

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL
T/PV.748
14 December 1956
ENGLISH

Sixth Special Session
VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-EIGHTH MEETING
Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 14 December 1956, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. ASHA (Syria)

The future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under French
administration [27] (continued)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.748. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

THE FUTURE OF THE TRUST TERRITORY OF TOGOLAND UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION (T/1290, T/1291 and Add.1 and 1292) [Agenda item 2] (continued)

Mr. ROLZ BENNET (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): At the two previous meetings of the special session of the Trusteeship Council, called at the request of the representative of France, we heard a statement from the representative of France, a statement from Mr. Poirier de Féral, the Referendum Administrator for the referendum held in October in French Togoland, a statement from Mr. Apedo Amah, the Finance Minister for that Territory, as well as the replies given by the representative of France with regard to certain questions put to him by the representatives of New Zealand, the United States of America and Australia. In addition, there were circulated document T/1290, containing the memorandum submitted by the Administering Authority; document T/1291, containing the petitions and communications relating to Togoland, etc.; and document T/1292, containing the report of the Referendum Administrator.

As the President will recall, the question of the Trust Territory of Togoland under French administration was dealt with at the seventeenth and eighteenth sessions of the Trusteeship Council. During the latter of these sessions the Trusteeship Council decided, under resolution 1499 (XVIII), to transmit to the General Assembly, at its eleventh session, the memorandum of the Administering Authority (T/1274/Rev.1) and to draw the General Assembly's attention to the debate which occurred during the seventeenth and eighteenth sessions of the Council.

The new reports and documents which we have now received from one single whole ~~and are a~~ continuation of the documents which we had decided to send on to the General Assembly. My delegation is of the opinion that the appropriate procedure under the present circumstances would be ~~also to transmit to the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly these new reports and documents which were submitted to us by the Administering Authority. To that end, the second part of the special report of the Council to the General Assembly, appearing in document A/3179, might be supplemented by means of an addendum in which we would give account to the Assembly of the new reports and documents submitted by the Administering Authority.~~

This, in the opinion of my delegation, is the procedure which we should follow, in harmony with the resolution to which I have referred. Therefore, we take the liberty of presenting a motion to that effect.

The PRESIDENT: The Council has heard the motion of the representative of Guatemala. Are there any comments?

Mr. BARNES (France) (interpretation from French): It is true, as has just been recalled by the representative of Guatemala, that the Trusteeship Council, during its last ordinary session, took a decision to transmit to the General Assembly, for examination during its eleventh session, the documents submitted by the Administering Authority to the Trusteeship Council, as well as the records of the meetings which the Council devoted to that matter.

(Mr. Barques, France)

I should like to point out that the Council took that decision after having devoted a number of meetings to the examination of that problem. The problem at that time was at a certain stage which resulted from the memorandum submitted on 30 January by the Administering Authority.

At the present time a new element of great importance has appeared, namely, the referendum which took place on 28 October. The results are well known and the Government of the French Republic, in agreement with the Government of the Republic of Togoland, on this point, has furnished us with an interpretation of these results, which led us to ask the General Assembly to put an end to the Trusteeship Agreement between the Administering Authority and the United Nations. I think that it would be advisable, before any decision is taken, that the Trusteeship Council should proceed to a detailed analysis of this new element. Purely and simply to transmit, without preliminary examination, to the General Assembly the documents relating to the future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under French administration would be equivalent to shirking a debate, whereas this is a question of vital importance. We must remember that French Togoland is the third Trust Territory in importance; it is exceeded in population and economic activity only by Tanganyika and the French Cameroons. We should realize that this is a question of the future of a Territory having more than a million inhabitants. The Trusteeship Council would have an abnormal concept of its role if it thought that it was limited simply to the functions of a mailbox and that it should leave the decision entirely in the hands of the General Assembly without furnishing to the latter all the elements necessary for judgement.

That is why I regret that I cannot subscribe to the proposal just made by the representative of Guatemala.

Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom): Before the representative of Guatemala made his formal proposal, I had wished to make one or two observations, principally of a preliminary nature, with regard to the study which we had embarked on of the French memorandum during our previous meetings.

