UNITED NATIONS

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

PROVISIONAL

T/PV.504
26 February 1954
ENGLISH

Thirteenth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 26 February 1954, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. MUNRO (New Zealand)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.504 and will be subject to representative's corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

54-05356

EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS CONCERNING THE CAMEROONS UNDER BRITISH ADMINISTRATION: FIFTY-FIFTH REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS (T/L.410) [Agenda item 4]

The PRESIDENT: Document T/L.410 deals with four petitions concerning the Cameroons under British administration. On each of three of these petitions, the Committee proposes a draft resolution for the consideration of the Council, and on one petition the Committee reports that it has no draft resolution to propose to the Council. The petition on which the Committee has no draft resolution to propose is T/PET.4/90, and, on pages 5 and 6 of the report, the Committee sets forth two alternative proposals, A and B, which were considered by the Committee. I call upon the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Quiros of El Salvador, to explain the situation that has arisen in respect to the petition contained in document T/PET.4/90.

Mr. QUIROS (El Salvador) (Chairman of the Standing Committee on Petitions) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to comment on this report. In the first petition, we have a case which I might say is extraordinary in comparison to those which have come up previously; that is, that the Committee was not able to adopt a resolution because there was a divided vote in the two alternatives which had been presented: proposal A, which was suggested by the delegation of Syria, and proposal B. The fact that there were two split votes is why the Committee was not able to recommend either proposal. What the Committee has done has been to inform the Council of this situation and to place the text of both draft resolutions before it so that the Council might decide for itself which of the two is to be adopted.

I think that the procedure would be that the Chairman would put the draft resolutions successively to the vote.

The PRESIDENT: That is clearly the procedure which we ought to follow. It has now been explained to the Council and I shall put the alternative provisions to the vote.

I recognize the representative of the United Kingdom on an explanation of vote.

Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom): The Council has before it in this report of the Standing Committee on Petitions two alternative draft resolutions, numbers A and B on pages 5 and 6 of document T/L.410. My delegation is in a somewhat difficult position in this regard since the Territory which is under consideration is a territory for which Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom has responsibility. Therefore, it might be considered that we have a certain interest in the matter under discussion.

Our basic interest in present circumstances, however, is that the Council should reach a conclusion on these matters with full regard to the circumstances of the case and by applying the normal principles which guide us, namely, that the interests of the inhabitants should be effectively safeguarded within the general framework of law and of effective administrative practice which look towards the realization of the objectives of the International Trusteeship System in the Territory under consideration.

It would appear that the Council is to be faced by a choice between two draft resolutions. The first draft resolution, that designated "A" in this document, is one which my delegation cannot support. I would direct attention to operative paragraph 2 of this draft resolution, which is the crux of the matter. This paragraph "requests ... the Administering Authority" to "re-examine the petitioners' grievances in a spirit of goodwill, with a view to compensating them for the loss of their land, crops and animals in accordance with the principles of equity."

I am sure it would be somewhat tedious for the Council if I were to rehearse the whole circumstances of this case as they are set out both in the original documents under reference and in the report of the Standing Committee on Petitions of the Council. Briefly, however, it is a question of the acquisition of land owned communally by a certain community for useful public purposes; namely, the acquisition of land in this area for the construction of an airfield.

The processes involved in the British Cameroons in the acquisition of land for public purposes involve a consultation initially between the local representative of the Administration and the people or community who lay claim to the land in question. It is well known to the Council that in the British Cameroons, in general, land is not owned individually by freehold title but rather that it is owned communally. It is the possession of a social group and, within that group, the enjoyment of that land is allocated to individuals or individual families by the traditional authorities.

In this case, there was no shortage of land in the area. However, there was certain land, flat and level, which was convenient and which had been farmed, not intensively but on a certain scale, by individuals of the local community who had been allotted rights of occupancy by the traditional authorities. The Administeri Authority considered that it was in the interests of the community and the Territory as a whole that this land should be set aside for use as an airfield. It was so decided after consultation with those who had certain claims to rights of occupancy in this area: those who had planted certain trees in the area, who had standing crops in the area and who were to be compensated in accordance with the scale laid down by those agricultural and other authorities who could say with some certainty what the value was of the standing crops or trees in the area.

All this was done. I do not think that any question was advanced in the Standing Committee on Petitions as to whether procedures as established by practic and by law had not been followed. But the petitioners, after much lapse of time if I may say so, considered that compensation which they had been offered for the standing crops was not as much as they might have hoped for, and it was on this issue that they petitioned the Trusteeship Council.

It is the view of the Administering Authority that an agreement was reached between those who have traditional claims to some rights in property and the Administration regarding the terms on which this property should be taken over for public purposes. I would stress that this acquisition of land was not in any way in the interests of an individual or of the Administering Authority. It was directed towards the essential public purpose of improving the communications of the Territory by the establishment of an airfield in this area. I am sure that members of the Council will recognize that certain conditions are requisite for the establishment of an airfield and that land often must be taken respective to these requirements without essential regard to the use to which it is at present put.

I would also stress that there is no question of depriving those who occupy this land of it in any definitive sense. They were asked to remove themselves from the land in question; they were allocated other land on which they could cultivate the same crops on the same scale; and they were compensated for what I think one would describe in terms of the law as unexhausted improvements to the public land which they had previously occupied.

The question at issue is whether or not these people were in fact treated fairly by the Administration. The draft resolution under A, on which the Trusteeship Council will vote, suggests that the Administering Authority reexamine these grievances in a spirit of goodwill, with a view to compensating the petitioners for the loss of their lands, crops and animals in accordance with the principles of equity."

It is the position of my delegation that the whole matter was considered at all stages in a spirit of goodwill, that those who had any claim to the enjoyment of this land were compensated and that they were compensated in accordance with the principles of equity and that, therefore, there would be no case for a reexamination of the position by the Administering Authority. If the Council were to request the Administering Authority so to reexamine the case, the conclusions we would arrive at could not be different from those at which we have already arrived. I would therefore urge the Trusteeship Council not to accept the proposition put forward in draft resolution A but rather to accept the resolution put forward in draft resolution B on page 6 of document T/L.410, which lays out for the information of the petitioners in question the grounds on which the action was taken, on which they have some cause to complain, and points out in particular that the Administering Authority is very ready to satisfy one aspect of their request, namely, to provide them with a plan of the airfield in order that they may be fully aware of the present boundaries of the public property in this area so that they will be in a position to complain effectively against any encroachment on private rights which may still remain in this area.

I should therefore like to say that my delegation will be unable to vote for draft resolution A on pages 5 and 6 of this document but would be prepared to vote for the draft resolution contained in section B on page 6 of document T/L.410 -- and we shall vote accordingly.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (interpretation from French): As the representative of El Salvador pointed out a moment ago, draft resolution A was presented by the Syrian delegation to the Standing Committee on Petitions. I thought that that draft resolution would at once be accepted by the Administering Authority and by the other members of the Trusteeship Council. I thought that the Administering Authority would not insist beyond measure, but my hopes have been dashed. I find today that the Administering Authority insists on trying to have the Trusteeship Council reject the draft resolution which I have presented.

If, however, the three paragraphs which make up this draft resolution are studied, it will be noted that there is nothing really malicious or evil in it. This draft resolution merely appeals for one thing: "the principles of equity."

When I studied comparative law, I had always been taught that equity -- as the word "equity" is stated in English -- constitutes one of the sources of English law. I learnt that the continental countries are the countries of written law while the Anglo-Saxon countries are the countries of customary law where the principle of equity exists. However, I was surprised to learn that equity applies to Europeans and not to Africans; I wish to note this.

All that I have asked in my draft resolution is that the principle of equity should be applied in the case of these poor petitioners. It is possible that the Administering Authority may refuse, in accordance with the principles of equity, to grant the rights which they claim; but it is also possible that it may agree to grant them those rights in accordance with the principles of equity.

I was asking an Administering Authority -- because I was addressing myself to a country which applies the principles of equity in its own country -- to apply these principles of equity in a Territory which it administers because it administers this Territory as it does its own and in accordance with its own legislative procedures and its own juridical system.

The reasons which have led the representative of the United Kingdom to refute the arguments which I had advanced before the Standing Committee on Petitions have been repeated today here by this same representative, with an eloquence to which I must pay tribute. I was not satisfied by the statement he made just a moment ago. I repeat that my draft resolution contains no evil, and it is not addressed to the Administering Authority in any imperious tone. We are not asking the Administering Authority to act in any particular manner;

we are merely asking that Authority to reconsider the case of these petitioners and to grant them compensation in accordance with the principles of equity -- those principles which, I repeat, are the glory of British law, the glory also of American law and of Anglo-Saxon law in a general way. The representative of the United States will probably understand what I am trying to say, and I will be able to judge his position in the light of what I am saying now because these petitioners are not subversives.

The Trusteeship Council will vote on this draft resolution; I hope that the explanations which I have just given will be useful. I shall vote in favour of draft resolution A. I urge that the members of the Trusteeship Council accept this draft resolution in accordance with the principles which I have just stated.

Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom): I apologize to the Council for reverting to this matter which I had hoped I had amply exposed to them in my initial intervention, but there was one point in the intervention of the representative of Syria which, in spite of my personal regard for him, I feel I must take up before the Council passes to a vote.

