UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

PROVISIONAL

T/PV.963
18 February 1959

ENGLISH

Future of Cameroons
Report to full G.A.
adoption

Twenty-third Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 18 February 1959, at 4 p.m.

President: Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti)

Question of the future of the Trust Territories of the Cameroons under British administration and the Cameroons under French administration (continued)

(a) General Assembly resolution 1282 (XIII) [17]

(b) Reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, 1958 (T/1426 and Add.1, 1427, 1434) [6]

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.963 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

59-04023

AGENDA ITEMS 6 and 17

QUESTION OF THE FUTURE OF THE TRUST TERRITORIES OF THE CAMEROONS UNDER BRITISH ADMINISTRATION AND THE CAMEROONS UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION (T/L.896) (continued)

(a) GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 1282 (XIII)

(b) REPORTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO TRUST TERRITORIES IN WEST AFRICA, 1958 (T/1426 and Add.1, 1427, 1434)

General debate (continued)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Council has before it the draft special report of the Trusteeship Council (T/L.897) which is to be submitted to the General Assembly. Does any representative wish to make any comments?

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Russian text of the draft report contains an error in paragraph 6. It is stated there that the draft resolution on the French Cameroons was adopted by 12 votes, with 1 abstention, without mentioning that there was one negative vote. This is not according to the actual situation. The delegation of the Soviet Union voted against that draft resolution. I suggest, therefore, that the appropriate correction be made.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Secretariat has taken note of the observations made by the representative of the Soviet Union. It is regrettable that the Russian text is not correct; both the English and French texts state that one delegation voted against the draft resolution. These texts state: "... the Council adopted the draft resolution by 12 votes to 1, with 1 abstention".

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to ask whether, in this report, the interventions will be reflected which were made by various delegations in connexion with the draft resolutions -- I refer specifically to statements made by the Soviet delegation. In this regard I do not refer to statements made in the course of the general discussion, but those referring directly to the draft resolutions.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I believe that the Council must decide this question. In fact, all the records of the Council's deliberations on this item will be available to the General Assembly, and those records contain all the statements which were made here.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I have raised this question because the present draft report is rather unusual. Normally, the reports which the Council submits to the Assembly reflect the entire discussion -- not merely the statements made during the general debate, but all the statements. I believe that that should be true of the present draft report. The records are something different. I am referring to the statements actually made by delegations on the draft resolutions, and I think that the draft report should contain some indication of those statements, perhaps as an annex. If that is not done, there will be no way of understanding why one or another delegation took a certain position.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I understand that the Secretariat has followed the usual practice of the Council in preparing the draft special report now before us.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to have some clarification from the representative of the Secretary-General. What is the usual practice to which reference has been made? The twelve reports which the Council has previously submitted to the Assembly have contained at least the substance -- not necessarily the verbatim texts -- of the statements made before the Council. I therefore do not understand what practice is being referred to here.

The SECRETARY: The observations made by individual delegations in the Council do form part of the regular reports submitted by the Council to the General Assembly; those reports are drawn up as the result of the Council's discussion of conditions in the various Trust Territories. In its special reports on particular questions -- for instance, the report last year on Togoland -- the Council has always followed the practice that has been followed in drawing up the present special report.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not think that the reference just made by the Secretary to the precedent of the special report on Togoland is very relevant. It is well known that no discussion actually took place in the Council at that time. Delegations reserved their right to speak on the matter in the General Assembly. There was therefore no need to reflect in the report the statements that were made in the Council. The present case, however, is quite different. Delegations are entitled to have their views reflected in the report to be submitted to the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I would draw the Soviet Union representative's attention to the text of the resolution which the Council adopted on the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration. Paragraph 4 of the operative part states that the Council:

> "Transmits to the General Assembly the report of the Visiting Mission, the observations of the Administering Authority and the records of the Council's discussion ...".

A similar provision is contained in the resolution adopted on the Cameroons under French administration. Thus, the General Assembly will have before it all the relevant documentation. That is what I meant when I said at the beginning of this meeting that the records would be available to the Members of the General Assembly. I do not think that the Assembly will lack any documents.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I am very grateful to the President for that clarification. I am aware of the provision to which he has referred. I should not have had to raise this question had I not observed in the present draft special report references to the statements of the representative of France and the representative of the United Kingdom. It evidently was deemed appropriate to include those statements in the report. Why, then, should the report not include the statements made by other delegations? That is the point on which I should like some clarification.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) (interpretation from French): My delegation believes that in order to overcome this difficulty -- which in reality is not an important one -- we might add to the report a paragraph saying that it was decided that all the records of the discussion will be transmitted to the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Council has heard the proposal just made by the representative of the United Arab Republic. Are there any comments on that proposal?