(Mr. Gidden, United Kingdom)

Before addressing a supplementary question to the representative of France, I should like to draw attention, at least so far as my delegation is concerned, to the extreme interest with which we heard the account given by the Referendum Administrator, at our last meeting, of the steps which he had taken in pursuance of the decisions of the French Government in connexion with the conduct and operation of the referendum in the Trust Territory. I felt at that time that it would be a service to the General Assembly, in whatever form we report on the proceedings of this special session to the Assembly, if it were possible for a fairly ~~full~~ summary of the statement made at our last meeting by the Referendum Administrator to be included in our report. This, I think, is a purely factual suggestion, but my delegation felt that the lucidity with which the Administrator informed the Council of the various measures for which he had been responsible in the Territory was an element which, perhaps, would be of service to the Fourth Committee. I am, of course, aware that the verbatim records of the Council are available to all members of the Trusteeship Council, and also, of course, that the formal report of the Referendum Administrator will equally be available to the General Assembly. Nevertheless, the clarity with which the Administrator presented his statement at our last meeting would, I think, be usefully reflected in any report which the Council decides to send to the Assembly.

So much for that by way of a preliminary comment.

I should like, with your permission, Mr. President, to return to one element of the statute annexed to document T/1290, which was touched upon by the representative of the United States at our last meeting in certain questions which he put to the representative of France, and, craving the indulgence of the representative of France for a second time, I should like to refer to the provisions of the statute which are contained in Part X of that document.

It seems to me that it is extremely important that we should understand precisely the nature of these transitional provisions which are included in the statute, and it may be that, from the point of view of the Council, I am asking

(Mr. Gidden, United Kingdom)

a question here which is abundantly clear to other representatives; but, reading the verbatim record of our last meeting, I felt that there was still a possibility for some misunderstanding to arise, a misunderstanding both possible amongst representatives on the Council and, as the result of our discussions here, in the General Assembly.

The question is, in effect, this. Am I right in thinking that the only diminution of the status of an autonomous Republic like French Togoland is contained in the transitional provisions included in Part X of the statute?

(Mr. Gidden. United Kingdom)

Am I right in thinking that in the opinion of the Government of France there are no other diminutions of the status of autonomy as defined in French constitutional law, in the statute apart from those transitional provisions which are contained in part 10 of the statute?

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): Mr. President, this may be out of order, but I did not understand quite what the representative of the United Kingdom was asking. What does he mean by diminution?

Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom): I apologize if I have not framed my question clearly but my reason for asking this question is precisely because of the several questions which were asked by the United States representative at our last meeting. I think his second question, which was answered at some length by the representative of France, did not in fact leave -- in the opinion of my delegation -- a completely clear understanding of the view of the French Government with regard to the inclusion in the statute of the transitional provisions. The point upon which I would like clarification is the following: without using the word diminution, in case that is ambiguous, are the transitional provisions which are included in part 10 of the statute, or are they not, the only provisions within that statute which, in the opinion of the representative of France, derogate -- as indeed they must derogate -- from the status of autonomy which the Territory of French Togoland is regarded by the French Government as having achieved with the introduction of the statute.

Mr. BARGUES (France): It is true that the provisions in part 10 of the statute constitute the only restrictions made by the statute on the exercise of autonomy on the part of the autonomous Republic of Togoland. I must say that these restrictions are of an obligatory and temporary nature. They are obligatory because, as I pointed out at the last meeting in reply to the question put to me by the representative of the United States, if the statute had been implemented without these transitional provisions France would have found it impossible to fulfil all the obligations incumbent on it as a result of the Trusteeship System in Togoland and as a result of the Trusteeship Agreement concluded in 1946.

(Mr. Bargues, France)

Under this agreement and because Togoland has been placed under the Trusteeship System, France must fulfil certain obligations. On the whole I would say that these obligations consist of exercising supervision over the administration of Togoland and also of reporting to the United Nations on the way in which Togoland has been administered. Togoland acquires autonomy or self-government; now the position is changed thereby. Certain duties or powers which were within the competence of the administering authority are now transferred to the autonomous Republic of Togoland. France, therefore, if the statute is applied as a whole, is not in a position to fulfil some of these duties and it was accordingly necessary -- even obligatory -- and for that reason I have stated that these provisions were obligatory. This is so if France, in the absence of an act terminating the international Trusteeship System, had to continue to exercise its duties, and express provision to this effect had to be made in the statute.

