

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWELFTH SESSION
Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE 733rd
MEETING**

*Friday, 6 December 1957,
at 10.50 a.m.*

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 13:	
Report of the Trusteeship Council (<i>continued</i>)	449
Consideration of draft resolutions (<i>continued</i>) . . .	449

Chairman: Mr. Thanat KHOMAN (Thailand).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Božović (Yugoslavia), Vice-Chairman took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 13

Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/3595 and Corr.1, A/3718 and Corr.1, A/C.4/372 and Add.1, A/C.4/L.512/Rev.3) (*continued*)

1. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) raised a point of order concerning the drafting of the provisional summary records. He referred in particular to the provisional text of document A/C.4/SR.727, and said he found it strange that a statement which he had made in English at the 727th meeting should appear first in French and that three days should elapse before he received the English text. Moreover, what he had said had been condensed beyond recognition. He had had in mind, in his statement at the 727th meeting, the setting up of an advisory committee whose first task would be to consider the question of the administrative union of certain Trust Territories with other countries or groups of countries. It had been his intention that such a committee should also consider the possibility of enabling inhabitants who so desired to give the Fourth Committee or other United Nations organs information about their countries. It was not a proposal to conduct oral hearings, as the above-mentioned provisional summary record said. He pointed out further that the same summary record had reported that the committee which he had suggested should be set up would consist of not more than twelve members, whereas he had spoken of twelve or fifteen members. Since he had often had occasion to note such errors, he wondered whether a kind of censorship was being exercised. He requested information concerning the method by which the summary records were drafted, in order that he might learn whether they could be made more accurate and whether the delegations could thereby be spared the necessity of sending in numerous corrections.

2. Mr. COHEN (Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Information From Non-Self-Governing Territories) said that there were several aspects to the question raised by the Philippine representative. With respect to the language of the summary records, the established practice was to use English and French alternately. The delay about which the Philippine

representative had complained was due merely to that practice. As to the accuracy of the summary records, he reminded the Committee that those documents were summaries and that on occasion they might not be satisfactory. The summaries were prepared by the technical services and not by the Department of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories. The impartiality of the précis-writers was beyond question and the word "censorship" was hardly appropriate when applied to the United Nations Secretariat. He drew attention to the fact that the summary records appeared first as provisional documents and that the delegations could submit any corrections deemed necessary, which would be inserted by the Secretariat.

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS
(A/C.4/L.512/REV.3) (*continued*)**

3. Mr. PRADO (Ecuador) said that in his statement at the preceding meeting, he had spoken on behalf of his delegation and not of all the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.512/Rev.3.

4. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) explained that he had submitted the third of his amendments (A/C.4/L.521, para.3) because he wished the Cameroonians to have an opportunity to express their views freely concerning their future. However, in view of the objections raised against the amendment, especially those raised at the previous meeting by the representative of India, he was prepared to accept the compromise amendment of the Guatemalan delegation (A/C.4/L.526), on the understanding that that amendment would not be substituted for the first amendment proposed by the seven Powers (A/C.4/L.516/Rev.2, para.1), which would be voted on separately. With respect to the title of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.512/Rev.3), he considered that it would be more logical to change it in accordance with the first of his amendments (A/C.4/L.521, para.1).

5. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) agreed that the title of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.512/Rev.3) was unsuitable. The Syrian proposal was much more logical and the sponsors of the draft resolution should meet in an effort to reach agreement on a new title.

6. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) shared the opinion of the Mexican representative. She pointed out that the present title of the draft resolution might give some readers the impression of attributing undue importance to hearings of petitioners. The Committee should adopt the first Syrian amendment.

7. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) said that the French, English and Spanish texts of his amendment (A/C.4/L.526) should be made to correspond exactly. In the French version, the word "toutes" should be inserted before the words "les solutions", and in the Spanish version the word "todas" before the words

"las alternativas". In the English text, the words "possibilities for" should be replaced by "alternatives concerning." Moreover, he asked that the paragraph he proposed should be added after operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution rather than after paragraph 3.

8. He urged that his amendment should not be substituted for the first seven-Power amendment (A/C.4/L.516/Rev.2, para.1). The two amendments were complementary, one referring to the Cameroons under French administration and the other to the two Trust Territories. Both amendments should therefore be put to the vote and he requested the Committee to decide on his amendment after voting on the first amendment in document A/C.4/L.516/Rev.2.

