



CONTENTS

	Page
General Assembly resolution 860 (IX): the Togoland unification problem and the future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration (T/1206 and Add.1, T/1213, T/1214, T/L.621) (continued).....	7
Arrangements for a periodic visiting mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific in 1956 (T/L.620) (concluded)	11

Temporary President: Mr. Miguel Rafael URQUIA
(El Salvador).

Present:

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

General Assembly resolution 860 (IX): the Togoland unification problem and the future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration (T/1206 and Add.1, T/1213, T/1214, T/L.621) (continued)

[Agenda item 2]

1. Mr. LALL (India) paid a tribute to the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Togoland under British administration and Togoland under French administration, 1955, for the thorough and conscientious manner in which it had performed its difficult and complex task.

2. The remarks he was about to make would be of a preliminary character and would be supplemented during the debate on the question in the General Assembly. By that time his delegation would have been able to examine the special report of the Visiting Mission (T/1206 and Add.1) in detail and would have heard the views of other Members of the United Nations and of the various petitioners who would be appearing before the Fourth Committee. For the time being he would confine his observations to the two main points: the question or questions to be put to the people of Togoland under British administration at the plebiscite and the suggested subdivision of the Territory for the purposes of the plebiscite.

3. The Indian delegation was entirely in favour of a plebiscite as the best method of ascertaining the wishes of the people in Togoland under British administration in the existing circumstances. The questions to be put at the plebiscite should first of all be capable of immediate implementation. Otherwise the plebiscite would have little practical value and might lead to confusion. There could be no doubt that the first question suggested by the Visiting Mission was a practical one that could be implemented at once. The second question was obviously based on the presumption that continued trusteeship of either the whole or part of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration would be possible after the Gold Coast had become indepen-

dent. As the Administering Authority had stated that the objectives of the Trusteeship System had already been substantially attained, he could not see why a part of the Territory should be separated and continued under some other form of trusteeship administration.

4. The Administering Authority had also stated that it would not be in a position to continue to administer the Territory as an integral part of the Gold Coast after the Gold Coast had become independent. It was not clear what the alternative was. Nor was it clear why continued tutelage should be necessary. Ever since the end of the First World War the Trust Territory had been administered as a part of the Gold Coast, and the logical result of that fact would be the development of the Trust Territory towards independence as part and parcel of the Gold Coast. Any attempt at the present stage to change the natural course of events might well have serious consequences not only for the Trust Territory but also for the Gold Coast.

5. In the opinion of the Indian delegation the people of Togoland under British administration should at the present stage be asked only one question, i.e., the question concerning integration with the Gold Coast. If integration were rejected a new situation would arise which would have to be considered afresh, but for the present it was unnecessary to anticipate that. The Indian delegation regarded the independent and isolated existence of Togoland under British administration as precarious, both politically and economically. The Visiting Mission itself seemed to have recognized the validity of that argument. Obviously a continuance of the present form of administration as an integral part of the Gold Coast after the Gold Coast had become independent would amount to limitation of that country's sovereignty and would not be acceptable. He could not therefore see any practical advantage in putting the second question to the people. The Territories of Togoland under British administration and Togoland under French administration had been for over thirty years under different Trusteeship administrations, administered by different Administering Authorities under different legal and administrative systems and with different cultural backgrounds. Their union would present many practical difficulties and should not, in the Indian delegation's view, be given serious consideration at the present stage unless there was clear evidence that a very large majority of the people in both Territories were in favour of unification. Such evidence was lacking. In any event, such a union in the future was not precluded by the integration of Togoland under British administration with the Gold Coast. It would undoubtedly be open to Togoland under French administration to decide at a later date to join its neighbour within the larger framework of some form of West African Federation.

6. The experiment of setting up a Standing Consultative Commission and later, a Joint Council for Togoland Affairs, by the Administering Authorities, had been a failure and the effort to promote common policies and programmes for the two Territories of Togoland and for increasing their collaboration in various

fields had had to be abandoned. Hence, a serious attempt at unification had already failed, and the reasons for that failure applied as much today as they had two years previously.

