



C O N T E N T S

Agenda item 35:

The Togoland unification problem and the future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration: report of the Trusteeship Council (continued) 365

Chairman: Mr. Luciano JOUBLANC RIVAS
(Mexico).

AGENDA ITEM 35

The Togoland unification problem and the future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration: report of the Trusteeship Council (A/3046, T/1206 and Add.1, T/1214, T/1215) (continued)

HEARING OF PETITIONERS (continued)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. S. G. Antor, Mr. A. K. Odame and Mr. A. A. Chamba, representatives of the Togoland Congress, Mr. J. A. Nagba, representative of the Northern People's Party, Mr. J. Mensah, Mr. F. Y. Asare, Mr. S. T. Fleku and Mr. S. K. Kumah, representatives of the Convention People's Party, Akan-Krachi Constituency, Buem Constituency, Ho District, and Kpandu District, respectively, Mr. S. Olympio, representative of the All-Ewe Conference, Mr. Mama Foussemi, representative of the Union des chefs et des populations du Nord-Togo, Mr. R. Ajavon, representative of the Parti togolais du progrès, and Mr. A. I. Santos, representative of Juvento, took places at the Committee table.

1. Mrs. MONTEJO ORTUNO (Costa Rica) noted that her country, together with Guatemala and Uruguay, had been one of those taken to task by a newspaper published in Togoland under French administration from which Mr. Santos had read extracts at the 530th meeting.

2. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) made the same comment. She would state her opinion when she had read the text of the article in question.

3. Mr. GARCIA (Philippines) asked the petitioners which countries they would consider the best qualified to supervise the plebiscite operations, if the United Nations was unable to supervise them.

4. Mr. OLYMPIO (All-Ewe Conference) and Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) thought that it was for the United Nations to appoint the countries. As the people of Togoland were parties to the case, they could not appoint the arbiters.

5. Mr. ASARE (Convention People's Party, Buem Constituency) also thought that it was for the United Nations and the Administering Authority to settle the matter the Philippine representative had raised.

6. Mr. MENSAH (Convention People's Party, Akan-Krachi Constituency) pointed out that that had been the conclusion reached by the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Togoland under British administration and Togoland under French administration, 1955.

7. Mr. GARCIA (Philippines) explained that he had asked his question because it had seemed to him that, in the view of some of the petitioners, the Administering Authority was not completely impartial.

8. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt) asked the petitioners who were in favour of allowing a transition period before the plebiscite was organized in Togoland under British administration, how long they thought that period should last.

9. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) pointed out that it had taken two years to organize the elections in the Gold Coast. In any case, at least a year would be needed to provide Togoland with separate political institutions and take the necessary steps for the organization of the plebiscite.

10. Mr. FLEKU (Convention People's Party, Ho District) did not agree. The Togoland problem had existed for eight years and there was no need to delay a settlement.

11. Mr. ASARE (Convention People's Party, Buem Constituency) added that it had taken not more than four months to organize the elections in the Gold Coast.

12. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) pointed out that preparations for the elections in the Gold Coast and the necessary consultations had started in 1953. He admitted that the Togoland problem had existed for eight years, but the plebiscite had raised a new question. The peoples must be informed of it and the necessary separate institutions set up.

13. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt) inquired about the effect of a separation of the Gold Coast and Togoland under British administration.

14. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) replied that the separation should affect only political institutions and that all other ties should remain intact.

15. Mr. TRIANTAPHYLLAKOS (Greece) wanted to know how the petitioners thought that the freedom of expression of the peoples could be safeguarded if the Fourth Committee decided not to postpone the plebiscite.

16. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) explained that separate institutions would have to be set up and a clearly defined frontier drawn between the Gold Coast and Togoland under British administration, in order to remove the confusion existing in that area. Togoland itself would also have to be divided into two regions, the North and the South.

17. Mr. ODAME (Togoland Congress) did not see why the future of Togoland under British adminis-

tration need be linked with that of the Gold Coast, in view of the conditions under which the two countries had developed.

18. In reply to a question from Mr. TRIANTAPHYLLAKOS (Greece) Mr. KUMAH (Convention People's Party, Kpandu District) said that he saw no reason why the population of Togoland under French administration need be consulted for the time being. The questions should be taken in order. The most pressing problem was to find out whether Togoland under British administration wished to be separated from the Gold Coast.

