

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

Thursday, 12 March 1959,
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 13:

The future of the Trust Territories of the Cameroons under French administration and the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration: special report of the Trusteeship Council (continued)
Consideration of draft resolutions (continued) . . . 757

Chairman: Mr. Frederick H. BOLAND (Ireland).

AGENDA ITEM 13

The future of the Trust Territories of the Cameroons under French administration and the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration: special report of the Trusteeship Council* (A/4092, A/4093/Rev.1, A/4094, A/C.4/395, A/C.4/L.580/Rev.1, A/C.4/L.581, A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1, A/C.4/L.585, A/C.4/L.586, T/SR.953-963) (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.580/REV.1, A/C.4/L.581, A/C.4/L.582/REV.1) (continued)

1. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) recalled that, in support of his contention that the women of the women of the Northern Cameroons could not be allowed the right to take part in the plebiscite, the United Kingdom representative had referred to the words "appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory" in Article 76 (b) of the Charter. The "particular circumstances" were the same in the North of both the Trust Territories; yet women in the Cameroons under French administration had the right to vote. Moreover, there was no question of obliging the women to vote; it was simply a matter of giving them the right to do so. Again, Article 76 c laid down that one of the basic objectives of the Trusteeship System was to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all "without distinction as to . . . sex". That made it clear that the reference in Article 76 b to "the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned" applied not only to the wishes of men but to those of women also.

2. The fact that the plebiscite would be taking place under the supervision of the United Nations made it even more undesirable that the right to vote should not be accorded to women in the Northern Cameroons, for the United Nations would then appear to be giving its approval to that infringement of human rights.

3. She felt that the Chairman of the Commission on the Status of Women should be invited to appear before the Fourth Committee in order to give the Commission's views on the subject. The Liberian delegation had always supported the cause of women and no dele-

gation in the Fourth Committee was better placed than hers to defend the rights of African women.

4. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) observed that the question raised by the representative of Liberia was far from simple. It was not merely a question of granting or refusing voting rights to women in the Northern Cameroons but also of taking custom into account. Custom was still a powerful social influence in many parts of the world; it differed from one country to another and it was best left to be dealt with by the competent national authorities. If it supported the Liberian proposal, his delegation would fear that it was interfering in matters which really concerned only the Cameroons. The matter was still the subject of discussion in the Sudan itself. Since it was unable to take a definite stand on the matter, his delegation would abstain.

5. Mr. LORINC (Hungary) said that his delegation's attitude towards the draft resolutions before the Committee was based solely on the principles of foreign policy derived from the social system set up in Hungary since 1945. His delegation was not prompted by any selfish interests, either economic or political; its sole desire was to help the Cameroonian peoples to achieve the aims for which so many patriots had given so much, namely, independence and unification.

6. The draft resolutions made it clear that the objectives of the colonialist Powers were diametrically opposed to those of the Cameroonian people. It was an established fact that, from the beginning of their trusteeship, the United Kingdom and France had opposed any arrangement which might cause their hold over the Territories to be lessened. Times had changed, but their intentions had not. The two Administering Authorities now gave the impression that they were impatient to grant "independence" to the Territories, but only subject to conditions designed to prevent the people from achieving a genuine independence. The draft resolutions were the logical outcome of the events which had taken place since the submission of the reports (T/1426 and Add.1¹; T/1427 and T/1434²) of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, 1958, and the consideration of those reports by the Trusteeship Council. Despite the good faith of the sponsors of the draft resolutions, some of whom themselves represented former colonies, the proposals served the interests of the colonial Powers.

7. The draft resolution on the Cameroons under French administration contained in document A/C.4/L.580/Rev.1 brought out the difference which existed between the Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly, for the latter had heard what the petitioners had to say. Nevertheless, the draft resolution made

¹/ Transmitted to Members of the General Assembly by a note of the Secretary-General (A/4093/Rev.1).

²/ Transmitted to Members of the General Assembly by a note of the Secretary-General (A/4092).

