



Tuesday, 19 February 1957,
 at 11 a.m.

New York

CONTENTS

Agenda item 34:	Page
Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (<i>continued</i>)	
(c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information (<i>continued</i>)	467
Agenda item 13:	
Report of the Trusteeship Council (<i>continued</i>)	
Consideration of draft resolutions (<i>continued</i>)	467

Chairman: Mr. Enrique de MARCHENA
 (Dominican Republic).

AGENDA ITEM 34

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/3105 to A/3109, A/3110 and Corr.1, A/3111 and Add.1 and 2, A/3112 and Add.1 and 2, A/3113 and Corr.1, A/3114 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/3115, A/3127) (*continued*):

(c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information (A/3153, A/C.4/331 and Add.1, A/C.4/346) (*continued*)

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at its 623rd meeting the Committee had agreed to postpone a decision on the composition of the *ad hoc* committee, the establishment of which the Fourth Committee had proposed in draft resolution VI of document A/3531. He proposed that the *ad hoc* committee should consist of eight members.

It was so decided.

2. The CHAIRMAN said he had consulted several delegations in order to be able to submit to the Fourth Committee a list of countries willing to serve on the *ad hoc* committee, and had attempted to achieve the best possible geographical distribution; he had not, however, obtained the consent of all the delegations he had approached. The delegations of Ceylon, Iraq, Peru, the Philippines and Poland had agreed to serve on the committee.

3. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) asked whether the Chairman had approached the representatives of African States. She thought that Ethiopia or the Sudan might be included in the committee.

4. The CHAIRMAN proposed Liberia in that connexion.

5. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) intimated that the Sudan was willing to represent the African States on the committee.

6. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that the Mexican delegation had always displayed great impartiality and might serve on the committee.

7. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) replied that he would have to ask for instructions on the matter. He would like to see one of the Administering Members serve on the committee.

8. The CHAIRMAN then proposed that the committee should be made up of the following six countries: Ceylon, Iraq, Peru, the Philippines, Poland and the Sudan, and that the Fourth Committee should authorize it to continue its consultations with a view to adding a Latin-American and an Eastern European country to the list.

It was so decided.

9. Mr. NOGUEIRA (Portugal) said that the fact that his delegation had said nothing did not mean that it approved the composition of the committee. Portugal had no objection to any of the countries which might serve on it, but was opposed to the actual principle of establishing such a committee.

10. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the final decision lay with the General Assembly.

11. Mr. COHEN (Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories) said that in accordance with rule 154 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General wished to draw the attention of the members of the Committee to the financial implications of the draft resolution under discussion. No travel or subsistence allowances would be involved since the *ad hoc* committee would be made up of representatives of Governments. If the committee met in August or early September, efforts would be made to absorb the translation and documentation workload within the over-all 1957 budget estimates. It should not be forgotten, however, that the documentation services were already under severe strain. The committee might therefore meet for a maximum of two weeks; there would be no summary records; only consecutive interpretation into English would be provided; the documentation before and during the meeting would not exceed twenty pages, and the final report of the committee would be from twenty to fifty pages long.

AGENDA ITEM 13

Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/3170, A/C.4/350, A/C.4/L.482 and Rev.1) (*continued*)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.482 AND REV.1) (*continued*)

12. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia), introducing the draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.482, said that its provisions were very clear and should not give rise to difficulties.

13. Mr. MENCER (Czechoslovakia) said that the draft resolution was unexceptionable, but the Committee, having adopted at its 641st meeting a special draft resolution on the subject of Tanganyika (A/C.4/L.477/Rev.1), where the situation was not so serious nor development so rapid as in the Cameroons under French administration, could not be content merely to transmit the statements of the petitioners to the Trusteeship Council.

14. He therefore proposed that two paragraphs should be added expressing the Assembly's hope that the Administering Authority would take all the necessary measures to restore conditions which would make free and normal political activity possible in the Territory and bring to an end the tensions which had characterized the political life of the Territory, and further recommending the Trusteeship Council to continue to pay attention to the matters dealt with in the resolution and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its twelfth session. Thus when the petitioners returned to their Territory, they would be able to assure the population that the United Nations was not ignoring the situation. He hoped that the sponsors of the draft resolution would accept his suggestions.

15. Mr. JAIPAL (India) requested that the meeting be suspended so that the sponsors of the draft resolution might examine the Czechoslovak representative's proposals.

The meeting was suspended at 11.25 a.m. and resumed at 12.20 p.m.

16. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) introduced a revised version of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.482/Rev.1). The sponsors of the draft resolution had accepted as it stood the paragraph 3 proposed by the Czechoslovak representative and had made some changes in paragraph 2 in order to retain as far as possible the wording used in the Trusteeship Council's recommendations (A/3170, p. 153).

17. Mr. MENCER (Czechoslovakia) was happy that the sponsors of the draft resolution had been able to accept most of his suggestions. He would have preferred his own text, but he would vote in favour of the revised draft resolution, which would make it possible to achieve the purposes he had had in mind.

18. Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) thought the new draft resolution more constructive than the previous one, but regretted that it made no mention of amnesty. He suggested that the General Assembly should request the Administering Authority to declare the amnesty which it had itself contemplated and on which apparently the Cameroonians were insistent.

19. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) pointed out that the amnesty was one of the "necessary measures" referred to in paragraph 2. Moreover, the French representative had stated that the two months provided for under the French Constitution having passed since the adoption of the amnesty Act by the French National Assembly, the act was regarded as adopted, and it was now the responsibility of the President of the Republic to promulgate it. He therefore asked the Tunisian representative not to press his proposal.

20. Mr. BARGUES (France) paid a tribute to the moderation shown by the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.482. On the other hand, the Czechoslovak amendments, which now formed paragraphs 2 and 3 of the revised draft resolu-

tion (A/C.4/L.482/Rev.1) were objectionable in several respects.

21. With regard to the first paragraph of the preamble, one of the petitioners was a native of the Cameroons under British administration, and had spoken as the representative of an organization which had no legal existence in the Territory under French administration. France therefore considered that that petitioner was not competent to examine the situation in the Territory for which it was responsible. The two other Cameroonians, on their own admission, represented a small minority. It was hardly proper for the Committee to make a comprehensive judgment on the basis of such testimony, as it had done in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

22. Admittedly the paragraph was based on the recommendations of the Trusteeship Council, but the situation had changed greatly since those recommendations were adopted. At the present moment, the Territorial Assembly was discussing, freely and in an atmosphere of calm, the draft statute for the Territory, and the incidents which had disturbed the elections had not been widespread. It should not be forgotten, moreover, that under a democratic system election campaigns were often heated. Of course, things were quite different in the totalitarian countries, where such campaigns took place without disorder and the single list of candidates received almost all the votes. But that did not mean that the situation in the Cameroons was unusual.

23. Paragraph 3 of the amended draft resolution was unnecessary, since the Council must in any case examine the question of the Cameroons under French administration.

24. Mr. JAIPAL (India) pointed out that the first paragraph of the preamble merely stated a fact. Moreover, its wording was sufficiently general to enable delegations to interpret it as they liked.

25. Paragraph 2 of the draft resolution repeated almost word for word the conclusions of the Council as given on page 153 of its report (A/3170). The political atmosphere in the Territory was still far from normal—witness the number of written and oral petitions sent in to the United Nations.

26. The Tunisian delegation had suggested that the amnesty should be mentioned in the draft resolution. He personally agreed with the observations made on that score by the Yugoslav representative; moreover, if any such mention were made it would then be necessary to enumerate all the other measures contemplated, which would greatly complicate the debate. He therefore hoped that the author of the suggestion would not insist that a vote be taken on it.

The first two paragraphs of the preamble to the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.482/Rev.1) were adopted by 41 votes to 7, with 8 abstentions.

Paragraph 1 of the draft resolution was adopted by 43 votes to 7, with 8 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 of the draft resolution was adopted by 30 votes to 9, with 17 abstentions.

Paragraph 3 of the draft resolution was adopted by 36 votes to 10, with 11 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 38 votes to 9, with 11 abstentions.

27. Mr. HAMILTON (Australia) said he had voted against the draft resolution because by adopting it the Committee acknowledged the existence of an organization which had been declared illegal by the Administering Authority and thus appeared publicly to reject the validity of a law promulgated by the only established authority.

28. That decision was certainly not calculated to reduce any tension which might exist in the Territory. It could only harm the prestige of the Administration, whose exclusive prerogative it was to administer the Territory and to ensure respect for the aims of trusteeship. Lastly, it raised the prestige of the Union des populations du Cameroun (UPC), which thus would seem to enjoy the backing of the United Nations. That was hardly in keeping with the conclusion the Council had adopted in its report (p. 153) when it deplored—with special reference to the UPC—the abuse of the Organization's name on the part of certain political groups in the Territory.

29. Paragraph 2 of the draft resolution repeated a recommendation made by the Trusteeship Council at a time when the situation was entirely different. In reiterating that recommendation, the Committee was

ignoring the developments which had taken place in the Territory. The fact that the Committee had given no significant consideration to the present situation in the Territory was in itself reason enough to avoid adopting substantive recommendations.

30. Mr. KOCIANCICH (Italy) and Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) explained that they had voted against the resolution because they shared the objections expressed by France.

31. Mr. TAZHIBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he had voted for the draft resolution because he considered that the situation in the Cameroons under French administration was disquieting; he hoped that the draft resolution would help to restore normal political activity.

32. He noted further that a great many of the petitions received by the United Nations had not been brought to the notice of delegations (A/C.4/350, para. 4). He hoped that the Secretariat would be able to issue and circulate them in accordance with established procedure.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.