19. In reply to a question from Mr. TRIANTAPHYLLAKOS (Greece) Mr. NAGBA (Northern People's Party) said that he did not know the exact percentage of illiterates in his area, but added that that information alone would not make it possible to decide whether a people was qualified to decide on its future or not.

20. Mr. TRIANTAPHYLLAKOS (Greece) agreed with that remark. He wondered what would happen if the plebiscite showed a majority against union with the Gold Coast.

21. Mr. NAGBA (Northern People's Party) said that he could not imagine the peoples of Northern Togoland voting against the union.

22. Mr. TRIANTAPHYLLAKOS (Greece) recalled that some of the petitioners from Togoland under French administration had spoken for, and others against, association with the French Union. He inquired whether a plebiscite should not be held to clear up that point.

23. Mr. AJAVON (Parti togolais du progrès) thought that the people could decide on its future when the trusteeship régime came to an end.

24. Mr. TRIANTAPHYLLAKOS (Greece) asked which two countries were the most closely linked: the two Togolands, or the Gold Coast and Togoland under British administration?

25. Mr. OLYMPIO (All-Ewe Conference) recalled that under the German administration, Togoland had been one country.

26. Miss ROESAD (Indonesia) wanted to know whether the peoples of Northern Togoland were content to be governed by the Gold Coast, or whether they too would not like to achieve self-government.

27. Mr. MENSAH (Convention People's Party, Akan-Krachi Constituency) replied that the tribes in Northern Togoland and those of the Gold Coast were in very close contact, and that they wished that state of affairs to continue.

28. Mr. KUMAH (Convention People's Party, Kpandu District) added that, in his opinion, self-government lay in the power to elect representatives to the constitutional organs of a country.

29. Miss ROESAD (Indonesia) did not want to take up any position at that stage in the debate, but she wondered if it would not be possible to set up a representative organ for Togoland, which would subsequently be empowered to organize the elections and would earn greater prestige by so doing.

30. Mr. FLEKU (Convention People's Party, Ho District) noted that, according to those who advocated establishing separate institutions in Togoland, the

country could not decide on its future until it had its own institutions. But he did not see how such institutions could be set up except by organizing elections or appointing representatives. In either case, recourse would have to be had to the Administering Authority or to the people. Why, in those circumstances, should there not be a plebiscite directly organized?

31. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) thought that there was some difference between elections and a plebiscite, even though the people were consulted in both cases. He pointed out that he was by no means against a plebiscite; he only wanted to avoid confusion.

32. Mr. ASARE (Convention People's Party, Buem Constituency) stated that, if Togoland under British administration had an opportunity that very day to hold elections to establish its own institutions, the elections would doubtless be held under the supervision of the Administering Authority or the United Nations, or both, just like the plebiscite. Accordingly, if it were supposed that the plebiscite would be conducted in a state of confusion, the same would be true of any election of separate institutions.

33. Miss ROESAD (Indonesia) felt, in the light of some of the replies given by the petitioners, that the desire for union with the Gold Coast revealed by a part of the population sprang from sentimental reasons, such as ties of kinship. She wanted some further details on the subject.

34. Mr. ASARE (Convention People's Party, Buem Constituency) recalled that, in the statement he had made at the 529th meeting, he had said that the population of Togoland under British administration was bound to that of the Gold Coast not only by kinship, but by economic, social and cultural ties.

35. Mr. KUMAH (Convention People's Party, Kpandu District) pointed out that his party was not asking that the people should be forced to accept union with the Gold Coast. It was in favour of a plebiscite to determine whether the people desired that union.

36. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala), referring to the article from a newspaper published in Togoland under French administration read by Mr. Santos at the 530th meeting, deplored the fact that an official or semi-official newspaper should publish articles insulting not only to certain countries, but to the United Nations itself, its procedure and its decisions. He was sure that the French delegation regretted the incident.