*In accordance with General Assembly resolution 1281 (XIII).

only verbal concessions to the petitioners' statements; it did not settle either the question of elections before independence or that of the abrogation of the Decree of 13 July 1955 dissolving certain political parties. Furthermore, it deprived the United Nations of its basic right to ensure that the Trusteeship Agreement was observed up to the day of independence. It was therefore established that what France wanted was not the independence of the Cameroons but the termination of the trusteeship, which prevented it from continuing its political, economic and military domination of the Cameroons. His delegation was therefore unable to support the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.580/Rev.1. On the other hand, it would vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the African States (A/C.4/L.581), which defended the rights and interests of the Cameroons and the principles of the United Nations, especially those of the Trusteeship System.

8. The draft resolution concerning the Cameroons under British administration (A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1) made no mention of the possibility of unification with the Cameroons under French administration, although that was one of the main objectives of the Cameroonian people. By establishing different dates for the Northern and southern parts of the Territory it practically ruled out reunification and forced the Northern Cameroons either to join the Federation of Nigeria or to remain under trusteeship. It was therefore clear that the United Kingdom was seeking, although perhaps more adroitly than France, to achieve the same end of not granting independence to the Territory under its trusteeship. Whether people liked it or not, the Cameroonians would attain their independence in the end, for that would be determined by the course of history, but it was only by defending the interests of the African peoples and not by supporting the erroneous conclusions of a visiting mission that the United Nations could strengthen its authority in Africa. His delegation could not therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1, but would support the amendment submitted by the African States (A/C.4/L.589). It would continue to favour complete independence and the unification of the three parts of the Cameroons on 1 January 1960.

9. Mrs. SKOTTSBERG-AHMAN (Sweden) outlined the position of her delegation with regard to the draft resolution concerning the Cameroons under British administration (A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1) and the amendments thereto (A/C.4/L.587/Rev.1, A/C.4/L.589).

10. Her delegation could not support the amendment submitted by the African States (A/C.4/L.589) providing for a second choice to be made available in the Northern Cameroons. Although the question of unification had for a long time exercised the United Nations, the Cameroons under French administration and the Southern Cameroons, the same was not true of the Northern Cameroons, which, according to reliable sources such as the Visiting Mission and Malam Abdullahi, had never wanted it. She did not therefore see the point of suggesting that possibility. Furthermore, even in the Southern Cameroons, where opinion was keenly aware of the issue of unification, Mr. Foncha, the Premier, considered that it would be premature to refer to it in the plebiscite to be held in the spring of 1960. It would therefore be still more premature to do so in the Northern Cameroons in November 1959. On the other hand, the suggestion made in the draft

resolution (A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1) was, in her delegation's view, a reasonable one. If the people of the Northern Cameroons declined to remain attached to the Federation of Nigeria and preferred their future to be decided later, the General Assembly, when considering at its fourteenth session the questions to be asked in the Southern Cameroons, would also be able to come to a decision about the other choice to be offered in the Northern Cameroons.

11. The Liberian amendment (A/C.4/L.587/Rev.1) placed her delegation in an awkward position. Sweden was as much attached as any other country to the principle of equal rights for men and women. Its Constitution provided for universal suffrage and women played an important part in public life in Sweden. Her delegation considered, however, that there were circumstances in which it was better to go slowly, and to educate and persuade not only women but men also, rather than to impose a solution. It was clear that public opinion in Northern Nigeria and in the Northern Cameroons was not ready to accept such a major change in long-established custom. The United Kingdom delegation had recalled that, at the last Nigeria Constitutional Conference, the representatives of the Southern Cameroons, who were in favour of universal suffrage throughout the Territory, had deferred to the representatives of the Northern Cameroons who had held the opposite view. The Conference had therefore decided that the North would, for the time being, continue to act as it thought best. Thus it was quite clear that the existing situation was only temporary. Moreover, Malam Abdullahi had emphasized the fact that his Government was doing all it could to promote the education of women and that the right to vote would certainly be given to them within a few years. There was therefore reason to hope that the laws and regulations in the area would be changed as soon as possible so as to bring that about.

12. The main point was not to delay the independence of the Northern Cameroons. Her delegation feared that insistence on the institution of universal suffrage there would make it impossible for the proposed plebiscite to be held. She would emphasize that Article 76 b of the Charter drew attention to the need for taking into account the particular circumstances of each Territory.

13. Accordingly, although it subscribed to the principles of the Liberian amendment, her delegation would be unable to support it.