As I heard the intervention of the representative of Syria, he appeared to suggest that although the principle of equity in Anglo-Saxon law, whose flexibility he conceded in this particular instance, was observed in the United Kingdom, he suggested that it was not valid in African Territories administered by my Government because of a certain element of racial discrimination which might be imported into the application of those principles which we observe.

It is not the custom of the Trusteeship Council to get unduly excited about these exchanges of points of view on the approach to the problems which we consider, but I should like to say that my delegation not exactly resents -- because that would be rather too strong a word -- but is considerably disturbed at suggestions that our Administration is in any way actuated in African Territories by considerations of racial discrmination which, I think, any impartial observer would consider not to be a dominant, or even observable, factor in our Administration of Trust Territories. I attempted to point out

at an earlier stage that in considering this case we had from the outset applied those principles of equity for which Anglo-Saxon -- if I may borrow a word from the representative of Syria -- administration and law is, I think, noted in the world.

We have applied these principles in considering this case. We have taken the greatest care to ensure that the legitimate interests of these petitioners were safeguarded and satisfied at all stages of this operation, and it would indeed be somewhat unhelpful if the Trusteeship Council were to adopt a resolution which invited us to re-apply these principles to a case to which we have already applied them. The result would be no different from the result which we now see before us, and, although we are always ready to pay profound attention to any advice which the Council may offer us, in this case we feel that where the principles to which we attach importance, and to which the representative of Syria clearly attaches importance, have been applied, there is no point in asking us to review the question in the light of the same principles. Therefore, my delegation would still prefer to see the Council adopt alternative B rather than alternative A in this document which we have before us.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I believe that in the examination of a question of this nature the Council should act calmly and not let itself be led astray by passion. In this question, two issues arise. The first issue is whether the law in the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration is equitable in dealing with the expropriation of land for public use, and whether it offers proper compensation to the owners. The second issue is whether that law was applied.

I do not think anyone will question the equity of the law. The persons concerned cannot bargain with the representatives of the Administration as to the size of the indemnity they are to receive. If they feel the indemnity is inadequate, they can appeal to the courts. That is the law, and it is the law which prevails in all civilized countries.

The second issue is whether the law was observed. There is no doubt at all that the persons concerned knew all about the right to go to court. Indemnity was offered to them. The size of the indemnity was determined after consultation with representatives of the agricultural services. I know from my own experience that when representatives from agricultural services are called upon, in the course of their official duties, to propose indemnities for

agriculturalists against public works services or port services, or any of the other services, for that matter, they tend to call for an indemnity which more than adequately measures the damages or losses suffered by the persons concerned.

In this case, the representatives of the agricultural services appraised the value of the plantations, and the Administration made an offer which took into account this loyal and unbiassed estimate made by the personnel of the agricultural services. The indigenous inhabitants did not suffer by having their lands alienated, since they could occupy other land within the limits of their own district without having to pay anything for it. The only damage they suffered was that of having to move and losing crops for the period of time required for the new trees planted in the new location to begin to yield. The sum of £600 was offered to them as indemnity. Now, £600 was regarded as adequate indemnity for the expropriation. The indigenous inhabitants, in fact, accepted that indemnity. Later, they approached the Trusteeship Council, and in so doing incurred neither expense nor risk, to try to obtain an increase in the indemnity which originally they voluntarily accepted.

Can the Trusteeship Council encourage such a proceeding? I submit that it cannot, and I call upon my colleagues to ask themselves this question: what would they do if a competent organ of the United Nations were to be confronted with petitions of the same nature regarding indemnities paid by their respective Governments for the building of an airport, a railway line, or anything of that kind?

The representative of Syria stated that the Administering Authority is not being addressed in imperious terms, is not being ordered to pay additional indemnity, but is simply being asked to re-examine the situation. The representative of Syria syggests that if, after re-examination of the situation, the Administering Authority feels that the inhabitants were properly compensated and that they have no right to supplementary compensation, and if the Administering Authority advises the Trusteeship Council that, after sympathetic re-examination, it did not deem it appropriate to modify its initial decision and offer additional indemnity, then the Trusteeship Council could declare itself to be satisfied. However, it goes without saying that

the petitioners will not give the same interpretation. If, after having called upon the Government of the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration to re-examine the question sympathetically, with a view to allocating to the petitioners the indemnity to which they have a right in equity, that Government, after such re-examination, allocates nothing else to them, then the suggestion will be that the Government has not done what the Trusteeship Council wanted it to do.

Therefore, I ask my colleagues to ponder upon the implications of a vote of the kind which is here proposed. We should find ourselves swamped with petitions relating to cases of expropriation, and in which the indigenous inhabitants had been loyally compensated and had accepted such compensation. Once the Trusteeship Council had offered such an example, and in a case, it must be remembered, where the persons concerned were in agreement about the indemnity, but decided later that they no longer liked the agreement, and if the Trusteeship Council supported the petitioners and called upon the Administering Authority to allocate more money, then the flood-gates would be opened. Invariably in cases where compensation had been offered for expropriation, a petition would eventually be sent to the Trusteeship Council asking it to call upon the Administering Authority to reconsider the case sympathetically and to re-examine it in a spirit of good will. This is a slippery slope down which we should not slide.

I think that in the present case the Administering Authority loyally applied a just law and that the petitioners have nothing to complain about. The petitioners might have had ground for complaint if they had not agreed to the indemnity offered in the first place and had then gone to the courts for arbitration. If, after having done that, they felt that the courts had not given them sufficient compensation, then I suppose it might be said they had a grievance. In this case, they do not have a grievance. I think it is the duty of the Trusteeship Council to adopt the resolution which is presented under "B".

Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (interpretation from French): I apologize for speaking again, but the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom and the views expressed by the representative of Belgium make it my duty to throw some light on this subject.

With regard to the assertion made by the representative of the United Kingdom that I levied an accusation against the Administering Authority, an accusation, in particular, of racial discrimination, that was far from being in my mind. The representative of the United Kingdom will allow me to tell him that he misinterpreted my thoughts. We have a habit of misunderstanding each other, but in rather a charming way.

With regard to the statement of the representative of Belgium, I should like from the outset to say that in my previous statement I did not advance any sentimental arguments. I did not appeal to the sentiments of the members of the Council, I made an appeal to principles, principles which the representative of the United Kingdom has acknowledged as being the very core of English law. Moreover, I said that these principles are the glory of English law. Where the representative of the United Kingdom and I did not see eye to eye was in the application of these principles. I did not say that these principles were not applied; what I did say was that the case might be re-examined in the light of the application of such principles.

The representative of Belgium made an admirable intervention to demonstrate how unwarranted my arguments were but, according to my understanding, he did not annihilate my arguments completely. He said -- and I quote his words -- that the present text of the draft resolution was acceptable and was quite modest in its terms.

I do not share the opinion of the representative of Belgium to the effect that the petitioners could have complained about the application of the law in such a case. If they had complained in that respect, such complaint would come under rule 81 of the rules of procedure. But they are not complaining about the process of the law; they are not even complaining about the action of the Administration. All they ask is that the Administering Authority should grant them additional compensation. I shall quote that well-known French saying: "There is nothing to make such a fuss about." This is a very simple matter and the apprehensions of the representative of the United Kingdom concerning the consequences of the adoption of this draft resolution, are, in my opinion, unwarranted. I do not think that, in accepting this draft resolution, the Administering Authority is in any way binding itself to undertake any action towards acceding to the desires of the petitioners. All that we are asking of the Administering Authority is to examine the case of the petitioners with good-will. This is the purpose of the draft resolution.

I shall not go further into the matter, but I urge representatives to support this draft resolution.

Draft Resolution A was rejected by 6 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

Draft Resolution B was adopted by 7 votes to 5.

Mr. S.S. LIU (China): I should like to say a word in explanation of the votes which my delegation has cast.

My delegation is, of course, entirely sympathetic with the claims of the petitioners and would like to help them in accordance with the terms of resolution A. But, since we voted in favour of resolution 178 (VI), we do not see our way clear to changing our attitude in the absence of any new facts which might authorize the Council to alter a decision which it adopted some years ago. My delegation does not see any new facts in the case which would justify any change

in that decision. Therefore, we have felt obliged to vote for the second resolution and to abstain from voting on the first, in spite of the laudable motives behind it. Otherwise, we should have been obliged to vote against it.

The PRESIDENT: I think I should say, before proceeding any further, that these petitions have been considered by the Standing Committee on Petitions. They have been carefully considered, and they have been considered in public.

The Council will now proceed to consider draft resolutions in the annex to T/L.410.

Draft Resolution II was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Draft Resolution III was adopted by 8 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

Draft Resolution IV was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of the Standing Committee's report, to the effect that the Council should decide that no special information is required concerning the action taken on resolutions II and III.

Mr. MATHIESON (United Kingdom): This suggestion was incorporated in the report of the Standing Committee on Petitions at a time when it was unable to make any recommendation regarding the draft resolution to be adopted on the first petition, which is the subject of this report. I would, therefore, think that, in the light of the decision now taken by the Council, the Council might well decide that no special information is required concerning the action taken on resolutions I, II and III adopted on this report.

Mr. SINGH (India): My delegation would request separate votes on these three items.

The PRESIDENT: The proposal before the Council, first of all, is that no special information is required concerning the action taken on resolution I.

The proposal was adopted by 7 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: The next proposal is that no special information is required concerning the action taken on resolution II.