37. With regard to the plebiscite, he was surprised that no effort was being made first to clear up certain points relating to a measure of such importance to the people concerned. A plebiscite did not suppose only an affirmative or negative reply to one or more questions. The entire people must first be instructed as to the scope and consequences of the plebiscite. He wanted to know whether these questions had been discussed throughout the Territory from the point of view of the general interest and not solely from the standpoint of local or group interests.

38. Mr. FLEKU (Convention People's Party, Ho District) expressed surprise at the efforts of some petitioners to convince the Fourth Committee that a plebiscite in Togoland under British administration would take place in an atmosphere of confusion.

39. The United Nations had sent a Visiting Mission to Togoland to determine how the true aspirations of

the population could best be ascertained. He recalled that he had told the fourth Committee at the ninth session that the people desired a plebiscite. The Visiting Mission had been instructed to verify that opinion. After studying the situation on the spot, it had submitted a report (T/1206 and Add. 1) in which it recommended a plebiscite as the only way of settling the Togoland question. The representatives of the Convention People's Party were therefore not the only ones who had asked for a plebiscite. As the Visiting Mission had had an opportunity to note, everyone in Togoland under British administration was familiar with the question, which had been debated at length throughout the Territory.

40. Mr. CHAMBA (Togoland Congress) said that his party was not opposed to a plebiscite, but he realized that the Gold Coast Government wished to kill two birds with one stone: to attain self-government and to bring about the integration of Togoland with the Gold Coast.

41. The people of Northern Togoland were opposed to the infiltration of Gold Coast inhabitants into that part of the Trust Territory. The Togoland Congress had already pointed out that a number of tribes straddled the frontier between the two Territories and were therefore under the control of the Gold Coast Government. The Togoland Congress favoured a plebiscite if that infiltration could be stopped, and it was with that purpose in mind that it sought the establishment of separate institutions for Togoland.

42. Mr. NAGBA (Northern People's Party) did not share the Togoland Congress representative's opinion. It was incorrect to say that certain tribal groups were controlled and that their views were ignored. As the Visiting Mission's report showed, it had consulted members of all the tribes and all the minority groups in Northern Togoland. The inhabitants of his region (the Dagomba district) had never been prevented from expressing their opinion, and the same was true of the tribes in all parts of Northern Togoland where there were minority groups.

43. Mr. ODAME (Togoland Congress) was very surprised that a representative of the Convention People's Party should assert that the population of Togoland was familiar with the question. The agents of the Gold Coast Government had in fact told the inhabitants of the Territory that to refuse to accept unification was tantamount to seeking French rule. When the Visiting Mission had arrived, it had been asked that question and had stated at meetings that that was not the situation at all.

44. On 15 November, before the Trusteeship Council had considered the question and submitted its report to the General Assembly (A/3046), the Gold Coast Government and the Administering Authority had already begun to take steps with a view to holding a plebiscite, although the people had not been informed. He believed that before a plebiscite was held care should be taken to ensure an atmosphere free from outside interference. Accordingly, there should be enough time to tell the people what was planned.

45. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) said that the plebiscite was of interest chiefly to three parties: the United Kingdom as Administering Authority, the Gold Coast Government and the people of Togoland. The Administering Authority was an organized Power, as was the Gold Coast Government, so far as administra-

tion was concerned; but Togoland had no organization to represent it. Therefore, separate institutions had to be set up to organize Togoland so that it could be represented in the agencies to be established for the preparation of the plebiscite.

46. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) pointed out that he had not asked whether the population would accept the plebiscite, but whether the political conditions in the Territory were such that an undertaking which would decide the fate of a whole people could be carried out with every chance of success.

47. Mr. JAIPAL (India) wished first of all to draw Mr. Olympio's attention to the fact that the figures on the Ewe population he had quoted at the fifth special session of the Trusteeship Council (649th meeting) had been taken from the special report of the Visiting Mission (T/1206 and Add. 1), which had in turn obtained them from official sources. Consequently, there was no reason to doubt their authenticity.

48. With regard to the newspaper article Mr. Santos had read at the 530th meeting, he was concerned not so much with the passage in which his country was mentioned as with the fact that the editor of the newspaper who, as he recalled, had been a member of the French delegation to the Trusteeship Council, had apparently tried to discredit not only certain States Members of the United Nations but the entire Organization. He hoped that the Administering Authority would supply an explanation, either in the Fourth Committee or elsewhere.