14. Mr. RAVNE (Norway) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1.

15. With regard to the right of women in the Northern Cameroons under British administration to vote, it was certainly desirable that there should be progress towards the aims of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights but the existing electoral register would have to be used in order not to delay the plebiscite. The Norwegian delegation would therefore vote against the Liberian amendment. At the same time it hoped that the authorities in the Northern Cameroons would endeavour to introduce universal suffrage, which already existed in the Southern Cameroons, as soon as possible.

16. Mr. Daniel CHAPMAN (Ghana) said that he would confine his remarks to the question of the Cameroons under French administration but reserved his dele-

gation's right to speak again on the question of the Cameroons under British administration.

17. He was sorry that certain delegations had seen fit to accuse the African States of supporting the opponents of the present Government of the Cameroons under French administration. The delegation of Ghana did not support any party; it was actuated simply by a desire to see the new Cameroonian State established on a firm foundation at the time of its attainment of independence. Although all delegations agreed that there should be general elections in the near future, opinion was divided on the question whether they should take place before or after independence. That divergence of views was manifested in the two draft resolutions and the amendments before the Committee.

18. The delegation of Ghana was ready to accept some paragraphs of the preamble and operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.580/Rev.1, which also formed part of the draft resolution submitted by Ghana and seven other countries (A/C.4/L.581). On the other hand it could not note "with satisfaction" the adoption of the amnesty law of 14 February 1959, for it would like to be able to take note also of the abrogation of the Decree of 13 July 1955. Some delegations, including that of the United States, considered that to ask for the abrogation of that decree would be tantamount to recommending that violence should be legalized. That view ignored both recent developments in the Cameroons under French administration and the desire of all Africans to shake off the yoke of colonial domination. Until the decree was abrogated there could be neither true peace nor true reconciliation in the Territory. The Union des populations du Cameroun inevitably still exercised an influence on certain elements of the Cameroonian population, who were aware that the party had been prohibited because it had worked for aims which were now the aims of the Ahidjo Government, i.e., the independence and unification of the Cameroons.

19. The delegation of Ghana was in favour of the holding of general elections in the Cameroons under French administration before 1 January 1960. The fact that the Territory now exercised internal autonomy did not relieve the States Members of the United Nations of the duty of carrying out their responsibility under the Charter; there was no question of interference. At the 873rd meeting the United States representative had said that the Committee should not cast doubts on the representative character of the present Government, which had succeeded by peaceful methods in winning independence for the Cameroons, and that it should not lend its support, even indirectly, to those leaders who had exiled themselves from their country rather than renounce the use of force. He did not share those views. The Territory's struggle for independence had begun long before the present Government had come to power and it was only fair that all those who had fought for independence should be able to have a voice in choosing the Government and Assembly which would assume the responsibilities arising from independence. Furthermore he considered that the main responsibility for the acts of violence which had taken place in the Cameroons and in other African Territories lay with the colonial Powers, which had used force to suppress the African peoples' desire for independence. The question was not whether the present Government of the Cameroons under French administration was or was not

capable of holding free elections. In view of the existing divergences of view in the Territory, general elections held under United Nations supervision would be the safest way of ensuring the transition from trusteeship to independence in the best possible conditions.

20. In conclusion, he said that his delegation would vote in favour of operative paragraphs 1 and 3 of the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.580/Rev.1 and against operative paragraph 2, which did not provide for general elections before independence, and would abstain on the draft resolution as a whole.

21. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) remarked that a new question had arisen in connexion with the plebiscite which was to decide the future of the Cameroons under British administration—that of granting the vote to the women of the Northern Cameroons. In principle, it was not for the Fourth Committee to discuss women's rights and it was certainly not entitled to enforce a change in the local customs of a region, but neither could the General Assembly be forced to overlook the provisions of the Charter, nor could there be any exception to the principle of equality of the sexes. Perhaps it might still be possible to reconcile the views of the Liberian delegation and those of the United Kingdom delegation on the question.

22. With regard to the Cameroons under French administration, two contradictory draft resolutions had been submitted to the Committee: the first provided for general elections after the attainment of independence and the second recommended that elections should be held before independence. Perhaps the unanimous adoption of the draft resolution would be facilitated if the relevant paragraph merely said that the General Assembly "Expresses its confidence that elections will be held as soon as possible for the formation...".