The proposal was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: The third proposal is that no special information is required concerning the action taken on resolution III.

The proposal was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN TOGOLAND UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION (T/1091, T/L.409)

(a) ANNUAL REPORT (T/1080 and Add.1) [Agenda item 3 f7.

(b) PETITIONS (T/PET.7/L.4, 5; T/PET.6 and 7/L.7 to 11, 13 to 19) [Agenda item 47

(c) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO TRUST TERRITORIES IN WEST AFRICA, 1952 (T/1041, 1068) [Agenda item 5/ (continued)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Apedo Amah, special representative for Togoland under French Administration, took a seat at the Council table.

Observations of members of the Council (continued)

The PRESIDENT: I have two speakers on my list, the representatives of Syria and the Soviet Union.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (interpretation from French): Before making my comments on the situation in Togoland under French Administration for the year 1952, I must first of all congratulate the special representative on the ability and savoir faire which he has displayed in the course of the debate. Although most of the time we did not agree on a number of issues, I must pay tribute to the special representative for the very extensive knowledge he has shown. I will go further and say that this is striking proof of the fact that Trust Territories can and do produce men who in future years will be able to administer those very Territories. I also consider this to be a reply to those who claim that the Trust Territories must remain under that system for an indeterminate time, for "x" number of years, in accordance with the best principles of paternalism: the administering authority must look after this and must watch over the policy of the Trust Territories; all that they can hope for are the small parish politics and the small municipal politics. The special representative has dispelled any misunderstandings on this question and I must once again congratulate him, although, I repeat, I have not agreed with him in the majority of cases.

As regards the political development of the Territory of Togoland under French administration, my delegation has examined with care the interesting and voluminous report of the Administering Authority. As I have said, this report constitutes in itself a most valuable source of information concerning the juridical development of the Territory, which has to do with French law and customary law, and where a very clear and methodic expose is given of all the general principles underlying French law. I cannot but recommend the reading of this particular section to law students.

As regards the essence of the political development of Togoland, there has been talk here about the French Union. The special representative and the representative of France, in the course of the debate onthe Cameroons under French administration, have, I would say, dispelled certain apprehensions which had been manifested concerning the incorporation of the Cameroons and Togoland into the French Union. I take note, in particular, of the statement of the representative of France that the association of Togoland and the Cameroons within the French Union is an external association and that nothing prevents that Territory from becoming an independent country when the hour of independence rings.

I was also interested in the statement of the representative of France and the quotations which he took out of the excellent work of Mr. Lampué who is a professor of Faculty of Law in Paris and whose work on the French Union is highly regarded both in the centres of French law and of French doctrine. Mr. Lampue has written, since 1947, a work on the French Union entitled La Constitution. In that work he has recognized that by associated Territories, the authors of the constitution of 1947 had in mind the Territories which were under the mandate of the League of Nations and which have since become Trust Territories under the Trusteeship of the United Nations.

Mr. Lampue recognized very clearly that such Territories do not come within the internal constitution of the French Union but are external to the French Union. In an article which he published in 1953, in the Juridical and Political Review of the French Union, under the title of "The Juridical Nature of the French Union", Mr. Lampué wrote the following concerning the incorporation of associated Territories into the French Union:

"The associated Territories are not states and not having distinctive governments of their own, did not intervene by means of their own organs in the conclusion of the undertakings which refer to them. Moreover, every Trusteeship Agreement refer to a particular state and the bond which is thus established is between that Territory and the French Republic."

Consequently, as far as Mr. Lampué is concerned, the bond between an associated Territory and France is not the result of the action of the organs proper to that Territory. It is an issue which has been frequently debated and according to which the Trust Territories cannot be incorporated into the French Union except with the full and entire adherence of the population of those Territories.

I do not wish to prolong too greatly the discussion on this matter. I shall now pass on to an examination of the Territorial Assembly. I have noticed that in Togoland under French Administration there are no electoral colleges. The electoral college is unique. However, if we read the electoral law which applies to that Territory, we will find that universal suffrage is not and does not show the characteristics of universal suffrage which are to be found in the majority of civilized and democratic countries.

That suffrage is not in fact universal; it is restricted. Many individuals within the population do not in fact participate in the vote. I think that the Administering Authority will take this fact into consideration and that in the near future it will succeed in establishing in the Territory an electoral system which will enable the entire population, without distinction, to participate in elections and in the choice of their representatives both in the Territorial Assembly and the assemblies of the French Parliament.

The second defect which we can attribute to the Territorial Assembly as it is constituted at present, lies inthe fact that the Assembly is not as sovereign a body as the special representative informed us with such cogency and eloquence. The Territorial Assembly remains under the control of the Administering Authority and the representatives of the Administering Authority in the Trust Territory.

One of the objects of the Trusteeship System is to enable the representative assemblies of Trust Territories to exercise almost uncontrolled activity. I am well aware of the fact that the representative of France, as well as the special representative, may object to this on the ground that the Territorial Assembly of Togoland does not show the characteristics of a legislative assembly. It only has the characteristics of an administrative assembly. It may be compared to the conseils géneraux en France, or the Algerian Assembly, for instance. But that argument cannot be brought into play in this case because the Territoraial Assembly does have a sort of two-fold character. I recognize that this Territorial Assembly is an administrative assembly, that it can in certain instances be compared to the conseils généraux in France and also to the municipal councils of the metropolitan territory.

But as a result of the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement, the Territorial Assembly must occupy a special role, one which is not represented by the assemblies and councils of the metropolitan Territory. In the metropolitan Territory, the local assemblies are competent to deal with administrative matters, while the parliament is sovereign in legislative matters. That is recognized. But in the Trusteeship Territory we find that the Territorial Assembly has so far not had to deal with questions of a strictly legislative nature, apart, of course, from the budget. According to the English theory of constitutional law -- parliamentary constitutional law was born in England -- budgetary control and the right to examine budgets are not in fact acts of a legislative nature.

The special representative has informed us that the Territorial Assembly was competent to deal with budgetary affairs. There is no disagreement between us on this point. But we cannot deduce from this that the Territorial Assembly enjoys legislative powers. All authorities on constitutional law, whether from Anglo-Saxon or continental European countries, agree that when parliaments are competent to vote upon the budget and to vote upon the law, there is a juridical difference between the budget and the law. In voting on the budget, parliamentary assemblies in fact are not exercising legislative powers. They are exercising a given power of a financial nature. We know how that power arose in England as the result of the development of the monarchy, of the absolute monarchy in the first place, and subsequently of parliamentary monarchy in France. The example of les Etats Generaux in France is typical in this case. When the King needed money, he appealed to les Etats Generaux. However, in granting him the necessary money for the coming financial year, les Etats Generaux were not in fact exercising legislative power, since the legislative power resided in the King of France. He possessed this power by virtue of a law recognized by custom because he was a sovereign king subject to control by the French Parliament, which exercised judicial functions. The King of France had the right to overrule the different French parliaments, but he could not break the resistance of les Etats Generaux, which did not always agree to grant him the amount of money he felt he required to fulfil his tasks.

The Territorial Assembly has the right to vote upon the budget of the Territory, and it is a vote which is subject to control by the local representative of the Administering Authority. But because of this, it cannot be argued that the Territorial Assembly exercises legislative power.

The Administering Authority, moreover, goes so far as to recognize that legislative power in the Territory is exercised by the French Parliament. I do not wish to repeat the observations I made yesterday when discussing the report on the Cameroons under French administration. However, at that time I said, and I was supported in these views by the representatives of India and the Soviet Union, that the Territorial Assembly should exercise some legislative power. If it could not be granted the full exercise of legislative power in the Territory, then it should gradually exercise more and more functions of legislative power. They could exercise this power in certain fields, and in time they could reach the point at which complete power would be granted to the Territorial Assembly in legislative matters.

The representative of the United Kingdom objected to my arguments and said that the Trusteeship Agreement which was signed by France concerning the Cameroons -- the same is true for Togoland -- provides in article 5, paragraph A, that the Administering Authority "shall have full legislative, administrative and juridical power over the Territory, and will administer it in accordance with French legislation as an integral part of French territory". In quoting that text, the representative of the United Kingdom forgot to quote something else. The Administering Authority administers the Territory "in accordance with French legislation, as an integral part of French territory" -- to which we agree, but to which must be added -- "subject to the provisions of the Charter and of this Agreement". As Pascal said, "The letter kills, but the spirit revives". If we take the provisions of this text literally by cutting them we can say that the Administering Authority -- I am not speaking only of France; I am referring to all the Administering Authorities -- can administer a territory in accordance with their own legislative procedures as an integral part of their territory, but -- and there is a "but" -- "subject to the provisions of the Charter and of this Agreement".

I do not wish to discuss again a question which was discussed yesterday by the representative of the Soviet Union concerning the juridical nature of the Trust Territory. I regret that Mr. Ryckmans is not present now to listen to me. Yesterday he stated that Trust Territories are administered by the Administering Authorities and not by the United Nations. I have looked through international law books written in French; I regret that I do not sufficiently understand English to read the English books on the subject. However, I believe that the French are authorities on the subject of public international law. This may at times be contested, but I must say that the French professors exercise complete objectivity and impartiality. In all books on international law written by Frenchmen, it is stated that the Trusteeship Territories are administered by the United Nations, that the Administering Authority manages the Territory in the name of the United Nations. It is on the basis of that view and in that spirit of the Charter that we should apply our principles. I still regret that the representative of Belgium, Mr. Ryckmans, is not here, because I should like to hear his reply, and I am quite prepared to reply to him again.