49. With regard to Mr. Antor's proposal for the creation of separate institutions in Togoland under British administration—which would be equivalent to separation from the Gold Coast for administrative purposes—he felt that Mr. Antor must be well aware that such a separation would be contrary to the Trusteeship Agreement, under which the Administering Authority administered the Territory as an integral part of the Gold Coast. Furthermore, the people of Northern Togoland were apparently not prepared to accept separate institutions. The separation of Togoland from the Gold Coast was in fact one of the questions that had to be settled by the plebiscite.

50. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) repeated that if it was decided to hold a plebiscite in the present circumstances, the people of Togoland would not be represented in the agency set up to prepare the plebiscite.

51. Replying to a question by the Indian representative regarding the Ewe population figure, he pointed out that, contrary to the practice in Togoland under French administration, the term Ewe should be construed to mean the members of all tribes speaking the Ewe language. The official figures given by the Administering Authority of Togoland under French administration were therefore wrong.

52. Mr. JAIPAL (India) expressed surprise at the proposal that institutions should be set up to organize the plebiscite.

53. He recalled that Mr. Antor had said in the statement he had read at the 528th meeting that his party would accept nothing less than independence. He wondered whether, in Mr. Antor's opinion, the southern part of Togoland under British administration could exist as an independent entity.

54. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) believed that his statement was consistent with resolution 860 (IX)

adopted by the General Assembly at its ninth session. Accordingly, when the plebiscite was held, the inhabitants should first be asked to state whether they desired independence. They could then be asked whether they wanted Togoland under British administration to be united with the Gold Coast.

55. With regard to the viability of the southern part of Togoland under British administration as an independent entity, he pointed out that according to the author of an article published in an English periodical the districts of Kpandu and Ho had sufficient resources to be self-supporting, and it was, *a fortiori*, logical to assume that the same was true of the entire southern part of Togoland.

56. Mr. JAIPAL (India) recalled that Mr. Antor had said at the 528th meeting that a plebiscite should be organized throughout the entire Territory and not in one part only. Today Mr. Antor had stated in reply to a question by the Greek representative, that he favoured separation of the north and south of Togoland for the purpose of the plebiscite. There seemed to be a contradiction between the two statements.

57. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) said that he was well aware that in any democratic plebiscite an entire territory was deemed to constitute a single entity. If there were to be a plebiscite in Togoland, then, it should be held in both Territories of Togoland at the same time, since the two Trust Territories were one and the same country. The laws and the administration of the two Territories were of course different, but the laws and administration also differed in the northern and southern parts of Togoland under British administration. If that fact was cited as an argument against the organization of a single plebiscite in the two Trust Territories, it was logical to conclude that two separate plebiscites would have to be held in Togoland under British administration: one in the northern part and one in the southern part.

58. Mr. ASARE (Convention People's Party, Buem Constituency) said that it was incorrect to say that the laws and administration in Northern Togoland were different from those in the South. One legislative assembly enacted the legislation for the entire Trust Territory. Mr. Antor, being also a member of that assembly, knew that very well.

59. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) pointed out that the legislative assembly in question had been set up less than ten months previously and that it was nevertheless true that the northern part of Togoland had different legislation and a different administration. The United Kingdom representative had repeatedly admitted that himself and had explained that the reason for it was that the people of Northern Togoland had ties with the people of the northern part of the Gold Coast.

60. Mr. ODAME (Togoland Congress) added that before the creation of a legislative assembly in the Gold Coast, different ordinances had been issued. Ordinance Cap. 79, for example, applied to the northern part of Togoland, while Ordinance Cap. 90 applied to the southern part.

61. Mr. ASARE (Convention People's Party, Buem Constituency) repeated that there was now only one legislative assembly and it passed laws for the whole of the Trust Territory. Elections to the assembly had been held at the beginning of the year, and the whole population had taken part in them.

62. Mr. BARGUES (France) noted that the quotation from an article which had appeared in a newspaper from Togoland under French administration had given offence to a number of representatives in the Fourth Committee, who seemed to expect an explanation. In view of the friendly relations existing between France and the countries concerned, especially India and certain Latin-American States whose concepts of freedom were extremely broad and were in fact founded on those great principles which had first been enunciated in France, had then been spread throughout the world by Frenchmen, and finally had helped to shape the democratic constitutions of modern States, he wished to make a statement.