23. Mr. HERRARTE (Guatemala) said that his delegation had joined in sponsoring the amendments in document A/C.4/L.588 which had been incorporated in the revised draft resolution (A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1) because it considered that the people of the Northern Cameroons should be enabled to choose between two alternatives. Since it had no objection to the amendment in document A/C.4/L.589, it would be able to vote in favour of that amendment.

24. The remarks of the representative of Panama at the 877th meeting with relation to universal suffrage were very well-founded. The delegation of Guatemala hoped that the Administering Authority would reconsider its position. Custom should undoubtedly be respected, but the question at issue was not a general election but a decision which would determine the whole future of a Territory; in so important a matter the greatest number of individuals should be enabled to vote. In any case, participation in the election would not be obligatory; women who did not wish to vote would be perfectly free not to do so.

25. Prince Aly KHAN (Pakistan) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.580/Rev.1, which approved the attainment of independence and sovereignty by the Cameroons under French administration. In particular it supported operative paragraph 2, in which the General Assembly expressed its confidence that, at the earliest possible date after the attainment of independ-

ence on 1 January 1960, elections would be held for the formation of a new Assembly which should take decisions regarding the establishment in their final form of the institutions of a free independent Cameroons. The delegation of Pakistan hoped that Mr. Ahidjo's Government would be able to hold elections before final action was taken on the application of the Cameroons for membership in the United Nations, which would presumably be in the autumn of 1960.

26. With regard to the Cameroons under British administration, the delegation of Pakistan would naturally vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1, of which it was a sponsor. He thought it unnecessary to reiterate the explanations on the subject already given by the representatives of Argentina and Italy. He would vote against the amendment in document A/C.4/L.589, for he considered it premature to ask the population of the Northern Cameroons to express their wishes concerning union with an independent Cameroons until it was known more clearly what form the Union would take. That alternative should be proposed to the population only if in the plebiscite to be held in November 1959 it opted in favour of deciding the future of the Northern Cameroons at a later date. The delegation of Pakistan would vote also against the Liberian amendment (A/C.4/L.587/Rev.1) for reasons which had been clearly explained by the representatives of the United Kingdom, Argentina, the Federation of Malaya and Ceylon. In that connexion he contested the assertions in the report of the Visiting Mission (T/1426 and Add.1, para. 146) that Moslem religion and culture kept the women of the Northern Cameroons out of public life. In Pakistan, where the great majority of the population was Moslem, women enjoyed complete equality of political rights with men and some of them played a prominent role in public affairs. As the United Kingdom representative had explained, it was the social customs of the people of the Northern Cameroons, not the Moslem religion, which prevented women from exercising the right to vote.

27. In conclusion, he emphasized that his vote against the Liberian amendment should not be interpreted as meaning that his delegation was opposed to universal suffrage. The sole question at issue was whether universal suffrage should be imposed on the people of the Northern Cameroons against their wish. To that question the delegation of Pakistan gave a negative reply.

28. The CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to vote first on the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.580/Rev.1 relating to the Cameroons under French administration, and the amendments thereto (A/C.4/L.584/Rev.1).

29. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. LOUTFI (United Arab Republic) asked that, in accordance with the usual procedure, the Committee should begin by voting on the amendments.

30. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) asked for all the amendments to be voted on by roll-call.

31. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) asked for a separate vote to be taken on sub-paragraph 3 (a), and on sub-paragraphs 3 (b) and (c) together, of the amendments in document A/C.4/L.584/Rev.1.

A vote was taken by roll-call on paragraph 1 of the amendments (A/C.4/L.584/Rev.1).

Ireland, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq.

Against: Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India.

Abstaining: Mexico, Pakistan, Panama, Finland, Greece, Iran.

Paragraph 1 of the amendments (A/C.4/L.584/Rev.1) was rejected by 45 votes to 30, with 6 abstentions.

A vote was taken by roll-call on paragraph 2 of the amendments in document A/C.4/L.584/Rev.1.

The Union of South Africa, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Against: Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey.