9. Mr. JAIPAL (India), commenting on the revised text of the seven-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.516/Rev.2), said that the present text of the first amendment took into account the objections of the Haitian representative, who had pointed out at the 731st meeting that the future of the Territory did not depend exclusively on the Administering Authority. Moreover, the objections raised at previous meetings by the representative of Ecuador to the amendment regarding a general political amnesty appearing in document A/C.4/L.516/Rev.1 had been met by the deletion of that amendment from the present proposals of the seven Powers (A/C.4/L.516/Rev.2).

10. On behalf of the sponsors, he said that the paragraph proposed in the first of the seven-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.516/Rev.2, para.1) should be added to the draft resolution after operative paragraph 4 rather than after paragraph 3.

11. Mr. YAMAGUCHI (Japan) pointed out that the sponsors of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.512/Rev.3) had agreed to a large number of amendments; their reason for rejecting several amendments was that they had not been compatible with the ideas set forth in the draft resolution and the sponsors had preferred to leave it to the Committee to decide the matter for itself.

12. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) was gratified to note that the sponsors of the seven-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.516/Rev.2) had taken account of the suggestions of his delegation, which would support those amendments and vote for the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.512/Rev.3).

13. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) expressed satisfaction that the first and sub-paragraphs (a) and (d) of the third of his amendments (A/C.4/L.524) had been accepted by the sponsors of the draft resolution and incorporated in the text now before the Committee (A/C.4/L.512/Rev.3). In a spirit of conciliation he would agree to modify sub-paragraph (b) of his third amendment so that it would read "Replace the words 'all political parties' by the words 'all concerned'"; and to delete sub-paragraph (c) of his third amendment. He requested that the words "in particular", in the last part of his second amendment (A/C.4/L.524, para.2) should be replaced by the word "including"

14. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that the final text of the proposed draft resolution (A/C.4/L.512/Rev.3) was a far cry from what his delegation was entitled to expect, since it did justice neither to the efforts of the Administering Authority nor to those

of the Government and people of the Cameroons. The Committee had come a long way since the tabling of the first text (A/C.4/L.512 and Corr.1 and 2); representatives had expressed doubts and fears and had submitted numerous amendments. However, France could not allow doubt to be cast on its word or on that of an African Government responsible for the destinies of its country in agreement with the Administering Authority. In the French view, instead of asking that a visiting mission should be sent, the Committee should congratulate France on the manner in which it had applied the principles of the Charter. It was regrettable that certain delegations appeared to take greater account of statements by petitioners than of the aspirations of a democratically elected Government.

15. He had received the following telegram from Mr. Mbida, Prime Minister of the Cameroons: "Since May 1957, the Administering Authority responsible for all questions concerning the Cameroons has been replaced by a Government which is strictly and exclusively Cameroonian, constituted as a result of completely free elections held in December 1956 on the basis of universal suffrage and enjoying the confidence of the sovereign Legislative Assembly, in full accordance with the rules of democracy. These measures, contrary to what certain ill-informed nations are asserting at the United Nations, are the only valid proof of the real advances being made in democracy and in political activity in the Cameroons. The Cameroonian Government requests that these remarks should be brought to the immediate attention of the members of the Trusteeship Committee and of the General Assembly. It could not feel bound in any way by any resolutions which did not take account of the democratic and political achievements of the country."

16. The French delegation did not consider the proposed draft resolution to be satisfactory but it wished to respond to the appeal of the sponsors, who represented countries whose democratic tradition France respected, and by way of a conciliatory gesture, it was prepared to vote in favour of the draft resolution. However, it would be compelled to reject the draft resolution as a whole if any one of the proposed amendments was adopted.

17. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) recalled that Article 76b of the Charter laid down either self-government or independence as the objectives of the Trusteeship System. He failed to see, therefore, how the co-sponsors of the first of the seven-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.516/Rev.2, para.1) could state that the measures taken to achieve the first of those objectives should not preclude the eventual attainment of the second. The seven Powers were, in fact, trying to distort the Charter by implying that independence was the only objective laid down. Furthermore, they based themselves entirely on the arguments put forward by the petitioners, who represented only a fraction of the opinion in the Cameroons under British administration and, he believed, a minority in the Cameroons under French administration. He would therefore vote against that amendment.