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not object to the proposal of the representative of the United Arab Republic, but I should like to supplement it in the sense that the statements made by the representatives of France and the United Kingdom should be given equal treatment with all the documentation which will be presented to the General Assembly.

I should also like to draw the attention of the Council once again to paragraph 4 of the resolution adopted this morning by the Council which reads:

"Transmits to the General Assembly the Report of the Visiting Mission, the observations of the Administering Authority and the records". (T/L.896)

I quite agree with this language. But then, Annexes III and IV of the report should be eliminated and then everything will be in order if we also accept the suggestion made by the representative of the United Arab Republic. Otherwise it would not be quite in order.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): I want to be quite clear what this suggestion is before making up my mind on whether I have any views on it. I am not quite clear what it is.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union would delete from the draft report Annexes III and IV, and the representative of the United Arab Republic has asked that mention be made in the draft report that the records -- and I think now the statements also of the Administering Authorities -- will be transmitted to the General Assembly. I think my interpretation is correct. Are there any comments?

Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (interpretation from French): If I understood the President correctly, Annexes III and IV would be eliminated and would be replaced by the records of all the discussions in the Council during the debate. Am I correct in my understanding?

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): That in effect is what I understood. Annexes III and IV would be omitted from the draft report contained in document T/L.897 and in this draft report we would add a new paragraph which would mention the fact that the statements of the Administering Authorities as well as the records of the meetings of the Council will be transmitted to the General Assembly.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): I do not think that there is anything involved here except a procedural discussion. But I have had my attention drawn to rule 99 of our rules of procedure which states:

> "Each visiting mission shall transmit to the Trusteeship Council a report on its visit... The report and the decisions or observations of the Council with respect to each such report, as well as the comments made by the Administering Authority concerned, may be published in such form and at such date as the Council may determine."

I do not think that the procedure now proposed is quite correct. I think that it is clearly in accordance with rule 99 that Annexes I, II, III and IV should be included. I agree, of course, that when the verbatim records are submitted they will include also all the things that are said, including presumably what the Administering Authority said. But the observations of the Administering Authority are part of the things which should be transmitted, and I think the Secretariat has been quite right in what it has done, and I do not think that any change is needed.

I do not see any objection to the proposal of the representative of the United Arab Republic, if that would help to make it quite clear to everybody who reads it that the verbatim record, the whole of what is said, will be transmitted. I think that is a very useful suggestion. I am not sure that the proposal to cut out the two annexes is strictly in accordance with rule 99. I believe it would be useful to the Fourth Committee to have the statement made by the representative of France and even, if I may be so bold as to venture to say, the remarks which I ventured to make myself. I believe that these are of special importance because they give the views of the Administering Authority, and we all know that everybody else's views will also be submitted to the General Assembly, and I quite agree that that should be done.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Nobody in the Council has any objection to the transmission to the Fourth Committee of the observations and statements of the Administering Authorities. I also hope that nobody will object to transmitting to the Fourth Committee the observations made by the different delegations. This is not the point. There is no violation at all of rule 99 of the rules of procedure in the fact that the observations of the Administering Authorities would be submitted to the Fourth Committee with the observations of other delegations, in order that all of these relevant documents can be taken into account. However, the point made by the representative of the United Kingdom actually amounts to some discrimination against other members of the Council, which is not acceptable.

Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (interpretation from French): I fully support the statement just made by the representative of the United Kingdom, but I must say that I do not quite share the views expressed by the representative of the Soviet Union. This is not because we have any pride of authorship; we also, of course, do not wish to impair the principle of equality which is absolute here in the Council; nevertheless, there does exist a difference. We are dealing with Territories under two Administrations, one under French administration and one under British administration. Reports of the Visiting Mission were submitted, and, quite normally, as was stated by Sir Andrew Cohen, the Administering Authorities also made observations.