Abstaining: Uruguay, Venezuela, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Ecuador, India, Iran, Mexico, Panama, Philippines.

Paragraph 2 of the amendments (A/C.4/L.584/Rev.1) was rejected by 42 votes to 28, with 11 abstentions.

A vote was taken by roll-call on sub-paragraph 3 (a) of the amendments (A/C.4/L.584/Rev.1).

Afghanistan, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Against: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Iran, Mexico, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Sub-paragraph 3 (a) of the amendments (A/C.4/L.584/Rev.1) was rejected by 47 votes to 27, with 7 abstentions.

A vote was taken by roll-call on sub-paragraphs 3 (b) and 3 (c) of the amendments (A/C.4/L.584/Rev.1).

China, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Against: China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile.

Abstaining: Finland, Iran, Mexico, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Venezuela.

Sub-paragraphs 3 (b) and 3 (c) of the amendments (A/C.4/L.584/Rev.1) were rejected by 46 votes to 28, with 7 abstentions.

32. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on each of the preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.580/Rev.1).

The first preambular paragraph was adopted by 70 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

The second preambular paragraph was adopted by 64 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

33. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the third preambular paragraph, asked the sponsors of the draft resolution what they understood by the words "the statements made in the Fourth Committee".

34. Mr. DEMARCHENA (Dominican Republic) pointed out that it was contrary to the rules of procedure to interrupt the voting.

35. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) asked for the third preambular paragraph to be put to the vote in two parts,

the first part to consist of the words "Taking into account the statements made in the Fourth Committee".

36. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) asked for a roll-call vote on the second part of that paragraph.

The first part of the third preambular paragraph up to and including the words "Fourth Committee", was adopted without objection.

A vote was taken by roll-call on the remainder of the third preambular paragraph.

China, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile.

Against: Czechoslovakia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Abstaining: Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Afghanistan.

The remainder of the third preambular paragraph was adopted by 58 votes to 11, with 12 abstentions.

At the request of the Liberian representative, a vote was taken by roll-call on the words "with satisfaction" in the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.4/L.580/Rev.1.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma.

Against: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria.

Abstaining: Cuba, Ghana, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan.

The words "with satisfaction" were adopted by 53 votes to 10, with 17 abstentions.

The fourth preambular paragraph as a whole was adopted by 56 votes to 9, with 15 abstentions.

The fifth preambular paragraph was adopted by 59 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.

The sixth preambular paragraph was adopted by 54 votes to 9, with 17 abstentions.

The seventh preambular paragraph was adopted by 57 votes to 1, with 20 abstentions.

The eighth preambular paragraph was adopted by 51 votes to 4, with 24 abstentions.

37. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) asked that a separate vote be taken on the words "and readiness" in the ninth preambular paragraph.

The words "and readiness" were adopted by 56 votes to 14, with 10 abstentions.

The ninth preambular paragraph as a whole was adopted by 68 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

The tenth preambular paragraph was adopted by 68 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

The eleventh preambular paragraph was adopted without objection.

At the request of the Afghan representative, a vote was taken by roll-call on operative paragraph 1.

Laos, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan.

Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 81 votes to none.

At the request of the Indian representative, a vote was taken by roll-call on operative paragraph 2.

Saudi Arabia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal.

Abstaining: Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Philippines, Poland, Romania.

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 48 votes to none, with 33 abstentions.

At the request of the Afghan representative, a vote was taken by roll-call on operative paragraph 3.

Albania, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan.

Abstaining: Albania, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 71 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

At the request of the French representative a vote was taken by roll-call on the draft resolution as a whole.

Austria, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

The draft resolution (A/C.4/L.580/Rev.1) as a whole, was adopted by 56 votes to 9, with 16 abstentions.

38. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) said that as the amendments in document A/C.4/L.584/Rev.1 had been rejected by the Committee, and as those amendments reproduced word for word specific provisions of the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.581, the sponsors of that draft resolution had decided to withdraw it.

39. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the amendment in document A/C.4/L.587/Rev.1 to the draft resolution on the Cameroons under British administration (A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1).

40. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) asked for a vote by roll-call.

41. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay), supported by Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), asked for a separate vote on paragraphs 1 and 2 of the amendment.