7. A study of the matter showed clearly that the unification move had arisen out of the desire of the Ewe people to be under one administration and had later assumed a larger political aspect. Basically the problem was still an Ewe problem. In the opinion of the Indian delegation political union based on tribal and ethnic considerations was undesirable and unwise, and perhaps even contrary to the basic objectives of the Trusteeship System. In any case tribal aspirations would not be jeopardized by the union of Togoland under British administration with the Gold Coast; on the contrary, it would result in some 138,000 Ewes joining with 375,000 Ewes in the Gold Coast as against their joining 176,000 Ewes in Togoland under French administration. Any concession to the Ewe demand for unification might well raise similar problems concerning other tribes, which, like the Ewes, were distributed between the Gold Coast and the two Territories of Togoland. Apart from that danger, the question arose of the degree of importance to be attached to the demand for Ewe unity. In the southern part of Togoland under British administration Ewes constituted about 60 per cent of the population and in the whole Territory about one-third of the total population. The question was whether one-third of the population should be placed in a position where they exercised a disproportionate influence on the future of the Territory as a whole. In Togoland under French administration the Ewes constituted one-third of the population in the southern part and one-sixth of the total population of the Territory. The Visiting Mission recommended a plebiscite in Togoland under French administration after certain political advances had been made, but it was not known when that would be. Nor was it clear what questions would be put to the people of Togoland under French administration, how or when the plebiscite would be held there and whether there would be a subdivision of that Territory also for purposes of the plebiscite. Until those questions could be answered it would be extremely unwise to place before the people of Togoland under British administration the alternative of separating any part of the Territory from the Gold Coast to be placed under an unknown trusteeship administration in the vague hope of an eventual union with part or all of Togoland under French administration, when the whole combined territory would have to determine its future. Such hypotheses seemed much too distant to be put before the people in the plebiscite in 1956.

8. His delegation had doubts with regard to the wisdom of the suggested subdivision of Togoland under British administration for the purposes of the plebiscite. The idea was obviously based on the assumption that part of Togoland under British administration might wish to continue under the Trusteeship System. Such a course should not be necessary and in any case appeared to prejudice the results of the plebiscite. A plebiscite was seldom held in parts and a divided plebiscite in a Togoland that was already divided and unable to exist independently would weaken it still further. If the idea were extended to other areas there might be a general disintegration of stable political units.

9. The Indian delegation was in general agreement with the views of the Visiting Mission with regard to the plebiscite arrangements and was in favour of

entrusting the conduct of the plebiscite to the Administering Authority, under the supervision of a Commissioner appointed by the General Assembly, as suggested by the Visiting Mission.

10. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) paid a tribute to the manner in which the Visiting Mission had discharged its duties. Its report constituted a practical basis on which the Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly could, within the scope of their respective functions, take the necessary decisions. In that connexion he felt that the Trusteeship Council might work out its recommendations in general terms, leaving it to the General Assembly to make further detailed recommendations if it so wished.

11. The United Kingdom representative had mentioned certain recommendations which the United Kingdom delegation would like to see amended or changed. The United States delegation had always considered that the whole-hearted co-operation of the Administering Authority was essential in carrying out any plan affecting the future of Togoland under British administration. It was encouraged to believe that there would be such co-operation in view of the earnestness with which the United Kingdom Government had sought to satisfy the United Nations with regard to the problem. The differences between the recommendations of the Visiting Mission and those of the Administering Authority were not, in the view of the United States delegation, insurmountable. In particular he was glad to note that the Mission's recommendations as to the appointment of a Commissioner seemed to be acceptable to the Administering Authority.

12. One or two questions remained on which agreement would have to be reached. One was the nature of the question or questions to be put in the plebiscite. He agreed that experience had shown that in principle plebiscite questions should always be simple and easily understood and that the number of questions should be kept to a minimum. The essential difference between the formula proposed by the Visiting Mission and that preferred by the Administering Authority seemed to be the express reference to continuing some kind of trusteeship for any district that would not opt immediately for integration with the Gold Coast. However, if a single question were to be put, as proposed by the United Kingdom representative, and if a majority in any area were to vote in the negative, the practical result would be the same as if the question had been asked in two parts, inasmuch as some continuing administration would have to be provided.

13. Despite the undoubted problems involved in the formulation of the question, as pointed out at the 648th meeting by the United Kingdom representative, it was difficult to believe that the Administering Authority would find it impossible to continue temporarily to retain some kind of administrative responsibility in areas where there might be substantial majorities that were not ready to make up their own minds as to their future. He fully understood why the Administering Authority would not wish to administer part of the Territory after the Gold Coast had become independent. Nevertheless he hoped that the Administering Authority might find it possible to accept such a temporary situation if it arose and, in co-operation with the United Nations, might continue to assist in the final stages.