This procedure was accepted by the Assembly in Togoland and by the population in the referendum. I say that these obligatory provisions had to be temporary because, while they are applied, the Republic of Togoland will not find itself in a position to enjoy the complete autonomy provided by Articles 1 to 38 of the statute.

Mr. GIDDER (United Kingdom): I would like to thank the representative of France for having, I think, made this matter abundantly clear to my own delegation and I hope that any doubts which may have been in the minds of any of the other representatives may have been dispelled.

Mr. LORANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): In the view of the Soviet delegation the views stated before this Council by the representative of Guatemala deserve sincere attention and support and should be discussed first. Over a brief period the Trusteeship Council has examined the question of the Territory of Togoland with a view to fulfilling the decisions of the General Assembly which were made during the tenth session. Clear views were expressed by various delegations on this matter and the Council decided, at its eighteenth session, to refer to the General Assembly the memorandum of the administrative authority and the report of the discussions in the Council during its last session. At the present time the Trusteeship Council report is included in the agenda of the

(Mr. Lobanov, USSR)

Eleventh session of the General Assembly and is before the Fourth Committee, where there is every opportunity for all delegations to state their views and to make proposals. The administering authority, however, has now found it necessary to submit a memorandum to the Trusteeship Council and not to the General Assembly, before which this question now stands. The Soviet delegation considers that under these circumstances the discussion of the question in the Trusteeship Council would be irregular for the following reasons:

In the first place, included in the questions on the agenda of the eleventh session of the General Assembly this matter has been entrusted -- not to the Trusteeship Council but to the Fourth Committee. Bearing in mind that the Council has already considered the matter and has presented an appropriate report and that the tenth session of the General Assembly requested the Trusteeship Council to make a special study of this question and to hold a referendum of the population of this territory, that is to say Togoland under French Administration, concerning its future -- the Council is now asked to consider a fait accompli or the result of the referendum although the Council received no such request from the Assembly.

Next, the referendum was carried out by the administering authority without the agreement of the General Assembly, in violation of paragraph 2 of the resolution of the tenth session of the General Assembly. In this connexion, justice demands that the General Assembly itself should pass upon the merits of such an undertaking.

For these reasons, the Soviet delegation saw no need to call the present session of the Trusteeship Council, inasmuch as anything which the United Nations might undertake could be decided upon during the course of the present session of the General Assembly, which has included on its agenda the question of the future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under French Administration.

For the same reasons the Soviet delegation supports the Guatemalan proposal for the reference of the materials submitted to the Council directly to the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly. As regards the substance of the matter, the Soviet delegation will state its views during the discussion in the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly.

Mr. JALPAL (India): As you know, we were opposed to the holding of this special session. In our opinion, the Council at its last session already had completed consideration of this question for the rapporteur and its report is now before the General Assembly. Ordinarily, any further consideration of this particular Trust Territory should take place at the next regular session of the Council. However, the Administering Authority has now submitted certain proposals, and since the General Assembly is now in session, and is in fact anxious to take up this item at a very early date, in our opinion it would be more desirable to discuss this question at length in detail in the General Assembly, rather than here in the Trusteeship Council. One must remember that there are petitioners to be heard by the Fourth Committee, and it obviously would be necessary to examine their petitions before reaching a decision.

In the circumstances, we would like to reserve our position for the present in the Council, and we hope to explain our position more fully in the General Assembly. Therefore, we would support the motion made by the representative of Guatemala. We have no objection, indeed we see every advantage, in sending up a full report of the proceedings of this session to the General Assembly.

I do not think it is quite fair to say that the Trusteeship Council is shirking its responsibility. Members here have different conceptions about the extent of the Council's competence. Some of us here are elected by the General Assembly and are acutely aware of our responsibilities to the General Assembly.

We feel that in the recent case of British Togoland, the Indian delegation discharged rather fully its responsibilities both in the Trusteeship Council and in the General Assembly. Our views on the substance of the present question before us were fully expressed at the last session of the Council, and we do not think it necessary to go into it here once again before this organ.