(Mr. Koscziusko-Morizet, France)

These observations were incorporated in statements made by my United Kingdom colleague and by myself. They have a separate standing because it certainly must be admitted that the Administering Authorities have a certain responsibility, and the procedure actually provides for a special treatment of such observations of Administering Authorities. I quite agree that the procès verbaux of the debate should also be included. The observations made by all delegations should also be transmitted to the General Assembly. This would be quite normal. We do not expect our observations to receive any different treatment from that received by the observations made by other delegations. However, the preliminary statements, which are indeed the comments of the Administering Authorities on the reports of the Visiting Mission, must be transmitted separately. This does not involve any discrimination against any delegation.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I could agree with the statement just made by the representative of France if the report of the Trusteeship Council were not involved. We do not object to the publication of the report with the observations of the Administering Authorities. However, we have to insist that equal treatment be given to the views of the Administering Authorities and those of the other delegations in transmitting the report to the General Assembly. We are not approving the statements made by the Administering Authorities but the report of the Trusteeship Council.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic)(interpretation from French): My delegation feels that the suggestion made to transmit to the General Assembly the procès verbaux and the statements made by all the delegations was quite correct and might indeed meet all the wishes that have been expressed. We might say that the procès verbaux comprise the preliminary statements of the representatives of France and the United Kingdom as well as the statements made by the other members of the Council.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): It appears to me that we should have no difficulty in this matter. I should like to say, as President of the Council, that the statements made by the Administering Authorities concerning the two Trust Territories which we have examined are the official statements of those Governments in dealing with the reports of the Visiting Mission. The resolutions which have been adopted state that the reports of the Visiting Mission, as well as the observations of the Administering Authorities and the records of our meetings, will be transmitted to the General Assembly.

I would propose that we retain the statements of the Administering Authorities on the reports of the Visiting Mission and that we transmit the records of our debates to the General Assembly under an additional paragraph of the report. This suggestion would enable us to overcome a difficulty which is really one of form rather than of substance.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) (interpretation from French): My delegation would agree to the suggestion just made by the President, but I should like to hear the opinion of the representative of the Soviet Union, inasmuch as he is the one who raised the question.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): If I correctly understood the President's suggestion, it is to accord equal treatment as a matter of principle to the statements made by the Administering Authorities and to the statements made by other delegations. If that is correct, we are not going to object to his suggestion.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I believe that we have more or less reached an agreement. We shall keep the report as drafted, with annexes III and IV, and an annex V will mention the records of the debates, which also will be transmitted to the General Assembly. This would cover all the documentation mentioned in the resolutions which have been adopted.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It could be drafted as follows: Annex V, statements and interventions of the members of the Council on this point of the agenda. It does not matter whether it is the third, fourth or fifth annex.

Mr. JHA (India): I think that the last suggestion of the representative of the Soviet Union should be accepted, because in our resolution we definitely refer to the records of the Council's discussions along with the observations of the Administering Authorities. Including an annex V would be quite all right so far as we are concerned, and it could read "Records of the Trusteeship Council's discussions". Since the records are rather bulky, perhaps mention could be made in parentheses "already circulated to delegations", because we get these records every day.

(Mr. Jha, India)

If you do that, I think you maintain the recommendatory part of the resolution, which specifically refers to the records of the discussions. I feel that that might meet the difficulty. I am sorry to intervene and perhaps make it more complicated, but I thought I might make this suggestion.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I am very grateful to the representative of India for the observations he has just made. I was consulting members of the Secretariat to know exactly what the practical means might be of implementing the suggestion of the representative of the Soviet Union. It has been pointed out to me that various difficulties would face us if we attempted to do this. We were not really sure what the representative of the Soviet Union meant by "the statements made here in the Council". In addition to certain statements, which were rather long, there were various interventions on points of procedure and other such points. Was all of that to be included in the suggested annex V of the special report? Now the suggestion made by the representative of India will be considered, and I should like to know what the members of the Council think of this.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): If I correctly understood the suggestion of the representative of India, which did not seem to me to come too late at all, it seems to me to be a very practical way of dealing with the situation. I think we might bring this discussion to a close perhaps by accepting this compromise, which seems to me to cover the point.

Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France)(interpretation from French): I believe that the suggestion of the representative of India is satisfactory to all the members and can thus settle this matter.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): If there are no further comments, I shall take it that the Council has so decided.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, you have twice stated that a decision had been taken by the Council, but I do not know which decision is valid. I still hope that there

(Mr. Lobanov, USSR)

is going to be a fifth annex to the report, stating what it contains. Do I correctly understand the decision as announced by you, sir?