63. In France there was a law on freedom of the Press, of 29 July 1881, which applied not only in metropolitan France, but also in the territories administered by France. Its terms were extremely liberal. Those responsible for periodical publications had to comply with two legal formalities: they had to file a declaration and deposit a copy of each issue. So long as they did that, they were free to write what they wished, provided it was not calculated to disturb the public peace or offend against morality.

64. It had been said that the person responsible for the publication in question was a civil servant. Perhaps he was, but he was also a citizen and like all other citizens, was subject to the law on freedom of the Press. In France, certain newspapers published articles signed by civil servants attacking the Government and even the régime. But no French Government ever thought of prosecuting the authors of such articles. Even if it wished to do so, it would not have the means, because the law on freedom of the Press would not allow it.

65. However regrettable the article quoted at the 530th meeting might be, the French Government could take no steps against its author, because he was a French citizen and so was entitled to write, within the law, whatever he deemed fit.

66. It would be inappropriate if the French who, in days gone by, had erected barricades to safeguard the freedom of the Press, were now to restrict that freedom.

67. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) said he would like the petitioners to explain their reasons for disapproving or supporting the suggestion made by the Syrian member of the Visiting Mission and contained in paragraph 107 of the Mission's special report, that a separate assembly should be set up for Togoland under British administration.

68. Mr. MENSAH (Convention People's Party, Akan-Krachi Constituency) quoted a passage from his statement at the 529th meeting to the effect that his constituents were strongly opposed to the idea and would refuse to participate in such an assembly.

69. Mr. ASARE (Convention People's Party, Buem Constituency) wondered whether such an assembly would be created just for the purpose of a plebiscite and then dissolved after it. In that case, it would be a waste of time. If that were not the case, then a permanent assembly would prejudice the question of integrating Togoland under British administration with the Gold Coast. If the desired purpose was to make Togoland under British administration a sovereign State, the Convention People's Party was opposed to it: for demographic and economic reasons, the Terri-

tory, which had not even access to the sea, could not be a viable State.

70. Mr. ODAME (Togoland Congress) referred to a passage in the speech he had made at the 528th meeting in which he had approved the opinion expressed in paragraph 107 of the special report.

71. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) thought that there had never been a single instance of a plebiscite in a country which did not possess its own institutions.

72. Mr. NAGBA (Northern People's Party) said that the peoples of the North would refuse to participate in an exclusively Togoland assembly, because they would not wish to be separated from those with whom they were united by ties of blood.

73. Mr. FLEKU (Convention People's Party, Ho District) said that he was opposed to the idea of a separate assembly for Togoland, not only because it would delay the plebiscite, but also because it would be tantamount to an arbitrary separation. The idea was inappropriate and would produce nothing.

74. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) did not think the arguments advanced by the petitioners very convincing. The creation of a Togoland assembly would not hinder the plebiscite at all.

75. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) asked Mr. Antor for details regarding the frontier between the Gold Coast and Togoland under British administration.

76. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) said that it was very difficult to locate the frontier with the Gold Coast or even with Togoland under French administration. The difficulty was not so much ethnical, as the lack of roads and boundary marks; in the South there were only three boundary marks, while the only one in the North had disappeared.

77. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) asked what the petitioners thought of the questions on which they would have to vote in the plebiscite.

78. Mr. OLYMPIO (All-Ewe Conference) said that the petitioners who favoured the plebiscite would prefer, like the Administering Authority, the plebiscite to be considered as a matter entirely within the domestic jurisdiction of Togoland under British administration. The people did not know that they could opt for integration with Togoland under French administration. In his view, the plebiscite should be on the two following questions: first, whether Togoland under British administration should be integrated with an independent Gold Coast; and secondly, whether Togoland under British administration should be integrated with Togoland under French administration. Before Togoland under British administration could be integrated with another country, that country would have to be independent. The Gold Coast would therefore first have to attain its independence, and thus France would have to be induced to renounce its trusteeship over the Territory it was administering. The two parts of Togoland could then be asked whether they wished to unite or whether each wished to be integrated with another country.