14. The second point of difference between the Visiting Mission and the Administering Authority con-

cerned the way in which the plebiscite votes would be counted. The United States delegation had tried to see the advantages and disadvantages of both methods. If differences within the population were not too wide it would normally prefer to see a decision taken on the basis of a majority of the country as a whole, or if prevailing differences were evenly distributed throughout the country, it thought the attitude of the majority should likewise prevail. However, when there were pronounced differences between geographical areas a special situation arose which deserved special consideration. His delegation hoped, however, that there would be no ultimate fragmentation, which the Visiting Mission itself had sought to avoid. His delegation attached importance to the advantages of establishing and maintaining a politically and economically viable entity and it believed that the inhabitants themselves shared that opinion.

15. After weighing the advantages and disadvantages of the Visiting Mission's recommendations, the United States delegation was inclined to the view that the Mission's proposal that votes should be counted by districts was not only somewhat more sensitive to the feelings and attitudes of the people but was also feasible and practicable provided all the directly interested authorities could agree to co-operate in carrying it out. His delegation would naturally be prepared to consider adjustments or alternative arrangements which might be brought forward during the discussions in the Trusteeship Council or the General Assembly.

16. Nothing was more important than the building of a new nation made up of peoples with common interests. If the next step were carried out in a spirit of accommodation and with concern for the wishes of the people involved, the future of the people of Togoland and of the Gold Coast could, and he hoped would, be happy, peaceful and prosperous. The United States delegation's votes and decisions would all be directed towards that end.

17. Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand) congratulated the Chairman and members of the Visiting Mission on its impartial and thorough report.

18. He would not comment upon it at length, since, firstly, his delegation felt that the Trusteeship Council should, without undue delay, present its report on the question to the General Assembly. The General Assembly, which had a particular responsibility on the matter, must complete action on the Council's report before the end of the current (tenth) session and all members would have an opportunity to make their views known during the Assembly debate. Secondly, the Council unfortunately would not have the benefit of the views of several petitioners who had asked to be heard by the General Assembly. Thirdly, the Visiting Mission had made suggestions and recommendations to the Council with which, by and large, the New Zealand delegation did not disagree, and which would to a great extent provide the basis for the report which the General Assembly expected to receive from the Trusteeship Council. The Council could therefore transmit those recommendations to the General Assembly, with a suitable recognition of the task performed by the Mission, together with such endorsement and comment as a majority of its members was prepared to accord them.

19. He was glad to note that there was no disagreement on the part of any one concerned with the Visiting Mission's fundamental recommendation that the wishes

of the population should be ascertained by means of a plebiscite. All the major political parties in the Territory, the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration and the Visiting Mission were agreed on that recommendation, which the New Zealand delegation warmly endorsed.

20. His delegation agreed with the Mission on the principle mentioned in paragraph 105 that the issue should be put to the people in simple and clear terms. That principle was a prerequisite for a clear and precise evaluation of public opinion by plebiscite in any advanced democracy; how much more so where the voters had known universal suffrage in only one previous national election and where many of them were illiterate. It need not be stressed that where the result of the plebiscite would determine the political future of the people, every precaution should be taken to ensure that a direct and unambiguous answer came from the ballot box.

21. In the view of the New Zealand delegation the first question recommended by the Visiting Mission passed the test of simplicity and clarity. With regard to the second question, his delegation felt, without prejudice to its final attitude, that possible ambiguities and uncertainties might arise from an affirmative reply. If the second question were to be retained, it might be desirable for it to be further simplified and clarified in the light of the stated policies of the Administering Authorities concerned, of the views of the petitioners and of considerations advanced during the debate in the General Assembly.

22. With regard to paragraphs 106 and 107 of the report, the New Zealand delegation supported the opinion of the majority of the Mission that the suggestion made by the Togoland Congress that, before a plebiscite was held, the formal separation of Togoland under British administration from the Gold Coast should be established by the setting up of a separate legislature for the Territory, would be unnecessary and would delay the decisive plebiscite. Furthermore, the argument that Togoland under British administration would thereby be enabled to keep its status during the period of popular consultation and avoid any interference from political organizations with headquarters in the Gold Coast, could certainly not justify such a far-reaching and untimely proposal. From a theoretical point of view he had no doubt that the status of Togoland as a Trust Territory would be maintained during the period of popular consultation; indeed he could not see how it could be lost or changed without the concurrence of the General Assembly. Moreover the Mission's unanimous recommendations on the administrative machinery for the holding of the plebiscite adequately provided against any possibility of political interference from outside.