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): To avoid confusion, I shall ask the representative of India to be good enough to repeat his suggestion.

Mr. JHA (India): What I had in mind was that we have an annex V and that below that "Annex V" we should have "Records of the Trusteeship Council's discussions" and below that mention in parentheses "Already circulated to delegations" because we get these records every day.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): If reference is made to delegations of the Trusteeship Council, that would be correct, but if reference is made to delegations of the General Assembly I feel that the wording of the representative of India is not quite precise. They do not receive all the records that we receive here. The Soviet delegation is concerned to ensure that all other delegations as well should receive the records of the discussions and not merely summaries, because it is quite possible to mention only headings of statements with no real reflection of the statements made. In other words, we are using the same approach as we use with regard to the statements of the Administering Authorities.

Mr. JHA (India): I was going by the terms of the resolution. Our resolution says:

"the observations of the Administering Authority and the records of the Council's discussion".(T/L.896, page 2)

We have the statements made by the two Administering Authorities in annexes III and IV. If we have annex V transmitting also in the form of an annexure the records of the Council's discussions, I made the suggestion for a certain remark in parentheses, because it was my impression that these records are circulated to each delegation. However, if the representative of the Soviet Union and others would like the whole bulky record to be circulated at the same time I have no objection and I withdraw the suggestion. If it is already circulated, that is really immaterial. But the point is that in order to make our report complete

(Mr. Jha, India)

in the context of the terms of the resolution there should be a mention of the records of the Council's discussion, because it was definitely our intention that these records should go to the General Assembly to enable the Members to look into them and to find out exactly who has said what.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): Following on that intervention which has just been made, I should like to ask a question. Both resolutions passed on the two Trust Territories said that the records of the Council's discussions were hereby transmitted to the General Assembly. What I want to know is whether these are going to be transmitted to the Members of the General Assembly, because, if they are going to be transmitted to the Members of the General Assembly, then some variation of the parenthesis would cover the point. They are not part of the report but they are going to be transmitted to the Members of the General Assembly so that every Member of the General Assembly will have these records of the Trusteeship Council in accordance with the resolutions. Am I right, sir, or am I wrong?

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I shall ask the Council Secretary to give an explanation with regard to the procès-verbaux of the Council.

The SECRETARY: The only official records of this Council are the summary records. The verbatim records are made available to members of the Council only when absolutely necessary; they do not exist as official records outside this Council. However, the summary records, of course, are distributed to all delegations. If a resolution refers to the records of the Trusteeship Council, it can only mean the summary records, and these summary records can be put on the agenda of the Fourth Committee when it discusses this particular item.

If it is the intention of the Council to add as an additional annex the full verbatim discussion or the relevant verbatim discussion in this Council, obviously that would need the consent of the Council, and it would be only proper for me to draw attention to the fact that, since this is of course bulky, it will take some time, not only in assemblage but also in translation into the other official languages of the United Nations.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The difficulties referred to by the representative of the Secretariat are not very real, especially the difficulties connected with translation. He knows perfectly well that these texts already exist in all four languages -- so that no translation will be involved. But I did not want to stress that particularly.

I wanted to draw the attention of the rperesentative of India to the following point: If he feels it necessary to state in parentheses that the records were already circulated, the same could be said also about Annexes III and IV -- it could also be stated in parentheses that the statements of the Administering Authorities were also circulated. In other words, my observation mainly -- and I really wish to terminate this procedural discussion in a spirit of co-operation -- is that we are ready to accept the suggestion of the representative of India to the effect that a fifth Annex be added to the text, but without any text in parentheses -- just say, "Annex IV, the records of the Council"--- and without any mention in parentheses.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): It may not be necessary for me to intervene, but I should like elucidation on what is going to happen, if it says, "Annex V -- records of the Trusteeship Council discussions". What will happen to these records, how will they be dealt with? Could I have an elucidation on that?

The SECRETARY: At the moment the only thing that we could suggest in that regard, unless the Council decides otherwise, is to refer to the summary records of this Council, namely T/SR.953 to 963.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): The position is quite clear in the light of this discussion. The Council has passed two resolutions which say that the Council hereby transmits to the General Assembly the two reports of the Visiting Mission, the two statements made by the Administering Authority, and the records of the meetings which are the summary records, as we have just been told by the Secretariat. There is no reason whatever why we should depart from

(Sir Andrew Cohen, United Kingdom)

these decisions of the Council. But I see no objection to the suggestion by my friend from India, if that helps. The position would then be that this report would go in as it stands, and the summary records would be made available by the Secretariat to the Members of the General Assembly. I think that was what was always intended. I think that we could be quite clear that this should be done. That is surely the right procedure. I think we can now settle it on that basis.

