with rule 38 of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council, a second vote was taken.*

*There were 7 votes in favour and 6 against, with 1 abstention. The draft resolution, as a whole, as amended, was adopted.*

51. Mr. GRILLO (Italy), explaining his vote, said that there should have been no objection to a resolution taking note of the statements and requests of the Ngondo representatives, which could easily have been incorporated in the preamble to the resolution. He had therefore voted in favour of the Australian representative's amendment. On the other hand, he was not sure that the Council should adopt a resolution based solely on those statements and he had therefore voted against the draft resolution as a whole.

52. In view of the preamble, the operative part of the draft resolution had far-reaching implications. The problems involved were of such magnitude as to require a more thorough study by the Council. The French representative had suggested that such a study could and should be undertaken on a more appropriate occasion.

53. He agreed with the Haitian representative's contention that the Council must take all views into consideration, including those of small minorities, and with the Indian representative's argument that all petitioners equally deserved a hearing and that it was open to any delegation to propose some suitable form of action; but he felt that it was one thing to take into consideration the views of a small minority and quite another to take

action as if they were the views of a large majority. The action recommended in the operative part of the resolution was entirely out of proportion to the hearing on which it had been based.

54. The serious problems referred to in the operative part of the draft resolution had been discussed by the Council at its previous session, and several recommendations had been adopted. It was only fair to the Administering Authority to give it time to bring about the reforms recommended by the Council. He was sure that the Administering Authority itself, having established universal suffrage, would take the further step of holding elections to the legislative assembly on that basis. When that had been done the Council would be in a position to recommend further reforms because it would be informed of the opinions of the majority of the population. The proper course would have been to note the statements and wishes of the Ngondo representatives and submit them to the Administering Authority for its consideration. At the next session, the Council might then have examined them further together with the annual report. In that way the hearing and the conclusions drawn by the Council would have been brought into proper perspective.

55. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) explained that in voting against paragraph 4 of the draft resolution (T/L.689/Rev.1) he had not meant to imply that his delegation did not share the hope expressed in that paragraph. Indeed, he was sure that the paragraph embodied a hope which both he and the Administering Authority could share; but he felt very strongly that the only context in which the Council could express such a general hope regarding constitutional developments in the Cameroons under French administration was the proper and regular study of conditions in the Territory in the light of the annual report. To have based such a far-reaching statement on the hearing of the Ngondo representatives would have been a complete distortion of the proper procedures relating to petitions and hearings. He was happy, therefore, that paragraph 4 of the draft resolution had been rejected, as that had made it possible for him to abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole as amended, although he had some misgivings about certain statements in the preamble and operative paragraph 1.

56. He wished to make it clear that he did not interpret operative paragraph 2 as embodying any judgement by the Council on the merits of the requests which it was commending to the Administering Authority's attention. Had he considered that there was any such implication he would have voted against the draft resolution as a whole.

57. Mr. MULCAHY (United States of America) regretted that, despite the amendments included in the draft resolution, his delegation had reluctantly been compelled to vote against it. It had done so in the belief that so sweeping a resolution ought not to be adopted by a session of the Council which had not considered in detail the substance of the questions with which it dealt. He hoped that in future the Council would endeavour to hear petitioners at the time when the affairs of their Territories were being discussed.

58. He had voted in favour of the preamble despite great misgivings, thereby permitting to appear in writing the statement that "the inhabitants seek an independent and unified status for the Trust Territories of the Cameroons under British administration and the Cameroons under French administration". As a member of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust

Territories of the Cameroons under British Administration and the Cameroons under French Administration, 1955, he had not reached that conclusion, but he had felt that the petitioners' statement of opinion should be allowed to appear.

59. Mr. THORP (New Zealand) had no doubt of the desirability of ensuring that the petitioners received some acknowledgement by the Council of their appearance before it, although he was not sure that a resolution was necessary. The operative paragraphs of the revised draft resolution, as amended, contained recommendations which were not justified as a deduction from the hearing. A comparison of those recommendations with the recommendations adopted by the Council at its last session after full consideration of all the conditions in the Territory made the disproportionate nature of the draft resolution very evident. He had favoured a solution along the lines proposed by the Belgian representative, and had voted for the Belgian amendments.

60. The petitioners' statements helped the Council to understand conditions in the Territory, and they would be equally valuable at the next session, when they would be seen in the right perspective in connexion with the Council's examination of the annual report. He had voted against the resolution as a whole, as amended, because it had been so dismembered as to have lost any comprehensible form for the petitioners.

61. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that his delegation's amendment had been of almost immediate importance. The vote against it had been virtually a vote against the exercise of suffrage for the purpose of consulting the people's representatives on the political reforms to be introduced in the near future. To a very large extent, its rejection deprived the law establishing universal suffrage of whatever immediate merit it might otherwise have.

62. Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) explained that he had voted against the Belgian and Australian amendments and in favour of all the paragraphs of the draft resolution and of the word "urgent" in operative paragraph 2. He had been extremely surprised at the negative vote cast by the United States representative on operative paragraph 1, which merely noted the petitioners' requests. That was the least the Council could do. He was also surprised at the fact that certain representatives had abstained from voting on the word "urgent". Apart from the fact that the requests referred to action which the Council had been recommending for years, the matter was obviously urgent in view of the institutional reforms which the Administering Authority was planning to introduce. Furthermore, consideration by the Administering Authority did not necessarily imply acceptance.

63. His favourable vote on the draft resolution as a whole did not mean that the resolution entirely reflected his views. He had intended to submit a draft resolution of his own, but had refrained from doing so in view of the amendments accepted by the Haitian and Syrian delegations. The resolution omitted one important element to which the petitioners had referred, namely, their views on the Administering Authority's proposed reforms. He hoped that their views on that matter would be taken into account by the Trusteeship Council at its next session, and that the Administering Authority would consider all the opinions expressed in the Council, whether or not they had been included in the resolution.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.