23. The arguments advanced in support of the Mission's proposal for the division of the Territory into two separate areas for the purposes of the plebiscite were understandable in the light of the terms of reference of the Visiting Mission. Nevertheless it was difficult to escape the conclusion that if the administration of the whole of the Trust Territory as a separate and independent entity was regarded as impracticable by the Administering Authority, it would be much more difficult and impracticable to administer a portion of the Trust Territory as a separate entity. Most of the members of the Council were fully aware of the dangers of fragmentation. No doubt the people of the

Trust Territory would give that consideration very careful thought.

24. The New Zealand delegation was in agreement with the proposal in paragraph 111 of the special report concerning the appointment of a special United Nations Commissioner with appropriate ancillary staff to serve as United Nations observers. If the plebiscite was to be held, as the Mission suggested in paragraph 209, about the middle of 1956, it would seem advisable for the Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly to take an early decision on the appointment of a United Nations Commissioner. The recruitment of ancillary staff and the co-ordination of arrangements with the Administering Authority, which would bear responsibility for the holding of the plebiscite, would take time and should therefore proceed without undue delay.

25. Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador) associated himself with the tributes which had been paid to the admirable work of the Visiting Mission.

26. Before he discussed the Mission's report in detail, he would like the Syrian representative to explain the views reported in paragraph 107. It had long been the opinion of the Salvadorian delegation that, in principle, administrative unions did not promote the development of Trust Territories towards independence and self-government. The procedure suggested in paragraph 107 might delay the holding of the plebiscite, but it was a suggestion in accordance with the real spirit of the Trusteeship System. Certain objections had been voiced to the Visiting Mission's plan to divide the Trust Territory into sections for the purposes of the plebiscite. If the suggestion in paragraph 107 was adopted, the problems referred to by the representatives of the United Kingdom, the United States of America and New Zealand would not arise. He felt that there were also a number of other considerations implicit in the phrase "constitutional separation", and he would be glad to know what the Syrian representative had had in mind.

27. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) said that he still considered that a plebiscite should not be held in the Trust Territory until a constitutional separation had been effected between the Gold Coast and Togoland under British administration. The Trust Territory had been administered for many years as an integral part of the Gold Coast, as was of course authorized by the Trusteeship Agreement, but the unfortunate result was that the Trust Territory had no separate identity.

28. His personal impression, gleaned from his visit to the Trust Territory, was that the attitude of the people towards union with the Gold Coast was different in the North and in the South. In the Northern part of the Trust Territory, there were few political parties. The traditional chiefs enjoyed greater authority than their colleagues in the South, where the social structure was perhaps more advanced. The opinion of the population in the North was thus to a certain extent guided by the attitude of their chiefs, and the principal political parties of the Gold Coast and Togoland under British administration had little influence. The Northern peoples felt that they had always been united with the Gold Coast and did not envisage any separate existence. In the South, on the other hand, the question of integration was a genuine issue and there was considerable difference of opinion among the active political parties. However, the problem of integration was not always clearly understood. For example, cer-

tain of the opponents of the unification of the two Trust Territories of Togoland had tried to give the impression that unification might mean that the French administration would take over both Territories, instead of resulting in a free and independent Togoland.

29. He felt, therefore, that before the question of integration was put to the people of Togoland under British administration, those people should be given an opportunity to elect their own representatives to debate the various aspects of the problem. That was the meaning of his suggestion of "constitutional" separation. The administrative union which existed between the Trust Territory and the Gold Coast would remain in administrative matters but the Trust Territory would be given an opportunity to set up a Legislative Assembly of its own choosing to debate the political problems confronting it. He felt that if such a step were not taken, discontented elements might subsequently complain that they had not been given a proper opportunity to express their views on the integration of the Trust Territory with the Gold Coast.

30. Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador) thanked the Syrian representative and reserved the right to return to that point in greater detail in the Fourth Committee.

31. Mr. FORSYTH (Australia) noted that for the first time in the history of the Trusteeship System a Trust Territory was about to emerge from Trusteeship into self-government, and stressed the historic importance of the occasion. Since an Australian had been a member of the Visiting Mission, his delegation was gratified to hear several members express appreciation of the Mission's work. His own delegation was impressed by the conscientiousness of the members of the Visiting Mission and their devotion to the Purposes and Principles of the Charter in respect of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British Administration.