Mr. JHA (India): Well, my apprehensions have come true. I raised another problem altogether by my intervention. But it seems to me that whether you mention "there are already circulated" or you only transmit the summary, those who are interested will look into the discussions of the Council. So far as we are concerned, I do not mind whether it is the summary record or the discussions. The verbatim discussions are more voluminous. There may be a difficulty in translations, as the Council Secretary has said.

With regard to the other point -- the portion that I mentioned in parentheses -- I have only in mind the difficulty of transmitting these bulky documents. But if that is possible, that can go. We have no strong opinion on that. We were only trying to help in the discussion of this question. So far as we are concerned, we would look into all the discussions because we have had the benefit of being here. I am sure that those delegations which are not here but which will be called upon to make a statement, will also look into the records. I feel that we should cut the discussion short. We have agreed on an Annex V and below Annex V there should be "records of the Council's discussions". And that record normally is the summary record. I would be quite happy and willing if that is only said.

Mr. LOVANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I should like to receive clarification on one point. As far as we understand, the summary records will be the usual summary records normally annexed or included in the reports of the Trusteeship Council; and each delegation would be entitled to read them, and to correct them -- to see whether they really coincide with the interventions actually made. If this interpretation is correct we will consider the question as exhausted.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I believe that the Council has had sufficient clarification of this question. The last observation made by the Soviet Union is in agreement with my opinion, and I believe also with the opinion of the members of the Council.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic)(interpretation from French): I completely agree, but I have an observation to make of a different type. If you will allow me, I will make my observation now.

In paragraph 3 of the report, in the French text, we read:

"...the Council agreed to examine the future of the Cameroons under French administration and the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration separately in that order." (T/L.897, p. 2)

My delegation is of the opinion that this phrase is really not in conformity with the facts. It might produce implications which might affect the entity of the Cameroonian question. Therefore, we would like to suggest that this phrase be replaced by the following phrase,

"...the Council agreed to examine firstly, the report on the future of the Cameroons under French administration, and then, the report on the future of the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration."

in view of the fact that this examination was decided in this way out of consideration for facilitating the debates, and so forth. That is the only reason that such a decision was taken.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Are there any objections to the suggestion just made by the representative of the United Arab Republic? It would seem there are no objections. Therefore, the suggestion of the United Arab Republic calling for a modification of paragraph 3 is accepted by the Council.

The French text of paragraph 3, as I understand it now, would read as follows:

"At its 953rd meeting, after the Chairman of the Visiting Mission had introduced the two reports of the Mission, the Council agreed to examine firstly, the report on the Cameroons under French administration, and then, the report on the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration."

It was so decided.

Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (interpretation from French): I wanted to make two drafting comments. In paragraph 4, we read:

"The examination of the future of the Cameroons under French administration was begun at the 953rd meeting, when an opening statement was made by the representative of France."

I suggest a drafting change to the effect that we place a period after the words "953rd meeting", and then say, "An opening statement was made by the representative of France."

The same applies to paragraph 7. I suggest that a period be placed after the words "959th meeting", and then say, "An opening statement was made by the representative of the United Kingdom."

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Secretariat has taken note of the comment made by the representative of France.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Of course, we entirely support the suggestions of the representative of the United Arab Republic. However, we feel that it is necessary to add the following words to explain why the Council was forced, so to speak, to consider separately these two reports:

"At the 953rd meeting, the Council, after the Chairman of the Visiting Mission had introduced the two reports of the Mission, because of the fact that the representative of the United Kingdom was not ready to make the concluding statement concerning the report dealing with the Cameroons under British administration, the Council agreed ..."