Mr. ROLZ-BENNETT (Guatemala)(interpretation from Spanish): I must in the first place say that my delegation feels that the documents submitted and the statements made by members of the French delegation before this Council constitute a contribution which was necessary for our debate here or our debate in the General Assembly, specifically in the Fourth Committee. Therefore, my delegation is sure that these documents and statements will be taken very ~~much into account~~, not only here in the Council but in the Fourth Committee. This means that my delegation is in favour of the idea that in the report which we sent up to the General Assembly there should be a broad and ample summary of these documents and statements to which I have been making reference.

In spite of this, it is true that following logically upon our decision as taken in the resolution to which I have referred, it would be best for these statements and documents which form a part and are a continuation of the previous statements and documents submitted to the Council, that they be offered, and transmitted to the General Assembly in conformity with our prior resolution. I think we could have a motion to this end, since the new information submitted formed part of the previous document mentioned.

Also, I would like to say that the sense of my motion does not have as its object to avoid a discussion. Rather quite on the contrary, the object of it is to have this discussion occur as soon as possible. We have learned that the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly expects us to conclude our debate here so that they can take up the debate in the Fourth Committee. The sooner we despatch this matter here and send our report up to the General Assembly, then the sooner will the debate get under way in the Fourth Committee.

Now in conclusion, I must recall the position of my delegation with regard to certain aspects which I believe I should bring up now. This position specially is with regard to the powers which the Council has, vis-à-vis the General Assembly. We stated these very clearly when we made an analysis of General Assembly resolution 944 with regard to the powers and functions of this Council, when we were debating British Togoland at the eighteenth session of the Council. And likewise on this occasion, my delegation is of the opinion that resolution 944 in its second part stated very clearly the role to be played by our Council in this matter; and my delegation feels that we have done our duty under that resolution, in the report which we have sent on to the Fourth Committee and which now can be supplemented with the new documents and statements which the Administering Authority has submitted to the Council.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I believe that the Trusteeship Council has a duty of considering the documentation furnished to it by the representative of France, and that it has the duty of discussing it and giving to the General Assembly the benefit of its views, its considered views on this document. I believe that no one will dispute the fact that the Administering Authority has the right as an active administration to carry out a consultation with the people in a territory. This consultation with the people was carried out by France. It took measures so that this consultation with the people might be held under circumstances of complete impartiality and of complete freedom for the electors.

The referendum Administrator has reported to us, it is for the Trusteeship Council to fulfil its duty which is to assist the General Assembly by studying this document and giving the benefit of its views to the General Assembly.

I would add that the very dignity of the Council, which is a principal, a main organ of the United Nations, requires the discussion here to be held in a complete way. As far as I am concerned, as far as my delegation is concerned, it would protest most vigorously against any attitude which would deprive the Council of its prerogatives and deprive the Administering Authority of the position it occupies on the Council, which does not exist in the Assembly.

The Council is a parity body, and that was the intention of the General Assembly. What is desired here is to take away from the Administering Authority the guarantee which is given to them by the parity nature of the Council, and take questions which should be examined by the Council and give ~~them to the General Assembly~~, where parity does not exist. No one should make any mistake about that. And we do not make any mistake about it. I am speaking on behalf of the Belgian delegation.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): My delegation listened with considerable interest, as it always does, to the statement of the representative of India. We think he made a very good point and we shall support the motion as he recommended it. On the other hand, what the representative of Belgium said with respect to the constitutional position of the Trusteeship Council seems to my delegation to be perfectly sound. Affairs in Africa are moving faster than my good friend who has spent his whole life in Africa could ever have conceived of five years ago. It seems to me therefore more important than ever that a balanced Committee like this should have the opportunity, whenever the occasion arises, to discuss in a calm atmosphere what is going on so that the Fourth Committee, which is sometimes far from calm, should have the advantage we might care to give it.

On the other hand, we are presented with a special situation. The General Assembly is in session, the Fourth Committee is in session; it overlaps with the special session of this Council. This Council is not today in possession of certain information that will be available to it after Christmas. For that reason I think it is not a weakening of the constitutional position of the Trusteeship Council to vote in favour of sending this matter to the General Assembly forthwith, provided it is a fair presentation of all the information which the French Government has given to us at this time.