The Territorial Assembly should in fact be a legislative assembly. We address ourselves in this hope to the Administering Authority, and we hope that it will bear in mind this hope of ours, which is inspired by the Charter and by the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreement.

As regards the judicial system, I notice that there are two types of courts, the customary courts and the French courts. I do not want to contest the existence of this twofold arrangement in the judicial system, but I should like to point out that in the customary courts, the Administering Authority has not exactly applied the principle of the separation of judicial and executive powers, or, shall we say executive and administrative powers. At the head of the indigenous tribunals we find civil servants.

One of the principles which constitute the glory of the French Revolution and which is set out in the law of 1791 -- I apologize for not having the exact date, but it is the law relating to the separation of administrative and judicial authorities -- is that administrators are forbidden to interfere in judicial affairs in the same way that it was forbidden for the tribunals to do what was called in French law before the Revolution des arrêts de règlement.

We believe that the above-mentioned principle should also be applied to the native tribunals. It should not be impossible for the Administering Authority to do that in future.

As regards the French tribunals in the Territory, I note that principles no less important than that of the separation of judicial and administrative powers have been jeopardized.

There are in the Territory magistrates with extended powers. As may be seen from the Administering Authority's report, those magistrates exercise three functions. They are procureurs de la République, juges d'instruction and heads of the courts of first degree. I do not object to their serving as heads of the courts of first degree. They can be permitted to exercise that function because their decisions may be appealed. But I believe it is inadmissible for the same person to act as procureur de la République -- that is, as a representative of the Ministry of the Interior -- and as juge d'instruction. In this connexion, also, there is a principle of French law -- a principle which applies to penal matters -- under which the powers of instruction and judicial authority must be separated. A juge d'instruction may not also serve as procureur de la République because the procureur de la République pleads cases before the juge d'instruction. Under the system used in the Trust Territory, the procureur de la République, who is the juge d'instruction, pleads a case before the juge d'instruction, who is the procureur de la République.

If I remember correctly, the procureur de la République is a judicial official responsible to the French Administration. The juge d'instruction is a magistrate responsible to the judicial authority to the Conseil supérieur de la magistrature. That system represents one of the great achievements of the Fourth Republic. Thus, to grant the same powers to a juge d'instruction who is also a magistrate, the head of the court of first degree and procureur de la République is to violate a principle which I have been taught and which is one of the glories of the French judicial system. I do not think that the Administration of the Trust Territory can, under French legislation, refuse to apply that principle in the Territory. Hence, the Administering Authority must see to it that the principle is implemented.

There is another anomaly which I have noticed in the judicial system of the Trust Territory: there is no court of appeal. Any appeal from the decision of the magistrates with extended powers must be taken to the court of appeal at Abidjan. But Abidjan is not in a Trust Territory. It is in a country which, under the French Constitution, is called an associated territory; I do not use the word "colony", because that word has been banished from the French Constitution, which speaks of the overseas territories as "former colonies". There must be a clear distinction, therefore, between a Trust Territory and a territory which is not under the Trusteeship System. To establish a court of appeal in a territory which is not a Trust Territory and to provide that decisions rendered by courts in the Trust Territory should be appealed to that court of appeal represents, I think, a judicial anomaly which is not in harmony with the provisions of the Trusteeship System.

Indeed, I would go further. In reply to a question which I asked him, the special representative said that the court of cassation of Paris -- and, incidentally, that court meets in Paris but is called simply the court of cassation; there is only one -- can reverse a decision rendered by a tribunal in the Trust Territory, but can lso refer the matter to tribunals in another territory, a territory not under Trusteeship; it would be expected that the cases would be judged by tribunals whose members were different from those of the tribunals which originally handed down the decision.

I recognize the value of the judges who belong to the court of cassation; I am well aware of the valuable judicial work that that court has carried out since it was established by Napoleon. I do not, however, think that the court of cassation of France should pass upon decisions rendered in the Trust Territory. A Trust Territory must, in principle, become independent eventually; it is, as it were, outside the French Union. I think that the Administering Authority should establish a court of cassation in the Trust Territory. If it cannot do that at this stage, the court of cassation in France must not refer a matter on which a decision has been rendered by a tribunal in the Territory to a judicial authority outside the Territory; rather, it must refer such a decision to a judicial authority in the Territory.

I come now to the economic section of the report.

I have noted that the Trust Territory does not have its own bank of issue. The notes issued by the Territory's bank are legal in other territories as well as in the Trust Territory, in territories which are more closely linked to France. The special representative told me that the French parliament was now studying a bill in this connexion. The economic interests of the Trust Territory must be borne in mind, for, when that Territory becomes independent, prolonged and difficult negotiations will be required if the economic and financial relations between the Trust Territory and other territories are too close. Such negotiations have been required, for example, in the cases of Syria and Lebanon, which were States under French mandate but whose bank of issue was in Paris. It has been materially impossible -- even up to the present time -- for these two States to disentangle themselves, financially speaking, from France. There is no use in saying that the bank of Syria and Lebanon, which may issue notes in Syria and Lebanon, is a bank established in those two countries: the truth is that the bank's headquarters are in Paris, at 12 rue Roquépine, and that it still issues notes. Of course, there must be a period of transition, but it should be possible to see to it that the Trust Territory is spared the difficulties which other countries have experienced.

As regards the customs regime in the Territory, the report of the Administering Authority demonstrates that there is equality of treatment as regards all members of the United Nations, but the special representative has given us certain facts which are most interesting and which reflect what is the true situation in the Territory. It is clear in the light of those explanations that the principle of import and export licences is in force, but that principle of licences applies only to produce and merchandise which does not come from the metropolitan territory, because the monetary union which exists between the metropolitan land and the Territory has as its corollary that the French products can enter the Territory without its being necessary to obtain an import licence, and in consequence there may be some inequality of treatment, the benefits of which, of course, are enjoyed by the metropolitan country. The Administering Authority therefore, I think, should reflect on this matter because, if the system of licences is to be applied, it should be applied to all countries which lie outside the Territory -- and this, of course, goes for the metropolitan country itself.

As regards the juridical nature of the land system, the report of the Administering Authority refers to the diversity of that nature. There are various sorts of property and land in the Camerooms. But property in Togoland under French administration is and remains bound to ancient customs and traditions which do not reflect the present desires of the population and which prevent an expansion in wealth in the Territory because, so long as property remains on a collective or tribal level, this prevents the proper exploitation of the land. Hence, the cadastral system, the land register system, the Torrens Act, if you like, or the system which was created before, which had also existed in Germany -- it was known as the grundbuch system, which was established by the promulgation of the German Civil Code in 1900 -- this principle should be applied in the Territory too. The special representative replied to one of the questions which I had asked him, but I must admit that his reply was not very convincing. He began by telling me that when the land register, the cadastre, is applied to a Territory, the result is not to modify the juridical status of that land. To another question which I asked him, trying to find out if the co-owners, the co-proprietors, of the land, those who hold that land by virtue of custom and in a collective manner, saw any change in their rights since

the application of the cadastre, the special representative told me that they would continue to be co-proprietors or co-owners -- at least, that is as I understand it -- and it seemed to me clear from his previous answer that the juridical status of the land remains the same. So the cadastral regime, if I correctly understood it, does not in fact affect the juridical status of the land. The cadastre, as set up by virtue of the Torrens Act in Australia for the first time, had as its consequence to clarify the juridical status of those who hold land and to liquidate rights which existed upon that land prior to the promulgation and passing of the Torrens Act.

That should be done in Togoland, it seems to me, and in the very interests of the peasants and the proprietors themselves, because, if we continue to apply the system of collective property, no progress can be achieved in the exploitation of the land.

The report of the Administering Authority tells us that Togoland under French Administration is a country of basically agricultural nature. So the Administering Authority must, above all, develop agriculture in that territory.

As regards the industrialization of the country, we find, in reading the report of the Administering Authority, that industry offers very little promise as far as the future is concerned. I think that the Administering Authority could take the necessary steps to develop the industrialization of the country, and I was very impressed by the quotation made yesterday by the representative of Haiti, who told us that Montesquieu, in his Persian Letters, had drawn a distinction between the agricultural countries and the industrial countries. This makes it clear that the opinion of Montesquieu is the same opinion as Karl Marx's. But this is quite fortuitous, I might add. I had nothing to do with it; it was just quite by chance that that happened.

As regards the tax system, I feel, too, that this requires some clearing up, because the system of taxation in Togoland does not rest upon a modern basis. It is not a modern system. Of course, the taxation system should be an equitable and just system. The Administering Authority has made progress in this field, and I think the Administering Authority should continue along this road of progress.

As regards social advancement, the Administering Authority talks about the measures taken to raise the standard of living. I suppose that those measures

which have been applied to date continue to be insufficient. I realize that all this cannot be done at once, overnight, but such measures have to be further developed in order to ensure that the standard of living of the population is raised.