The rest of the text would be as suggested by the representative of the United Arab Republic.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): I would not agree with this suggestion. There is no evidence that this was necessarily the only reason why this was done. I do not think that this suggestion is something that we can accept without further discussion. Therefore, I hope that my friend from the Soviet Union will not press the point. I personally would not agree with this suggestion.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I feel that this fact needs no further proof. The records clearly show what statement was made by the representative of the United Kingdom. He stated that at the present moment for such and such reasons he could not make the statement concerning the Visiting Mission's report. Then the representative of France stated that he was ready to make a statement, and the discussinn of the report concerning the Cameroons under French administration was initiated. This is a matter of fact. I believe that it would be entirely inappropriate to have a discussion about this point. This is a factual reference to what happened.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): Of course a great deal of what my Soviet friend says is true. But the point I am making is that there is no evidence that convinces me at any rate that this procedure would not have been adopted even if I had been ready to make my statement. The Council might well have decided to proceed accordingly. This is not a correct factual account. These glosses after the event are not very helpful. While I think it is a matter of very, very small importance, I do not think it is correct to put it in this form. It may or may not be correct. In my opinion we should not put it.

Mr. KELLY (Australia): I respectfully request the representative of the Soviet Union to withdraw the proposal that he has made. As all will recall, we have agreed to transmit the summary records of the Trusteeship Council's discussions to the General Assembly, and I feel that all Members of the Assembly will be able to draw their own inferences from those records and that it is unnecessary to insert in this report the unilateral inferences which the representative of the Soviet Union has drawn from our proceedings.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): If the reference of the representataive of Australia is taken seriously and deals with the whole of the matter, then it should not be shown that the Council decided to consider the two reports separately. Everyone who read the discussion of the report would see it anyway. The clarification of this point becomes necessary because some parties wanted to emphasize that the

(Mr. Lobanov, USSR)

discussion was not simulataneous. If this is to be done, it is necessary to point to all the circumstances of the situation and also to show what the reason was. If the representative of the United Kingdom feels that the real cause is not in his refusal to make a statement, I would be very interested in finding out what were the real reasons which prevented the simultaneous consideration of these two Territories. This would be very interesting indeed, as well as very important.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to ask the representative of the Soviet Union whether his delegation is making a formal suggestion with regard to paragraph 3.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I did not make any formal proposal, but I wanted the Council to consider this point.

Mr. SYLVAIN (Haiti) (interpretation from French): These discussions naturally do not have too much order in them because we are pressed for time.

I should like to make an observation with regard to paragraph 6 which refers to the vote taken on the resolution. The Council will recall that at the conclusion of the vote the representative of France made a statement which my delegation feels was a very important one and should figure in this report at the end of paragraph 6. I will therefore suggest that mention should be made of the statement by the representative of France concerning the amnesty law which had just been adopted. He read out a cablegram, I believe.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): We have heard the proposal of the representative of Haiti with regard to paragraph 6 of the draft report. Are there any objections?

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation would like to know what would be the wording and in what context would this reference appear in paragraph 6. Will it be said, for instance, that the representative of France stated that the amnesty law which was

(Mr. Lobanov, USSR)

adopted in the Territory will be submitted to the General Assembly for consideration? I do not quite understand what the actual text will be.

Mr. SYLVAIN (Haiti) (interpretation from French): My thought was that the report should note that the representative of France, following the vote, made a statement concerning the amnesty law which had just been passed. With regard to the essence of what the representative of France said, if the Secretariat has no objection, it might figure in this annex V which we have been debating at such length.

Mr. KELLY (Australia): If I recollect aright, it was on the initiative of the representative of Haiti that the Council, by a roll-call vote, adopted the resolution on the report of the Visiting Mission with respect to the Cameroons under French administration. But no reference to that roll-call vote is made in paragraph 6. Without pressing the matter, I would suggest that the Secretariat record the fact that a roll-call vote was taken on that occasion.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Are there any objections to the suggestion just made by the representative of Australia dealing with paragraph 6 of the report?

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic)(interpretation from French): My delegation supports the suggestion just made by the representative of Haiti, but I would also like the paragraph to make mention of the fact that the representative of France promised to make available to us the text of the amnesty law.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Are there any objections to the suggestion made by the representative of the United Arab Republic?

Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France): I have no objection whatsoever. I am somewhat reluctant to refer to a statement made by myself, but I believe that the statement could not appear in separate parts. Perhaps it would be best to reproduce it either as an addition to annex III or within annex V as defined previously, so that the members of the General Assembly would be able to take cognizance of the complete text of the statement which I made in that discussion.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): As far as I understood the representative of the United Arab Republic, he was not concerned with the fact that the reproduction of the statements made by the representative of France should be very correct, but he was worried about the text of the amnesty law itself. If I correctly remember the statements made by the representative of the United Arab Republic during the discussion, it definitely had that sense. Now the representative of France stated that the amnesty law would be placed at the disposal of the members of the General Assembly for consideration and study. We are concerned with having the actual text of the law made available.