32. Commenting on the reservations expressed by some members on some of the recommendations made by the Visiting Mission, he said that it had obviously been the Mission's earnest desire that the wishes of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory should be expressed as clearly as possible in the plebiscite. With regard to the proposed division of the Territory, it was well-known that artificial international boundaries in West Africa did not correspond to ethnic, cultural and economic realities in the region. When making suggestions as to the arrangements to be made for the plebiscite, the Visiting Mission had obviously felt that that fact should be borne in mind. Referring to the alternative question to be put to the inhabitants, he noted that the Visiting Mission had found that many of the indigenous inhabitants had not reached a definite conclusion on the possibility of integration with the Gold Coast, and had therefore considered that they should not be denied an opportunity of considering their future if their particular area was not immediately integrated with the Gold Coast as a result of the plebiscite. The Mission had felt that the Trusteeship Council and the Administering Authority should seriously consider whether people of any such significant area should continue under a Trusteeship arrangement pending clarification of their position. The Visiting Mission had naturally taken the views of the Administering Authority into account on that matter.

33. The Australian delegation and others had repeatedly emphasized the primary role of the Administering Authority which, in the final analysis, was responsible for the best interests of the inhabitants of the Trust

Territory. The Trusteeship System called for full co-operation between the Administering Authority and the Trusteeship Council and its subsidiary organs, and it was the duty of all to facilitate such co-operation in order that the objectives of Article 76 of the Charter might be attained.

34. The Australian delegation fully supported the Visiting Mission's suggestion that the plebiscite should be carried out by the Administering Authority and supervised by a Commissioner appointed by the General Assembly, assisted by staff appointed by the Secretary-General in consultation with the Commissioner.

35. His delegation agreed with the French representative that the plebiscite arrangements in the Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration should not be regarded as a binding precedent when the time came for other Trust Territories to become self-governing or independent. The Australian delegation had always considered that the affairs of each Trust Territory should be examined separately in view of the very different conditions in, and the various stages of development of, such Territories.

36. The Visiting Mission's suggestions were not necessarily unalterable, but the report provided a sound basis for the necessary consultation and co-operative action between the Administering Authority and the United Nations in the light of which the decisions of the Administering Authority would be taken. The report would make a major contribution to the final stages in the evolution of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration to self-government.

37. The joint draft resolution submitted by the representatives of India and the United States of America (T/L.621) satisfied the main requirements of action by the Trusteeship Council in present circumstances. He reserved his right to comment in detail on the resolution at a later stage.

38. Mr. LALL (India) suggested that the joint draft resolution might be examined and voted upon forthwith in order to avoid delay.

39. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) said that as a member of the Visiting Mission he wished to thank those representatives who had paid a tribute to that Mission's report, and the Administering Authority for the courtesies extended to the members of the Mission.

40. As there appeared to be some divergence of views regarding the suggestions made by the Visiting Mission on the questions to be asked of the indigenous inhabitants at the time of the plebiscite and the procedure to be followed before the plebiscite was held, he wished to reserve his right to refer to such matters in the Fourth Committee.

41. Referring to the joint draft resolution (T/L.621), he suggested that in the first line of paragraph 1 of the operative part the words "of the members" should be inserted after the word "views", since one member of the Visiting Mission had held a different view from the other members.

42. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that as he wished to make some comments on the Visiting Mission's report and to study thoroughly the joint draft resolution before the Council, he hoped the representative of India would not press his proposal, and that the draft resolution would be voted upon at the following meeting.

43. Mr. LALL (India) said that he had merely made a suggestion and did not wish it to be considered if other members wished to continue the debate on the following day.

44. Mr. SERAPHIN (Haiti) associated himself with the USSR representative's statement as his delegation would be unable to vote on the draft resolution until it had given that document further consideration.

45. Mr. BARGUES (France), referring to the Syrian representative's proposed amendment, recalled the statement he had made at the 648th meeting that as a whole the proposals and conclusions in the report had been jointly agreed upon by the four members of the Visiting Mission. The amendment suggested might indicate that the report had not been unanimously adopted by the Visiting Mission. He therefore suggested that the amendment should be modified to read "the views expressed in the special report of the Visiting Mission".

46. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) accepted that amendment.