Mr. RIFAI (Syria): I wish to state quite briefly that my delegation wishes to endorse the opinion advanced by the representatives of Guatemala, India and now the United States with regard to the procedure which seems to us most advisable in the circumstances. We think that the second memorandum of the French Government should be transmitted immediately to the Fourth Committee so that it can be considered there where we can have a better view and a more complete appraisal of the situation.

I wish to state, while I have the floor, that in addition to what has been said by my colleagues I find it a little illogical for this Council to come and discuss a memorandum which in a sense is based on an action which has been implicitly rejected by the Trusteeship Council earlier. This Council has

certainly in a way refused to sanction the action which was taken by the French Government to hold a plebiscite in French Togoland. For this reason it cannot be invited now to discuss this action and I think that the most appropriate place in which to assess the merits of the whole case would be before the Fourth Committee and later before the General Assembly.

Mr. GRILLO (Italy): I would like to ask the President: which were the delegations which requested a special session of the Council.

The SECRETARY: Of the fourteen members of the Council, ten members replied. I shall enumerate those who did not reply in the affirmative. The Soviet Union replied in the negative, that it was opposed. No reply was received from the Governments of Syria, India and Australia.

Mr. GRILLO (Italy): I wonder if those delegations which agreed to a special session of the Council being convened would care to explain what they had in mind to discuss at this session. They knew very well that the subject of the discussion would be the future of Togoland under French administration and that this special session would imply a discussion on the merits of the question, at least on the part of those delegations which had called for this special session.

The PRESIDENT: I must reply to the representative of Italy on behalf of the Council. I do not think it is fair to ask members of the Council why they have accepted or not accepted the calling of the special session of the Council. We have rule 3 of our rules of procedure with which the representative of Italy is quite familiar. The Council was convened; members have stated their views; there are two opposing views; we have heard five members wishing to refer the matter to the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly; we have heard the views of two delegations who wished to have a full discussion of the question. It is for this Council to decide which course it wishes to follow.

Mr. KIANG (China): My delegation sees no irregularity on the part of France in requesting a special session of the Trusteeship Council and in reporting to this session on the results of the referendum held in French Togoland. Nor do we feel that such a request from France for such a meeting is in violation of the resolution adopted by the previous regular session of the Trusteeship Council. I think it is quite legitimate for France or any member of the Trusteeship Council to request a meeting of a special session of the Trusteeship Council.

Now let me come to the motion presented by the representative of Guatemala. As the Council is fully aware, my delegation voted for resolution 1499 (XVIII) on 14 August 1956. In my opinion the present proposal of the representative of Guatemala is quite in line with the meaning of that resolution for which my delegation voted. It is for this simple reason that we are now inclined to favour a fuller discussion of the present new French memorandum concerning the future of French ~~Togoland~~ and the report of the ~~Referendum~~ Commissioner to the General Assembly.

Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) (interpretation from French): Members of the Council will of course recall that during the eighteenth session two draft resolutions were considered. The first resolution referred to the memorandum of the French delegation to the Trusteeship Council referring to the holding of a popular consultation in the Territory, and on that occasion the French delegation asked for the participation of the Trusteeship Council through the dispatch of observers. There was a long debate on that memorandum and the position of the delegation of Haiti as to the terms of that popular consultation was that it could not agree to the alternative proposed to that consultation. Thus, we did not agree that the Council should send observers for that consultation. We know the arguments which were advanced by the French delegation in that respect and we could not agree with them, and that is why my delegation voted against the draft resolution.

(Mr. Dorsinville, Haiti)

We know that the interpretation which was given to the result of the tie vote cannot be the same as the interpretation of the delegation of Haiti. We do not think that the Council was unable to take a decision because of that tie vote. We think that the Council did not approve the proposal of the French Government.

There was a second resolution which referred to the General Assembly the discussion of the question of Togoland under French administration. We also know from the statement made by the French delegation during the eighteenth session that in spite of the result of the vote on the first resolution the French Government proposed to go ahead with its plan. The plebiscite was held in the Territory, and we have been seized by the French delegation of its new memorandum contained in document T/1291, which gives an account of that consultation.