With regard with the statement made by the representative of France, no discussion can arise around it. It will be part of annex V along with the other declarations made by the Council.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I would ask the Secretary of the Council to be good enough to recall to the Council the various suggestions which have been made concerning paragraph 6 of the draft report.

The SECRETARY: It might perhaps be best to add a new paragraph after paragraph 6 which would read:

"The representative of France made a statement concerning the adoption by the Cameroonian Legislative Assembly of a law of amnesty" -- which might be described a little bit more accurately -- which would be made available to the General Assembly."

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic)(interpretation from French): This formula completely satisfies my delegation.

The SECRETARY: In paragraph 6, after the words "with 1 abstention", we would enumerate the roll-call vote.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): If the roll-call vote were to be reflected, of course we would not object to it. But then it would be quite normal, after that, to have the explanations of vote. This is a rule which could really not be disregarded in this case. We would have to insist that this rule should be applied in this case and that the explanations of vote should also appear.

Mr. KELLY (Australia): I would be quite satified if the words "by roll-call" were inserted after the word "adopted". I would not insist upon an enumeration of the countries actually voting. If those words "by roll-call" were inserted, it would be sufficient to put the General Assembly on enquiry and they can then turn to the summary records in annex V and ascertain who it was that voted against independence for the Cameroons under French administration.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Is this last suggestion of the representative of Australia agreeable to the members of the Council?

Mr. LOPANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): It is entirely acceptable, but under the condition that annex V should show the explanations of vote in full. The Soviet delegation accepts the proposal of the Australian delegation.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French); Is the Council now ready to vote on the report as a whole, as amended?

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic)(interpretation from French): If I am not mistaken, the Council did not decide on the proposal concerning paragraph 3.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I shall call on the Council Secretary to speak on the question of the modification of paragraph 3.

The SECRETARY: If I understand it, the Council agreed to change paragraph 3, the first sentence reading as follows:

"At its 953rd meeting, after the Chairman of the Visiting Mission had introduced the two reports of the Mission , the Council agreed to examine, firstly, the report on the Cameroons under French administration and then the report on the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration."

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): If I hear no objection, we will then consider the draft report contained in document T/L.897 as having been accepted by the Council.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Due to certain difficulties that would arise, the meeting of the Trusteeship Council for tomorrow afternoon will be cancelled.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

FEB 19 1959

(For use of information media - not an official record)

Trusteeship Council
23rd Session, 22nd Meeting (PM)

Press Release TR/1472
18 February 1959

COUNCIL COMPLETES CONSIDERATION OF FUTURE OF BRITISH CAMEROONS, FRENCH CAMEROONS; APPROVES REPORT TO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The Trusteeship Council this afternoon completed its consideration of the future of the French Cameroons and the British Cameroons by approving its special report to the General Assembly on this question.

No formal vote was taken on the report which will now go before the Assembly at its resumed 13th session opening on Friday, 20 February. Meanwhile, the Council will be in recess during the Assembly discussions, expected to last about three weeks.

In the report adopted today, the Council transmits the two resolutions which were approved this week on the two UN trust territories.

In the case of the French Cameroons, the Council recommended, among other things, that the Assembly, after considering the Council's special report and any further views that may be expressed before it, "take a decision to terminate the trusteeship agreement upon the attainment of full national independence with effect from 1 January 1960."

On the British Cameroons, the Council decided to transmit to the Assembly the report of the UN visiting mission to the territory, as well the observations of the administering authority and the records of the recent discussions in the Council. This resolution suggests that the Assembly, in the light of these documents and any further views that may be expressed before it, take appropriate action in accordance with the provisions of the UN Charter.

The Council made a number of changes in the draft report (Doc. T/L.897) before its adoption this afternoon.

After the completion of the Assembly's discussion of the future of the two Cameroons, the Council will reconvene to complete its work for the current session.

The Council still has to complete action resulting from its examination of conditions in Tanganyika under British administration. It is also scheduled, among other things, to take up the 1957 reports on French Togoland, the British Cameroons and the French Cameroons, and reports of Council committees dealing with petitions, administrative unions, and rural economic development.

* *** *