As regards the political organization of the country, the Administering Authority gives us the list of the parties, but, as you know, the report of the Visiting Mission notes or reports certain complaints which appear to have been addressed to the Visiting Mission concerning a particular political party. The special representative has told us in the course of the discussion that the differences which existed formerly between the parties had disappeared by the time the Visiting Mission reached the Territory. I therefore hope that the law governing association in France, which is a law of 1881, will be applied in the Territory with all the equity or the justice which the case requires, and no veils should be thrown over the intentions, activities or policies of any party. In the French system, there is no recognized party and there are no unrecognized parties. All parties, if they declare themselves, can be recognized by the Government. There are no parties which hold ideas which are not acceptable, and parties which hold views which are acceptable. As far as the Territory is concerned, therefore, I see no reason why there should be any difference. Moreover, vast numbers of books should be written concerning the new ideas expressed in certain countries. But I consider that the French system of associations and of political parties is a system which has stood the test of time. It is an excellent system, and I think that its application in Togoland will enable all the parties to develop, and that no veil of secrecy will be thrown over concerning the activities or the intentions, secret or otherwise, of any party.

As regards the health situation in the Territory, of course, I have listened with great interest and I have read with great interest what the special representative has had to say on this subject. But I must say that, as far as doctors are concerned, there are simply not enough of them in the Territory. I must stress -- I always stress -- this question of doctors, because the medical profession is a necessary profession, it is a vital profession, and it is required in any social organism, whatever its nature.

The Administering Authority, therefore, will have to take necessary measures. To date, it has taken certain measures. However, it will have to increase the number of scholars who go to France in order to specialize in the medical profession because this concerns the whole future of the Territory and the population.

As for education, I should like to comment on the languages that are used. I have noticed that the electoral law which is applicable in the Territory provides that any individual who does not come within one of the above-mentioned categories, so to speak, but who knows French or Arabic can be an elector. I asked the special representative if there were any schools in the Territory which taught Arabic. He said that there were no official establishments or schools in the Territory which taught Arabic. Yet the fact remains that there is a part of the population which speaks Arabic. The Administering Authority has taken notice of this. It says so in its report and it has included a reference to it in the electoral law. Arabic is spoken in the Territory because of its historic development and past history. Therefore, the pupils should be taught that language.

I have learned that the only schools in which Arabic is taught are the Koranic schools which are directed by Imams. I know what Koranic schools are worth. In the Koranic school, you learn the Koran. Arabic is taught in order to learn the Koran. However, you do not learn Arabic in order to use it as a social instrument. Koranic schools are schools which are at an inferior level, lower than primary schools, generally speaking.

Since the Administering Authority recognizes that the Arabic language exists and that it has value, it should provide an opportunity to those inhabitants who can develop the language to do so. I am not advocating Arabic because it is my mother tongue, that of the country I represent here in the Trusteeship Council, far from it. I am not trying to be a vain nationalist or linguist. What I have in mind are the needs of the inhabitants. Language is a vehicle of thought. You do not learn a language because you have to use it but because you must become a man and because you have a duty towards society. Since there are people in the Territory that speak Arabic, that language is closer to those people than French. I am perfectly willing that the population should learn French. However, the Arabic language is also necessary because it enables them to develop their knowledge and also to learn other languages if they so desire.

I believe that the Administering Authority should control private educational establishments with a view to seeing whether they meet the objectives provided for in the Trusteeship Agreement and the Charter concerning civic and national education of the Togolese.

As regards secondary education, I have noted that despite beautiful photographs which illustrate the report of the Administering Authority and all its best efforts in this field there is only one secondary establishment at full strength. When I say at full strength, I mean a school which enables the pupils to attain the baccalaureate degree in the French educational system. Only the school at Lomé enables pupils to go on to a higher education. I think that the Administering Authority should develop this system of secondary education in other schools so that they will be able to offer to their pupils the opportunity to reach the baccalaureate stage. As far as the school at Lomé is concerned, there is a selective system with respect to the pupils admitted. Of course, there is always the disadvantage that some people are not admitted.

As far as higher education is concerned, the Administering Authority recognizes that there is none. However, I would point out that the scholarship system which applies at present does not enable all the young Togolese, who have the necessary aptitude to follow a higher educational course, to go to France. Hence, the Administering Authority should develop higher education in Togoland. It might even create a sort of framework for higher education or technical education. As we noted from the report by UNESCO, the majority of scholarships are available in the field of social science. The field of technology also requires development. This is especially so for a Territory which is trying to establish its future. As regards scholarships, the Administering Authority should increase them as well. These are the observations that I wished to make on the administration of this Territory.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): During the consideration of the report on Togoland under French administration, we encountered the same type of questions which arose during the examination of the report on the Cameroons under French administration. First of all, there is the matter of the violation by the Administering Authority of the special and separate status of Togoland as a Trust Territory. This is being done

by the incorporation of the Territory into the French Union. As members of the Council have pointed out, the French Constitution contains no special provisions or qualifications which would emphasize the separate status of Togoland as a Territory under trusteeship.

Moreover, having incorporated the Trust Territory of Togoland into the French Union, as was the Cameroons for that matter, the French Government now regards it as part and parcel of the French Union. Consequently, the status of the Trust Territory has been debased to that of a French colony which is a part of the French Union. It should be kept in mind that the French Constitution does not provide for any method or means for cessation from the French Union by a Territory once it is in that Union. The incorporation of a Trust Territory in the French Union is tantamount to its absorption into a colonial empire which has been dubbed the French Union. I must say that this kind of absorption has resulted in depriving the Trust Territories of the possibility of independent development and existence free from and outside the framework of the French Union.

This attitude of the Administering Authority to its Trust Territories is directly at variance with the explicit provisions of the United Nations Charter.

During the examination of the report of the Administering Authority on the situation in Togoland under French administration we had occasion to point out that the incorporation by the Administering Authority of this Territory into the French Union without the acquiescence of the population of Togoland or of the United Nations is tantamount to the violation of the special status of Togoland as a Trust Territory. We must point this out again.

This step has hampered and in fact has frustrated altogether the independent political development of Togoland as a Trust Territory; a Trust Territory which is supposed to be made ready for self-government and independence.

The unsatisfactory situation in Togoland in the political realm is characterized by the exceptional lack of rights of the indigenous inhabitants. Despite all sorts of criticisms made of the Administering Authority during the examination of its reports for previous years, the situation in the Trust Territory as regards the development of the political rights of the indigenous population has not improved one whit; the situation has in fact remained utterly unsatisfactory. The interests of the Trust Territory within the French Union are not secured in any way at all. Only three representatives of the population of Togoland sit in bodies outside of Togoland: one deputy in the French National Assembly, one senator and one councillor of the French Union.

It goes without saying that no appreciable influence can be exerted by these deputies on decisions taken by various organs of the French Union. Consequently, Togoland finds itself in the situation where legislative functions in the Trust Territory have been given lock, stock and barrel to the organs of the Metropolitan Territory. The Trust Territory has virtually no opportunity to secure its interests in those organs nor to influence the nature of the decisions adopted in legislation enacted in respect of the Trust Territory.

Let us now look at the Territory's legislative organs. The Territorial Assembly of Togoland has no legislative powers. That Assembly cannot even decide on questions relating to the local budget. The report of the Administering Authority points out that the budget of the Territory is framed and submitted by the French Commissioner; the Territorial Assembly only deliberates on that budget. The greater part of the budget, incidentally, consists of so-called obligatory expenditures such as the amortization of loans, personnel expenditures, public service expenditures, etc. These articles of the budget are incorporated therein irrespective of the views of the Territorial Assembly as regards the propriety of the size of the sums appropriated under various headings.

The political parties of Togoland have told the representatives of the United Nations Visiting Mission of 1952 that the powers of the Territorial Assembly are not in keeping with the genuine needs of the Territory. Although it gives the semblance of being a legislative organ for the Trust Territory, that Assembly has no legislative or law-making powers.

The budget and revenues of the Territory are under the control of the Ministry of Overseas Territories in Paris, and the decisions are actually made by the French Conseil d'Etat. Page 23 of the report of the Visiting Mission gives information to this effect. All executive power in the Trust Territory is in the hands of the French Commissioner and of other French officials who are appointed by the Commissioner and are subject to his orders. It is noteworthy that these officials are frequently endowed not only with administrative but also with judicial functions, the same person having both functions.

The report of the Administering Authority itself makes it clear that all major posts in the Administration are occupied by Europeans. As a rule, indigenous inhabitants are given secondary or purely technical duties such as bookkeeping, clerical work, service and maintenance work.

As the report indicates, the universal franchise applies in reality only to Europeans, not to the indigenous population. The report lists sixteen categories of citizens who have the right to vote. This includes notables, members and former members of local assemblies, all officials and clerical personnel, military personnel and mothers of two children, etc. As a result of the various limitations implicit in this list only 113,000 persons were inscribed in the electoral rolls last year whereas there are 400,000 adult inhabitants in the Trust Territory. Of course, all of them should have the right to vote. This is a situation which calls for urgent improvement.

The Trusteeship Council should immediately recommend the institution in Togoland under French administration of legislative and administrative organs which would not be subordinate to any governmental bodies that are founded on the union of this Trust Territory with French colonies. Legislative and other measures should be taken to ensure the participation of the indigenous population of Togoland in legislative, executive and judicial organs in the Trust Territory.