When the President of the Trusteeship Council informed the members of the Council of the request of the French delegation to hold this special session of the Council, my delegation did not oppose it because we thought that any Administering Authority had the right to ask for the calling of a special session if it thought that it had good reason to do so. Out of courtesy to the French request, my delegation did not oppose the holding of this special session.

As for the subject under discussion here, my delegation has not taken an active part in it because of the stand we took during the eighteenth session of the Trusteeship Council. We did not approve of what the French Government had proposed to do and we do not wish to take an active part in the discussion of the results of that popular consultation because it had not been authorized by the Trusteeship Council or the United Nations.

My delegation approves ~~the motion~~ submitted by the delegation of Guatemala as to what the result should be of our consideration of this item. We, as the representative of Guatemala has said, think that the reference of all the documentation supplied to this special session of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly is a logical consequence of the first decision taken at the eighteenth session of the Council; that is, we should supplement the documentation which has already been transmitted with the additions which are now before us. In doing this, we will be perfectly consistent with the position

(Mr. Dorsinville, Haiti)

which at least my delegation had adopted during the eighteenth session of the Council. That is why my delegation supports the motion moved by the delegation of Guatemala.

Mr. GRILLO (Italy): It is the opinion of my delegation that the Council would shirk its responsibility ~~if~~ it did not discuss fully the question before it -- the future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under French administration -- in the light of the new elements submitted by the French delegation. Negative action by the Council -- the transmission of the documents without any consideration to the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly -- would have the political implications to which the Belgian representative has referred. In this connexion I entirely share his view. Therefore, I suggest that a decision as to what should be done be not taken today and that the meeting be adjourned to Monday of next week.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I must take note of a statement which has just been made by the representative of Haiti and which is extremely serious. The representative of Haiti said that France organized a popular consultation which was not authorized by the Trusteeship Council. Since when does the Trusteeship Agreement give to the Trusteeship Council the right to authorize or not to authorize an administrative measure taken by an Administering Authority which has full legislative and administrative power?

I believe, as the representative of Italy, that the Council would be evading its responsibilities if it did not consider and give its views on the documents submitted to it by the French delegation. France had announced its intention of carrying out a referendum in Togoland, and it offered to the Trusteeship Council the possibility of having United Nations representation and supervision over the carrying out of that referendum. The Trusteeship Council voted against the draft resolution which invited the United Nations to send an observation mission to supervise the referendum operations. Under these circumstances, France took the measures which it would have taken in the absence of an invitation to the United Nations in order to be sure because of

(Mr. Ryckmans, Belgium)

its responsibilities as an Administering Authority that the referendum it organized would be carried out under circumstances of complete freedom and regularity. We have received a report on the results of that referendum.

The members of the Council would be evading their duty if they did not state whether or not they believed that the referendum was carried out under conditions of regularity. We have received documentation. We must give our view on that documentation. For my part, after having read the report of the Referendum Commissioner and having heard his explanation, I am convinced -- and I am prepared to state and to affirm this conviction on my responsibility in a vote -- that the holding of the referendum was carried out in a regular and legal manner. Otherwise, what are the results to be drawn from the referendum? That is a completely different question, but on that, too, the Trusteeship Council is duty bound to give its view to the General Assembly. If some members of the Council think that the referendum was not held under correct conditions and that the supervision which France had exercised through a member of its Conseil d'Etat was not adequate supervision, let them say so. If they recognize that the referendum was carried out legally or properly but they consider that the results do not justify the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement, let them say so. Let them assume their responsibilities to the General Assembly. Let us not evade the matter by hiding behind an Assembly where we know that there are sixty votes which in advance have decided to go against the colonial Powers.

Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) (interpretation from French): I did not think I would have to explain my views to my colleague from Belgium on the statement I made concerning an authorization from the Trusteeship Council for the referendum. My colleague, who perhaps has more experience than anyone here concerning the rights and powers of Administering Authorities, knows very well that the delegation of Haiti could not say that the Administering Authority did not have the right to hold a popular consultation in a Territory entrusted to it.