47. Mr. LALL (India) said that as a co-sponsor of the joint draft resolution he could accept the Syrian representative's amendment, but preferred the amendment suggested by the representative of France.

48. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) accepted the Syrian representative's amendment as modified by the French and Indian representatives. His delegation regarded the Visiting Mission's Special Report as being unanimous, and that view was confirmed by the Chairman's letter of transmittal dated 18 October 1955. The views held by the representative of Syria, who had been a member of the Visiting Mission, were given in the report and would undoubtedly be discussed by the Fourth Committee.

49. The TEMPORARY PRESIDENT, referring to the statements of the USSR and Haitian representatives, suggested that the consideration of the Visiting Mission's report and the joint draft resolution (T/L.621) should be deferred until the following meeting.

It was so decided.

Arrangements for a periodic visiting mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific in 1956 (T/L.620) (continued)

[Agenda item 3]

The TEMPORARY PRESIDENT called upon the representative of Haiti to introduce the draft resolution submitted by his delegation on the terms of reference of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific in 1956 (T/L.620).

51. Mr. SERAPHIN (Haiti) said that the provisions of his delegation's draft resolution on the terms of reference of the Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific were identical with those of resolutions establishing the terms of reference of previous visiting missions. He noted that operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution requested that the Visiting Mission should submit its report to the Council not later than 10 June 1956, so that it could be examined at the summer session of the Trusteeship Council in conjunction with the reports of the Administering Authorities.

52. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew attention to the fact that at its ninth session the General Assembly had adopted two resolutions which would require the Trusteeship Council to make provision for certain changes in the duties of its visiting missions. Resolution 853 (IX) on the par-

ticipation of the indigenous inhabitants of Trust Territories in the work of the Trusteeship Council recommended, *inter alia*, that the Council should instruct visiting missions to encourage public discussion of, and expression of views on, the annual reports of the Administering Authorities in the Trust Territories. Resolution 858 (IX) on the attainment by the Trust Territories of the objective of self-government or independence recommended that the Trusteeship Council should instruct its visiting missions to give special attention in their reports to the Council to the question of the attainment by the Trust Territories of self-government or independence.

53. In connexion with General Assembly resolution 858 (IX), he also noted that during the present (tenth) session, in the general debate on the report of the Trusteeship Council in the Fourth Committee, a number of Members had already expressed the view that it was regrettable that the Council's report (A/2933) contained nothing on the important question of the attainment of self-government or independence. The Council should not ignore the atmosphere which prevailed in the Fourth Committee. It would be appropriate for it to include references to those General Assembly resolutions in the terms of reference of the Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories in the Pacific. He suggested, therefore, that the words "in particular General Assembly resolutions 853 (IX) and 858 (IX)" should be inserted after the words "resolutions adopted by them" in operative paragraph 2 of the Haitian draft resolution.

54. Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador) said that his delegation had drawn the attention of the Trusteeship Council to the terms of those two General Assembly resolutions at its sixteenth session (632nd meeting). However, the Council had not seen fit to take any action to give its Visiting Missions appropriate instructions. His delegation would warmly support the USSR amendment to the draft resolution on the terms of reference of the Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories in the Pacific.

55. Mr. SERAPHIN (Haiti) said that he would not oppose the amendment proposed by the USSR delegation. However, he noted that the idea was already implicit in the phrase "in the light of discussions in the Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly and of resolutions adopted by them" in operative paragraph 2.

56. Mr. FORSYTH (Australia) found the Soviet proposal unacceptable. A number of successful Visiting Missions to the Trust Territories in the Pacific and to other Trust Territories had already been organized on the lines laid down in the original draft resolution. It would seem unnecessary to elaborate those terms of reference further. In connexion with the suggestion that the Visiting Mission should be instructed to encourage the public discussion of the reports of the Administering Authorities, he noted that that would be tantamount to instructing it to perform an unconstitutional action not within the functions of any organ of the United Nations. Administrative functions in the Trust Territories were explicitly reserved in all the Trusteeship Agreements to the Administering Authority of the territory concerned. Those administrative functions would cover the encouragement of the public discussion of any matter, as well as the education of the people in the ways of self-government. Such instructions would therefore constitute interference in the governmental functions of the Administering Authority

and a breach of the Trusteeship Agreements and the Charter of the United Nations.