Despite views clearly set forth by the Trusteeship Council concerning the necessity of supplanting the tribal system of government by a democratic system, the Administering Authority has persisted in encouraging the tribal system in Togoland. It has even bolstered the powers of the tribal chiefs by legislative measures. In December 1949 the Commissioner for Togoland issued Order 591-49/AR concerning the reorganization of indigenous administration in Togoland. Article 1 says that the native government of the Territory is carried out by the village chiefs. This is tantamount to saying that the power of the tribal chiefs is perpetuated in the villages. It goes on to list cercles and circonscriptions, etc. It also goes on to speak about customary chiefs who are not elected but selected by customary law -- in other words from a few families. They are assisted by councils of notables whose powers are set by custom.

I am simply listing legislative texts which perpetuate the powers and prerogatives of the tribal chiefs. In other words, instead of implementing the decisions of the Trusteeship Council and the views of the General Assembly on this score, the Administering Authority has chosen to strengthen and uphold the operation of the tribal system in the Trust Territory. In this manner the political advancement of the Trust Territory has been stultified. No progress is discernible and none can be hoped for so long as the system of tribal chiefs is upheld by the Administering Authority and so long as the Administering Authority in fact relies on the tribal chiefs to run the Territory.

On page 50 of the annual report it is indicated that the chiefs are the agents of the Administration in their communities, and that they have a specific circle of competence. For example, they collect the taxes and ensure the implementation of the decisions of the Administration. For this, the chiefs are compensated by the Administration. They receive their compensation from the taxes they collect or from special grants disbursed by the Administration.

With regard to the judicial power, the courts in the Trust Territory are composed of officials of the French Administration, tribal chiefs and tribal notables. Therefore, it can be seen that the judicial system is flagrantly anti-democratic.

The maintenance, retention and encouragement by the Administering Authority of the tribal system -- I must stress this again and again -- has hampered the political advancement of the Trust Territory and hindered the institution of organs of self-government based on democratic foundations. The Trusteeship Council should draw the attention of the Administering Authority to the necessity of enacting measures that would secure a transition from the tribal system to a democratic system of government. This would result in securing the rights of the indigenous population and would foster the political development of the indigenous population and lead to them towards self-government and independence.

In this connexion, it is essential to note that the rights of the indigenous population are still being violated. As has been shown by the various petitions received, the Administering Authority persecutes political parties and organizations in Togoland if they urge the independence of their homeland or call for the unification of the two Togoland Territories. The Administering Authority prohibits or disperses assemblies and meetings and hampers the activities of members of political parties. In petition after peitition the indigenous inhabitants have complained about the arbitrary action of the French authorities and the arbitrary action of the police. They have complained about the persecution and victimization to which they have been subjected by the Administration merely for being members of or participating in various political parties and organizations.

The petition submitted by the President of the Committee for the Unification of Togoland, dated 11 April 1953, reported that in January of that year the French Administration in Lomé prohibited an assembly and demonstrations that were to take place in the streets. The use of loud speakers was banned, and measures were taken to prevent the Committee for the Unification of Togoland from holding an assembly and hearing a report from Mr. Olympio, the well-known representative of the people of Togoland, who wanted to tell them about his visit to New York, where he attended the session of the General Assembly.

Assemblies were similarly prohibited in other places. In a petition from the Youth Movement for a United Togoland, it is shown that it is becoming more and more difficult for this organization to hold assemblies. For instance, in May 1953 in Tsévié a convention of that movement was held. The police questioned all the members and many delegates were ordered to return home. Others were flogged by the police, and those who dared to protest against that treatment were arrested.

Petitions T/PET.7/351 and T/PET.7/352 complain that the Secretary of Juvento and several other persons from Kpela Adeta were exiled from Togoland because of their political activities, which were designed to lead the Trust Territory to self-government and independence as rapidly as possible.

In petition T/PET.7/365, the Executive Committee of the Association of Togolese Students in France reported that one of the students from the Trust Territory of Togoland was deprived of his scholarship in France for purely political reasons. The petition also stated that Mr. Pechoux, the Governor of Togoland, had warned the other students that they likewise would lose their scholarships if they did not give up their demands for Togolese independence and for the remedying of other grievances.

Petitions T/PET.7/355, T/PET.7/356, T/PET.7/364 and others contain many complaints from the indigenous inhabitants about the various acts of persecution and illegal dismissalfrom work of supporters of the unification of Togoland. They complain of the dismissal of members of the Togolese Unification Party and Juvento. Petition T/PET.7/363, dated 8 November 1953, indicates that the Administering Authority subjected to severe persecution those persons who submitted petitions to the Visiting Mission of the Trusteeship Council. These

are outrageous instances of violations of the rights of the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territory. Some of the petitioners were put in jail, and others were flogged. In fact, it is stated that some of them became blind as a result of the beatings they received.

All this is evidence that the Administering Authority is committed to an anti-democratic policy which clearly violates the rights and interests of the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territory. It is evidence also of violations of the Charter and of the Trusteeship System, under which the legitimate rights of the indigenous population to submit petitions is unquestioned, and under which the submission of petitions should not lead to victimization of the petitioners by the Administering Authority. It is necessary to call upon the Administering Authority to put an end to such a policy and to ensure that the population of Togoland will, without let or hindrance, be allowed to exercise the rights granted to them by the Charter.

The economic situation in the Trust Territory is characterized by a complete absence of industry and an extraordinary backwardness in agriculture. Throughout the Trust Territory, agricultural work is done by hand, using the most primitive implements, such as the hoe. As the Administering Authority reports, there are only a few enterprises for the processing of agricultural products. In its annual report, the Administering Authority frankly declared that it would be illusory to look forward to the creation of heavy or processing industries in the Trust Territory. We are not told why it would be illusory to look forward to the setting up of industries in the Trust Territory. No argument or evidence can support such an assertion.

The enterprises which do exist in the Trust Territory belong to European owners. There are four cotton-combing mills, some cocoa factories and a few palm-oil factories, but those are the only industries in the Territory. Because of the absence of processing plants, the agricultural products must be exported in a raw form. Cotton is grown in Togoland, but not one textile factory has been built, although the raw material is available in abundance. For such a factory, there would be ample labour available and a considerable home market.

Why are there no textile factories? Because the Administering Authority's policy does not call for the promotion of industrial enterprises. The hope that some Belgian company will build a textile factory is illusory because the Administering Authority itself tells us that there is no way of knowing whether or when such factory will be built.

As a result of this policy, the Trust Territory is obliged to export raw cotton and to import from abroad cotton fabrics at high prices. In 1952, 1,927 tons of raw cotton were exported worth 283 million francs. Textile fabrics were imported worth 327 million francs. All of these fabrics could easily have been produced on the spot out of that raw cotton if, of course, textile factories were built.

All in all, examination of the economic policy of the Administering Authority with a view to reaching some general conclusions cannot fail to lead to the inference that the Trust Territory is a mere raw materials appendage of the metropolitan country. The economy of the Territory suffers from the blight of colonialism.

Cocoa, coffee, cotton, groundnuts, etc. are exported at low prices. The inhabitants are virtually under the control of large European business houses which deliberately set high prices on imported goods sold in the Territory, while setting low prices on exported agricultural raw materials. African producers of coffee, cocoa, cotton, groundnuts, etc. are paid for their labour sums which are a fraction of the world market prices. For example, the groundnut producers get only one-half of the f.o.b. price on groundnuts; cotton producers receive only 21 per cent of the f.o.b. price -- see page 47 of the report of the Visiting Mission.

All sorts of middlemen plunder the African peasants. These middlemen have entrenched themselves in all sorts of strategic spots and they plunder the indigenous inhabitants. They buy up cocoa and other products at low prices and sell manufactured articles at high prices.

The policy of the Administering Authority on the land question also deserves severe criticism. The Administering Authority has disregarded the interests of the indigenous population in this respect, in spite of the fact that this is a question which, I submit, is vital for the indigenous population. The

Administering Authority has tolerated the alienation of indigenous lands, although, year in and year out, the Trusteeship Council has drawn attention to this situation, warning against it and calling for the cessation of the practice of the alienation of lands from the indigenous population. The land belongs to the indigenous inhabitants of the Territory; the land in Togoland belongs to the indigenous population of Togoland. No one is entitled to deprive the population of such land. Nevertheless, the practice of land alienation continues.

The alienation of land often takes place under the guise of classification of forests, when large areas -- ten of thousands of acres -- along with cultivable land are declared by fiat to be forest reserves for which a special regime prevails. In 1951 the classification area was 65,000 hectares. At the beginning of 1952 an additional 38,000 hectares were added to these classified land areas. The Administering Authority has told us here that the classification has been carried out with the full agreement of the indigenous population. The real truth can be gleaned from the various petitions and from the questions we have asked of the special representative of the Administering Authority and the answers he has given. These answers and the petitions make it clear that the indigenous population is hardly ever consulted as regards classification of forest lands. We have many petitions from the indigenous population complaining about the alienation of lands by the Administering Authority. For instance, we have complaints about the unjust action of the Administering Authority concerning classification of forest lands, complaints about the classification by the Administering Authority of lands which actually are cultivable. The Trusteeship Council should defend the rights of the indigenous population to their land. It should draw the attention of the Administering Authority to the inadmissible character of the policy of alienating land from the inhabitants of the Trust Territory. The gentleman who spoke here as special representative of the Administering Authority should play an active role in this matter. He should see to it that the interests of the indigenous population are protected.