Our colleague knows how the discussion proceeded on the French Government's memorandum at the eighteenth session of the Trusteeship Council. It was within the limits of the proposals made then, of the discussion held and of the decision taken that I said that the Trusteeship Council ~~had not authorized that~~ popular consultation. Indeed, we know that the participation of the United Nations had been requested under certain conditions. That was ~~what~~ was opposed by certain delegations in the Council -- namely, the acceptance of the request of the Government concerned.

My thought is, therefore, perfectly clear. I have made this reply because I thought it necessary in order that there might be no unfortunate interpretation of my idea. It was, perhaps, unnecessary, but since my esteemed colleague felt that he had to reply to me by interpreting my thoughts -- which I think were perfectly clear to everyone here -- I had to make my position quite clear for purposes of record.

The PRESIDENT: Before I call upon the representative of Italy I would say that I think that he will agree with me that he had invoked rule 56 (g), because he proposed in his motion that we should defer consideration of the matter until Monday, thus specifying a certain day. That is why I had to call upon both the representative of Belgium and the representative of Haiti. As I say, I hope the representative of Italy agrees with me.

Mr. CRILLO (Italy): I do agree, Mr. President.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): On a point of order. You have just ruled, Mr. President, that the motion presented by the representative of Italy comes within the meaning of rule 56 (g) of the rules of procedure, which relates to a motion "To postpone discussion of the question to a certain day or indefinitely". I should like to draw your attention to the preceding sub-paragraph, (f), of rule 56, which relates to a motion "To refer any matter to a committee, to the Secretary-General or to a rapporteur". As my delegation understands it, the Guatemalan motion has to be interpreted as meaning the reference of this matter to the General Assembly, and I think that it would come within the spirit of this sub-paragraph (f). I would suggest, therefore, that the Guatemalan motion ought to be put to the vote first.

The PRESIDENT: I think that the representative of India may have misunderstood sub-paragraph (f) of rule 56 relating to a motion "To refer any matter to a committee, to the Secretary-General or to a rapporteur". It is my understanding that the committee referred to is a committee of the Trusteeship Council, not a committee of the General Assembly. I do hope that the representative of India will agree with me.

Mr. JAIPAL (India): I am not inclined to disagree with you, Sir, but I do think that a question which is being referred to a committee ought to receive less priority than a question which is referred to the General Assembly.

Mr. RYOGIANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The representative of Italy, unfortunately, remembered that today was Friday and that there would be no meeting tomorrow, Saturday. Therefore he asked that today's discussion be adjourned until Monday. Thus his motion came under sub-paragraph (g) of rule 56 of the rules of procedure, which relates to a motion "To postpone discussion of the question to a certain day or indefinitely". For my part -- and I hope the representative of Italy will agree with me -- I would move for adjournment under rule 56 (b).

The PRESIDENT: Before I put that motion to the vote, I call upon the representative of the United States.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): The idea of being bogged down by rules is to me unpalatable. This is a perfectly simple matter. Either we deal with it today or we deal with it on Monday. It seems to me that the representative of Italy had some ideas with regard to why it should be dealt with on Monday, and, while my delegation feels exactly as it felt when it spoke before, it might be helpful to the Council if we could dispense with the idea of rules, and so on, and ask the representative of Italy if he could explain to us, as he probably can, why it would be advisable to wait until Monday. It is of no great importance under any conditions.

Mr. GRILLO (Italy): I think that in view of the importance of the matter we can find a measure of agreement among some members of the Council on the way to proceed at a subsequent meeting. That is why I insist on my motion.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): As I said a moment ago, we feel, exactly as we felt before, that this matter ought to be sent to the Fourth Committee. Also, we see no reason why it should not finally be decided on Monday. If it comes to a vote whereby we can reach the final decision on Monday we shall vote in favour of a Monday meeting. However, we shall not vote in favour of no decision at all -- in other words, of leaving it open. We think that it is only fair to the French delegation that all the information which it has presented to this special session of the Council should be transmitted to the Fourth Committee.

The PRESIDENT: I have no alternative but to put to the vote now the motion presented by Belgium under rule 56 (b) to adjourn the meeting.

The motion was adopted by 7 votes to 6, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will meet on Monday morning at 10.30.

The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.