A vote was taken by roll-call on paragraph 1 of the amendment.

Ecuador, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Israel, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia.

Against: Federation of Malaya, France, Honduras, India, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Denmark.

Abstaining: Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Greece, Haiti, Iceland, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Mexico, Paraguay, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Yemen, Afghanistan, Australia, Burma, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic.

Paragraph 1 of the amendment (A/C.4/L.587/Rev.1) was rejected by 34 votes to 25, with 22 abstentions.

A vote was taken by roll-call on paragraph 2 of the amendment (A/C.4/L.587/Rev.1).

Tunisia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Liberia, Morocco, Nepal, Panama, Poland, Romania.

Against: Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, France, Honduras, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New

Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Thailand.

Abstaining: Uruguay, Yemen, Austria, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Mexico, Paraguay, Sudan, Sweden.

Paragraph 2 of the amendment (A/C.4/L.587/Rev.1) was rejected by 43 votes to 21, with 17 abstentions.

42. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the amendment in document A/C.4/L.589 to the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1).

At the request of the representative of the United Arab Republic, a vote was taken by roll-call.

Denmark, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia.

Against: Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, France, Honduras, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Portugal, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica.

Abstaining: El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Spain, Sudan, Uruguay, Austria, Brazil, Cambodia.

The amendment (A/C.4/L.589) was rejected by 36 votes to 32, with 13 abstentions.

43. The Chairman called for a vote on the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1).

44. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 2.

45. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested, firstly, that the preamble be put to the vote as a whole; secondly, that each operative paragraph be voted upon separately; thirdly, that with regard to operative paragraph 2, separate votes be taken on the words from "Recommends further" to "middle of November 1959" and on the remainder of the paragraph.

46. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) asked for a roll-call vote on operative paragraphs 2 and 4 and, with regard to operative paragraph 4, for a separate vote on the word "two" appearing before the word "alternatives".

47. Mr. HERRARTE (Guatemala) asked for a separate vote on the last part of operative paragraph 2, from the words "and that the plebiscite should be conducted".

48. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) thought that there was no point in voting on those words, which had already been the subject of a vote in connexion with the amendment in document A/C.4/L.587/Rev.1.

49. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that she wished to vote against that phrase.

The preamble of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1) was adopted by 62 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 64 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.

The first part of operative paragraph 2 from the words "Recommends further" to the words "middle of November 1959" was adopted by 71 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

The second part of operative paragraph 2, from the words "that the people" up to and including the words "at a later date?" was adopted by 50 votes to 13, with 16 abstentions.

50. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) could not understand how a vote could be taken on the remainder of operative paragraph 2. If that part were deleted, it was not possible to see on what basis the plebiscite could be conducted.

51. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his country did not wish to accept the responsibility for the organization of a plebiscite on the basis of an electoral register compiled for the elections to the Federal House of Representatives which was inconsistent with the provisions of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

52. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) stressed once more that an amendment to delete the phrase in question had already been rejected.

53. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had to decide at present on the adoption, not the deletion, of the phrase in question.

The remainder of operative paragraph 2, from the words "and that the plebiscite should be conducted" to the end of the paragraph, was adopted by 49 votes to 17, with 15 abstentions.

A roll-call vote was taken on operative paragraph 2 as a whole.

Indonesia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Honduras, Iceland, India.

Against: Poland, Afghanistan.

Abstaining: Iraq, Jordan, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary.

Operative paragraph 2 as a whole was adopted by 47 votes to 2, with 32 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 63 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

The proposal to delete the word "two" before the word "alternatives" from operative paragraph 4 was rejected by 33 votes to 17, with 23 abstentions.

A vote was taken by roll-call on operative paragraph 4 as a whole.

Panama, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan.

Against: Afghanistan.

Abstaining: Paraguay, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal.

Operative paragraph 4 as a whole was adopted by 55 votes to 1, with 25 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 5 was adopted by 66 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 6 was adopted by 78 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 7 was adopted by 70 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 8 was adopted by 67 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of the Federation of Malaya, a vote was taken by roll-call on the draft resolution as a whole.

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Luxembourg, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey.

Abstaining: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia.

The draft resolution (A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1) as a whole was adopted by 57 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 7.35 p.m.