The primitive economy and techniques that prevail in the Trust Territory do not even provide for the subsistence of the indigenous inhabitants. Seventy francs is the average daily wage; that is about forty American cents a day.

One indication of the unsatisfactory situation of the indigenous inhabitants is the large number of migrant seasonal workers who are obliged to work on the Palime plantation and in the Gold Coast. These labourers are forced to enter into unjust contracts which result in their exploitation. For example, the contract of Abidjan calls for some sort of indentured labour. According to that contract, the seasonal labourer who gets a piece of land must give two-thirds of his crop to the owner. That is share-cropping with a vengeance.

Inadequate medical care and bad social legislation have led to a high rate of mortality. The report of the Administering Authority indicates that child mortality among the indigenous inhabitants has been one of the major factors in the drop in population. However, for some reason, the report fails to give any specific figures on this point.

The unsatisfactory nature of the medical care given to the indigenous inhabitants is indicated by the fact that among the sick in hospitals the average percentage of mortality among the indigenous inhabitants is seven times higher than that among the European patients. The patients who have contagious diseases suffer from a mortality which is sixteen times higher than that of Europeans afflicted by such diseases.

Fifty per cent of the population suffers from malaria, and among the children the percentage is as high as 75. Social diseases are rampant.

The report of the Visiting Mission indicates that there are not enough medical workers in the Territory. There are insufficient lying-in hospitals and women's clinics. There are not enough general hospitals or dispensaries. Four-fifths of African mothers receive no medical assistance at all at childbirth.

These facts are eloquent evidence of the exceptionally unfavourable conditions in regard to medical care in Togoland under French Administration. This situation calls for radical improvement. Therefore, appropriations for the health services in the Territory should be increased several times.

The source of funds for health care should not merely be the small resources of the Territorial or local budget. The budget of the metropolitan territory should also allocate sums for improving the situation concerning health care in the Trust Territories.

The report of the Administering Authority, as well as the report of the Visiting Mission, try to represent the situation in Togoland under French Administration, in respect of the field of education, in a rosy light. But the educational situation in Togoland under French Administration is deplorable indeed. The greater part of children of school age have no chance to receive even primary education.

The tables appearing on page 233 of the annual report indicate that children of school age constitute 15 per cent of the population. That is approximately 154,000 people. Of these, about 50,000 boys and girls go to school. The table also indicates that 32 per cent of children of school age receive instruction. This information, which is to be found in the report of the Administering Authority, is however misleading both as regards the absent figures and the percentage of children who receive instruction in schools of the Trust Territory.

To corroborate this charge, it suffices to compare the figures in two tables of the report of the Administering Authority. I wish to draw the attention of the Council to the table appearing in paragraph 164 of the report, page 232. This table indicates that the average age of children in primary schools is six to fourteen. The question is, how many children are there in that span? That information can be obtained from another table on page 268 of the annual report which indicates that at the end of 1952 there were 231,000 children between the ages of six and fourteen, and not 154,000 as the report indicates on page 233.

If we keep in mind secondary education as well, it should be obvious that the school age should be increased to eighteen in making our computations. That increases the number of children of school age to about 300,000 rather than 154,000 as the report indicates on page 233. Of that number only about 50,000 children actually go to school. This makes it clear that the percentage of children who go to school in the Trust Territory is not higher than 17 per cent. Consequently the figure of 32 per cent to be found in the report of the

Administering Authority, which purports to be the percentage of children of school age who acutally receive instructions, is not in accord with reality.

That is how the matter of education shapes up in the Trust Territory at this stage. Perhaps we may be told that the Administering Authority is exerting itself to improve the situation in the future, the more so since paragraph 272 of the Visiting Mission's report contains a rather promising statement to the following effect:

> "The policy of the Administering Authority is to make education obligatory for all in the shortest possible time. Education as well as educational equipment and school books are free to all." (T/1041, para. 272)

What are the actual plans of the Administering Authority? How does it propose to introduce obligatory primary education in the Trust Territory "in the shortest possible time" as we are told? Other sections of the report of the Visiting Mission of 1952 shed some light on that problem. Paragraphs 293, 294 and 295 refer to the actual concrete plans of the Administering Authority. It is indicated that in 1961, 90,000 children will be receiving instruction in all the schools of the Trust Territory. In other words, there will be only 40,000 pupils more than were receiving instruction in 1952. But between 1951 and 1961, when that goal is to be achieved, the natural increment of children of school age in the Trust Territory will be not less than 60,000. That is just the natural increment of children of school age in the Trust Territory.

Therefore, to increase the number of pupils by 40,000 within the next seven years will still constitute a retrogression, since the increase will lag behind the natural increase in the school-age population. Consequently, the Administering Authority's educational programme is so insignificant that it will not even ensure the maintenance of the present unsatisfactory standards in the field of education in the Trust Territory. If the Administering Authority adheres to this plan for education, the number and percentage of illiterates in the Trust Territory of Togoland under French Administration will grow from year to year instead of shrinking.

No great ingenuity is required to realize that these plans of the Administering Authority with respect to education are appallingly inadequate. Therefore, far from promoting the educational advancement of the Trust Territory, as Article 76 b of the Charter requires, the result will not even maintain the present unsatisfactory standard. Still worse is the state of affairs regarding higher education. There is no such thing as an institution of higher education in the Trust Territory. The number of scholarships granted to Togolese students who wish to receive higher education abroad, let us say in France, is very small. There were a grand total of 79 such scholarships in 1952. Despite the great shortage in agricultural specialists, the Administering Authority has given scholarships to only four students for training in agricultural institutions of learning.

Moreover, 80 per cent of the teachers in the Trust Territory have inadequate training. There are only three teacher-training institutions in the Trust Territory. These schools cannot ensure adequate scholastic standards, nor can they properly train teachers, nor can they train a sufficient number of teachers.

A UNESCO report states that the number of teachers being graduated from these schools at the present time is not even sufficient to fill vacancies that presently exist and does not ensure the expansion of the school system.

In the circumstances, one cannot seriously claim that the Administering Authority is taking any reasonable measures to bring about the educational advancement of the population of the Trust Territory. It is essential indeed for the Trusteeship Council to recommend to the Administering Authority that it substantially increase educational appropriations in Togoland under French administration. This applies both to the budget of the Metropolitan country and to the budget of the Territory.

The Administering Power can usefully be reminded of the fact that the United Nations has conferred upon it, upon France, a certain responsibility for the administration of this Trust Territory. Responsibility does not mean to pump raw materials, cocoa, bananas, cotton, groundnuts, and so forth, out of the Trust Territory and into the Metropolitan country. That is not the meaning of responsibility; certainly it is not the whole meaning of responsibility. Responsibility, to say the least, includes appropriate instruction in education for the indigenous inhabitants, measures to ensure the advancement of their health, and so forth. The Administering Authority does make the necessary budgetary appropriations to maintain in the Trust Territory a gendarmerie. Why can it not find the necessary money in the metropolitan budget for educational and health needs? Somehow they do not seem to be able to find that. But they can find money for the gendarmerie. However, given any reasonable willingness to fulfil the obligations that are vested in the Administering Authority by the Charter, they could well do so.

I shall now try to sum up my survey. I would note that conditions in Togoland under French administration in the political, social and educational realms, are highly unsatisfactory. There is no detectable progress or advancement in these fields. The Administering Authority has failed to observe the provisions of the United Nations Charter as regards the operation of the International Trusteeship System.

In this connexion, it might be useful to read the text of Article 76 b of the Charter, which the Administering Authoirty and other members of the Council might well hark back to from time to time:

"The basic objectives of the Trusteeship System, in accordance with the Purposes of the United Nations laid down in Article 1 of the present Charter, shall be:

"b. To promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each Territory and its peoples and the freely-expressed wishes of the peoples concerned..."

The Charter, in Article 76 b, obliges the Administering Authority to promote the advancement of the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territory in the political, economic, social, and educational fields, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence. In all these respects, it must be admitted that the situation in Togoland is utterly unsatisfactory. In fact, the situation is very poor.

The Administering Authority has failed to observe the provisions of the Charter which I have just read out. The policy of the Administering Power in the Trust Territory, far from promoting advancement, has actually hindered the political advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory towards self-government and independence. In order to comply with the requirements of the Charter, it would be the duty of the Administering Authority to ensure the establishment in the Trust Territory of independent legislative and administrative organs, which would not be subordinate to any organs set up on the basis of the union between the Territory and France, that is the French Union. Legislative and other measures should be speedily instituted so as to promote and increase the participation of the indigenous inhabitants of Togoland in the government of the Territory. Measures should be taken to ensure the transition from a tribal system of government to a system of self-government based on democratic foundations. Measures should be taken for the restoration to the indigenous inhabitants of lands alienated from them. Measures should be taken to prevent any further alienation of land from the

indigenous inhabitants. Increased appropriations are required for medical care and education. All this should not be done only from the small resources available in the local budget, but it should be done at the expense of the budget of the Metropolitan country. New schools should be built, new hospitals are greatly needed, the mass training of teachers from the indigenous inhabitants is necessary, technical personnel are needed. The time has come to institute higher education in the Trust Territory by establishing higher educational institutions so as to prepare a group of higher educated people among the indigenous inhabitants. Effective measures in this field taken by the Administering Power would ensure the advancement of the Trust Territory towards self-government and independence, in accordance with the requirements of Article 76 b of the Charter.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium)(interpretation from French): I apologize for again taking up the time of the Council. I have listened with lively interest to the statement made a short while ago by the representative of Syria. I understand that he would like to hear my reply. If I did not reply to him, it might be thought that I had nothing to say. I should like to point out to the representative of Syria that I shall not reply to him myself, because my reply would not have the necessary authority. I shall state to him the reply of the Charter.