79. Mr. GRIECO (Brazil) asked how many active members the parties and organizations represented by the petitioners comprised.

80. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) replied that his organization numbered 173,000 members all over

Togoland under British administration, in the Gold Coast, where some of them had been compelled to go to find work, and even in Togoland under French administration.

81. Mr. NAGBA (Northern People's Party) explained that not being an active member of the party he represented, he could not give the exact number of adherents but it was perhaps over 200,000. His party represented a national movement and formed the opposition in the Gold Coast Legislative Assembly. In the North of the Territory, his party had won all the seats, except in three constituencies.

82. Mr. MENSAH (Convention People's Party, Akan-Krachi Constituency) said his constituency numbered 38,000 inhabitants, most of whom were members or sympathizers of the Convention People's Party (CPP).

83. Mr. ASARE (Convention People's Party, Buem Constituency) said that the Buem constituency numbered 37,000 inhabitants, and nearly all were members or sympathizers of the CPP.

84. Mr. FLEKU (Convention People's Party, Ho District) said that he could not give the number for the Ho District, but he was fairly certain that the majority of the inhabitants supported the idea of integration with the Gold Coast.

85. Mr. KUMAH (Convention People's Party, Kpandu District) did not know the exact figures for the Kpandu District, but emphasized that the CPP was a national movement.

86. Mr. OLYMPIO (All-Ewe Conference) pointed out that the Comité de l'Unité togolaise, of which he was one of the leaders, had 235,000 registered members. It belonged to the All-Ewe Conference, which was not a party, but all the parties that wanted to see the Ewes unified were affiliated to it. Sympathizers of the All-Ewe Conference were to be found not only in the two Territories, but also abroad; it was therefore impossible to give a total figure.

87. Mr. FOUSSENI (Union des chefs et des populations du Nord-Togo) did not know the exact figures, but estimated that his party represented half the population of Togoland under French administration.

88. He disputed Mr. Antor's statement that the Togoland Congress had sympathizers in Togoland under French administration.

89. Mr. AJAVON (Parti togolais du progrès) said that he could not quote any figures; however, although the Parti togolais du progrès might be in a minority at Lomé and at Palimé, it had a majority everywhere else in the South.

90. Mr. SANTOS (Juvento) said that at the moment the Mouvement de la jeunesse togolaise (Juvento) had 28,674 registered members. That figure might perhaps seem very small compared with the total population, but all were active, militant members, not merely sympathizers, as they had to cope with repressive measures and the absence of freedom.

91. Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress), replying to Mr. Fousseini's observation, cited as an example and gave the name of the Togoland Congress representative in Togoland under French administration.

92. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) said that in the newspaper article quoted at the 530th meeting his country had been mentioned in rather derogatory terms.

He would not demean himself by protesting. Such an article could not affect a country which had a long tradition of courtesy and individual freedom, but not freedom to make slanderous assertions. It revealed the intellectual, spiritual and moral level of the author, who was not only a citizen but also a servant of the administering State and therefore entrusted with the task of leading the people of the Trust Territory to the political, economic, social and cultural advancement advocated in the United Nations Charter. He deeply deplored the incident, and hoped that the Territory in question would in future give evidence of higher intellectual standards.

93. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said he would like to ask the petitioners two further questions. He would like to know whether Mr. Kumah and Mr. Nagba thought that the creation of Togoland institutions before the plebiscite would prejudice its results.

94. Mr. KUMAH (Convention People's Party, Kpandu District) replied that by the establishment of separate institutions in Togoland, one of the aspirations of the political parties would be fulfilled. If Togoland showed by its vote that it did not wish to be integrated with the Gold Coast, it would have institutions of its own, but to give it those institutions now would be prejudging the question.

95. Mr. NAGBA (Northern People's Party) associated himself with Mr. Kumah's observations.

96. Mr. JAIPAL (India) asked Mr. Asare whether, in his view, the southern part of Togoland under British administration could become a viable State.

97. Mr. ASARE (Convention People's Party, Buem Constituency) replied that if the whole of Togoland under British administration could not become a viable State, the same applied, *a fortiori*, to part of it.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.