57. The suggestion that the Visiting Mission should be instructed to pay special attention to the progress of the Trust Territory towards self-government was moreover unnecessary, since it was already implicit in operative paragraph 1 which directed the Visiting Mission to investigate and report on the steps taken towards the realization of the objectives set forth in Article 76 (b) of the Charter. He would vote against a specific reference to either General Assembly resolution.

58. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the changes in the duties of the Visiting Mission which he had referred to were not the idea of the Soviet delegation but were laid down in resolutions which had been adopted by the ninth session of the General Assembly. In the light of the Australian objections, it would seem particularly necessary to refer to those resolutions explicitly so that the Visiting Mission could carry out the duties laid down for it by the General Assembly. It was an obligation of the Trusteeship Council to abide by the terms of resolutions on its work and on the work of the visiting missions adopted by the General Assembly.

59. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that his delegation would vote against the Soviet amendment and, if it was adopted, against the resolution as a whole. Any specific reference to those controversial General Assembly resolutions, against which his delegation had voted in the General Assembly, would be quite redundant. He agreed with the representative of Australia that the Visiting Mission already had a wide mandate under operative paragraph 1 to investigate and report in a general way on the steps taken to promote full self-government in the area.

60. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) felt that it was entirely unnecessary and redundant to refer specifically in operative paragraph 2 to particular resolutions: if specific reference was made to General Assembly resolutions 853 (IX) and 858 (IX), it would by implication weaken the position of the rest which were not referred to specifically. The terms of reference of the Visiting Mission were already very broad. If the amendment was pressed to a vote, he would be obliged to vote against it.

61. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that the Belgian delegation had voted against the two General Assembly resolutions in question in the General Assembly. Hitherto, the visiting missions had worked in harmony with the Administering Authorities. It was clear that the Administering Authorities in the Trusteeship Council, which had voted against the resolutions in question in the General Assembly, would be obliged to vote against any invitation to a subordinate organ of the Council to conform to those resolutions, for the reasons which had already motivated them in the General Assembly. Thus, the Visiting Mission's instructions would be adopted in opposition to the views of most of the Administering Authorities. It would hardly be wise for the Trusteeship Council to sow discord between visiting missions and the Administering Authorities. The implementation of General Assembly resolution 853 (IX) in particular would clearly contravene the provisions of all the Trusteeship Agreements. There was no need for the Council to follow the General Assembly in pushing to their conclusion ill-conceived resolutions that had been hastily adopted.

The Belgian delegation would vote against the Soviet amendment, and if it was incorporated in the draft resolution, it would vote against the resolution.

62. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) said that since it seemed to be universally agreed that operative paragraph 2 covered the resolutions referred to by the Soviet representative, there would appear to be no objection to including a specific reference to those two resolutions. His delegation would vote in favour of the Soviet amendment.

63. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that under operative paragraph 2 of the Haitian draft resolution, the Visiting Mission was already required to take into account the terms of all relevant recommendations of the Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly. There would therefore be no doubt that the Visiting Mission would take into account the resolutions referred to by the representative of the USSR. If, however, the USSR wished to submit a formal amendment drawing attention to those two draft resolutions, the Indian delegation, which had voted in favour of them at the General Assembly, would be obliged to support it. However, he hoped that it would not be necessary, for if the amendment was carried the co-operation of the Administering Authorities might be withheld, and the Visiting Mission would perhaps be still-born.

64. Mr. BARGUES (France) said that his delegation had voted against the two resolutions in question in the General Assembly and he would vote against any explicit reference to them in the draft resolution.

65. Mr. S. S. LIU (China) said that he would abstain if the amendment was put to the vote. He agreed with the representative of Haiti that operative paragraph 2 covered all the resolutions adopted by the Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly, and he felt that there was no need to enumerate them. There was strong opposition to any special reference to those resolutions, and since his delegation did not want to see the Visiting Mission go without any terms of reference, it would abstain in order to prevent a tie vote.

66. The TEMPORARY PRESIDENT put to the vote the USSR verbal amendment to operative paragraph 2 of the Haitian draft resolution (T/L.620).

The amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

67. The TEMPORARY PRESIDENT put to the vote the Haitian draft resolution on the terms of reference of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific in 1956 (T/L.620).

The resolution was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

68. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that his delegation had voted against the USSR amendment to include a reference to two specific General Assembly resolutions. He had abstained from voting on the draft resolution itself because other resolutions were referred to specifically in operative paragraph 4.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.