The representative of Syria has said that the Trusteeship Territories were administered by the United Nations and managed by the Administering Authorities. I shall point out what the Charter says. Article 75 of the Charter states:

> "The United Nations shall establish under its authority an International Trusteeship System..."

Subsequent Articles of the Charter determine what that International Trusteeship System will be. Article 77 states:

> "2. It will be a matter for subsequent agreement as to which Territories in the foregoing categories will be brought under the Trusteeship System and upon what terms."

Article 79 states:

"The terms of trusteeship for each Territory to be placed under the Trusteeship System, including any alteration or amendment, shall be agreed upon by the States directly concerned, including the mandatory Power in the case of Territories held under mandate by a Member of the United Nations, and shall be approved as provided for in Articles 83 and 85."

Article 81, which is the principal Article, states the authority which will undertake the administration of the Trust Territory. The representative of Syria thinks that this is the role of the United Nations. However, Article 81 states:

"The Trusteeship Agreement shall in each case include the terms under which the Trust Territory will be administered and designate the Authority which will exercise the administration of the Trust Territory. Such Authority, hereinafter called the Administering Authority, may be one or more States or the Organization itself."

So far, there has been only one case in which provision has been made for the direct administration of a territory by the United Nations: the case of the City of Jerusalem. In the case of Togoland, the Republic of France is the Administering Authority; in the case of Ruanda-Urundi, Belgium is the Administering Authority; in neither case is the United Nations the Administering Authority.

Article 85 of the Charter states:

"The functions of the United Nations with regard to trusteeship agreements for all areas not designated as strategic... shall be exercised by the General Assembly...".

Article 87 sets out the functions of the General Assembly and, under its authority, the Trusteeship Council. It says that those bodies may consider reports, accept and examine petitions, provide for periodic visits to the Trust Territories and take other actions in conformity with the terms of the trusteeship agreements.

The trusteeship agreement for Ruanda-Urundi gives Belgium full legislative, administrative and judicial powers.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria)(interpretation from French): I am grateful to the representative of Belgium for having listened to my statement and replied to it.

I do not want to prolong this discussion, but would say this: In his statement, the representative of Belgium has himself recognized that the Trusteeship System is an international system. I did not say that the Trusteeship System was not an international system. I said that the Trusteeship System was established under the Charter and that countries under trusteeship were entrusted to the administration of various Powers, under the control of the United Nations. That is tantamount to saying that the United Nations is the ultimate supreme authority as regards Trust Territories.

In this respect, I would cite the precedent of the French Council of State. During the days of the League of Nations, Syria and Lebanon were countries under Mandate "A". They were States, not Territories. There was a French High Commissioner in Syria and Lebanon, and that High Commissioner could take measures in connexion with the two States. Now, under French administrative legislation, the High Commissioner's authority was challenged; it was held that he had exceeded his powers, and the case was brought before the French Council of State. That Council rendered decisions on the matter in 1924, 1925 and 1926, if I remember correctly. The Council of State said in those decisions that the French High Commissioner in Syria and Lebanon had two powers: on the one hand, he represented the French Republic and, on the other hand, he represented the international authority. When he adopted decisions in his capacity as representative of the international authority, those decisions were not subject to review by the Council of State, because the real power was held by an authority outside the French Republic. On the other hand, when he adopted decisions in his capacity as representative of the French Republic, those decisions could be appealed before the Council of State. The High Commissioner was, in fact, the representative of the French Republic, because the latter maintained purely French services in Syria and Lebanon - for instance, in the Navy Ministry and the Army Ministry. Hence, when the High Commissioner took decisions concerning military requisitions or supplies to be shipped to French garrisons, and so forth, he was acting as representative of the French Republic and those decisions, as I have said, could be appealed to the Council of State. I repeat, however, that the decisions which the High Commissioner took as representative of the international authority were not subject to appeal before the French Council of State.

The High Commissioner at one time adopted an order forbidding the Syrian and Lebanese Councils of State to discuss his decrees. Unfortunately, I do not have before me books of international law, from which I could quote in this connexion. I could, for instance, quote the opinions of Professor Georges Scelle and Professor Charles Rousseau, who is counsel to the French Foreign Ministry. Those two professors have discussed the present matters.

I would assure the representative of Belgium that I had absolutely no intention of interfering in any way with Belgium's administration of Ruanda-Urundi.

The PRESIDENT: I trust that this debate will not be unduly prolonged, because the representatives of Belgium and Syria will not succeed in convincing each other.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium)(interpretation from French): I think that, in substance, the representative of Syria and I agree. I must, however, inform the representative of Syria that I should not have replied to him as I did if I had understood his previous statement in the sense which he has just given to it. Either his tongue betrayed him, or my microphone was faulty, but I understood him to say in his first statement that the Trust Territories were administered by the United Nations and managed by the Administering Authorities. The correction which the representative of Syria has just made brings us entirely into agreement.

The PRESIDENT: The Council has now concluded the general debate on the Trust Territory of Togoland under French Administration. On Monday, we shall hear the special representative.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The PRESIDENT: After the special representative for French Togoland has made his statement on Monday, the Council will proceed to discuss the Togoland unification problem and will hear the petitioners.

Two Committees are meeting on Monday morning at ten-thirty: the Drafting Committee on the Cameroons under French Administration, in Conference Room 8; and the Drafting Committee on Togoland under British Administration, in Conference Room 11.

I think it would be useful if I gave the Council some idea of the present stage of our work.

We are two days behind the schedule set forth in the original time-table, which provides that the Council's session should end by 18 March. I do not think that that delay of two days represents an insuperable obstacle. We can make up the time if the Committees of the Council complete their work and report to us on time.

Now, that is very simply said. When I proceed to present some of the facts in this connexion, I would ask members to bear this in mind: Committees meet only in the morning; they do not have two meetings a day. Furthermore, there are some delegations which are very small in size.

The situation as regards Committees is as follows:

The Drafting Committee on the French Cameroons will finish its work at the end of next week; that is, by 5 March.

The report of the Drafting Committee on British Togoland will be ready for consideration by the Council at the specified time.

The Committee on Administrative Unions requires six meetings to complete its work and prepare its reports. The difficulty in this respect is connected with the scheduling of meetings; owing to its membership, this Committee cannot meet simultaneously with other Committees.

It is anticipated that the Committee on Indigenous Participation will have its report ready by the specified time.

Three more drafting committees must be appointed. Members will bear in mind that some representatives are on one or two drafting committees already. The three drafting committees which must still be appointed are those on French Togoland, Tanganyika and Ruanda Urundi.

Hence, the progress of our work depends to a great extent upon the speed with which these committees complete their work.

I should now like to draw the attention of the Council to the work of the Standing Committee on Petitions. At the end of its meeting yesterday, the Committee had still to examine the following number of petitions: Togoland under French Administration, 18; Tanganyika, 4; Ruanda-Urundi, 3; Nauru, 1. That is a total of 26. Now, if one assumes that the Committee will deal with four petitions at one meeting, between six and seven meetings will be required to examine these petitions.

That, of course, is not all, because then the Committee has to consider and adopt the following draft resolutions: Cameroons under French Administration, 41 -- not an indifferent number; Somaliland under Italian Administration, 23 -- a considerable number; Togoland under British Administration, 5; and then draft resolutions concerning the petitions to which I have just referred, 26. The Committee therefore has to consider and adopt 95 draft resolutions -- and members of the Committee know, better than I do, that that takes time. At a rate of adoption of seven resolutions at one meeting, between thirteen and fourteen meetings will be required to adopt these draft resolutions.

Now, we are supposed to complete our work by 18 March, and nobody that I know of around this table wants particularly to sit twice a day -- but, when these resolutions are completed, there are one or two members who want a week to think about them.

At the present rate of progress, twenty meetings will be required to deal with the petitions on the agenda. In addition, the Committee has to consider the question of procedure and to report its recommendations to the Council.

Between 26 February and 17 March, both dates inclusive, there are fourteen working days. By working twice a day, the Committee could finish all the petitions on the agenda by 11 March -- but, I repeat, that is very doubtful. In addition, we estimate that about eight meetings will be needed to deal with the question of procedure.

On Monday, I will have distributed to the Council a time-table which, I know, is obviously tentative only. I understand that it is within my functions to say that the Petitions Committee shall meet twice a day, but whether that could be usefully said is an entirely different proposition. All I say, and all I am

prepared to say, at the present time is that the Chairman of the Petitions Committee will make such arrangements as he thinks fit to accelerate the work of the Committee.

I listened with great interest to the remarks of the representative of India the other day about our meeting all day. It is not as easy as that, as all of you know. It depends upon the availability of members of delegations; it depends upon the amount of time which members are perhaps entitled to say that they want in order to consider a matter. I do not think we can usefully discuss this now -- the time-table will be distributed on Monday -- but I think it is proper that you should have this information at your disposal now. I therefore propose that the Council should adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.

54