18. He was unable to support the amendment submitted by Guatemala (A/C.4/L.526) either, although he sympathized with the motives which had prompted it. Firstly, the wording was not very happy, as the

free expression of the wishes of the people came within the ambit, not of constitutional measures, but of human rights. Furthermore, the United Kingdom could not see, in the record of its administration of the Cameroons, anything to justify the admonition that would seem to be addressed to it. Finally, the United Kingdom was neither for nor against the unification of the two Cameroons; that question would depend largely on the views of the inhabitants themselves and he reiterated the undertaking that, when the time came, it would make proposals for obtaining those views. If the Committee made an immediate decision in favour of unification, it would be intervening in the internal affairs of the two Territories by supporting the claims of one political party in preference to those of another.

19. Although it appreciated the comment made by the representative of Liberia, the United Kingdom delegation would vote against the first Syrian amendment (A/C.4/L.521, para.1), for it would be premature to adopt resolutions on the future of both Territories, since that item was not on the agenda. The Committee should not adopt any such resolutions until the Administering Authorities made specific proposals on the subject.

20. Finally, the procedure proposed by the seven Powers in their second amendment (A/C.4/L.516/Rev.2, para.2) was not in accordance with the past practice of the Trusteeship Council. The Council had always taken account, in particular, of the Administration's convenience and of climatic conditions in the different Territories to be visited. As the rainy season extended from April to October in the Cameroons, the visiting mission should go to the Territory during the last three months of 1958, as it would almost certainly not be possible to organize a visit as early as February 1958. He could not undertake that his Government would agree to make any change in the usual arrangements. Secondly, visiting missions had always submitted their reports to the Trusteeship Council, which considered them and made a report on them to the General Assembly but did not transmit them to the Assembly. That had not been the case for the United Nations Commission on Togoland under French Administration, which the French Government had invited to the Territory, but the circumstances had been completely different, and that had not been a mission of the Trusteeship Council.

21. Although it did not find the present text of the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.512/Rev.3 entirely satisfactory, the United Kingdom delegation was ready to vote for it in a spirit of compromise. However, if there were changes in the text following the adoption of amendments, it would be obliged to vote against the draft resolution as a whole.

22. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that the United Kingdom representative apparently felt that one of the objectives of the Trusteeship System excluded the other. Such an interpretation was all the more surprising as the policy of the United Kingdom had always been to prepare Territories for self-government before granting them independence. Self-government was the stage immediately preceding independence and if a self-governing Territory wished to become independent, it should be able to do so.

23. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) said that there seemed to be some misunderstanding about his amendment (A/C.4/L.526), as he had never intended to criticize or cast suspicion on the intentions of the Administering Authorities. All he had wished to do was to invite the Administering Authorities to ensure that the constitutional measures taken would enable the population to choose, when the time came, between all the alternatives before them. The text did not prejudge in any way the solution to be adopted, but emphasized that all the possible solutions should be proposed. He felt that there was a direct connexion between the constitutional measures taken and the free expression of the wishes of the people, as constitutional development could be given a bias which would prevent the population from having complete freedom of choice at the decisive moment.

24. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that there was certainly a connexion between the two factors mentioned by the Guatemalan representative but, in his view, it was the free expression of the wishes of the people which facilitated the adoption of constitutional measures, not the other way round. He agreed with the representative of India that a self-governing country should be able eventually to achieve independence if it wished, but there was no escaping the fact that, according to the Charter, a Trust Territory had achieved the prescribed objective if it was self-governing or independent. Those who thought that independence was the only objective of the Trusteeship System were disregarding paragraph b of Article 76.

25. Mr. JAIPAL (India) pointed out that the United Kingdom had asked for the termination of the Trusteeship System in Togoland under British administration because the territory of the Gold Coast, with which it was to be united, was about to achieve self-government; in that case, therefore, the terms "self-government" and "independence" had been considered synonymous.

26. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) said that the question at issue between the representatives of India and the United Kingdom had always been one on which the Members of the United Nations were divided and it had been discussed many times. He wondered, however, whether the problem really arose in the Cameroons. Indeed, as early as April 1957, the representative of the Administering Authority had told the Trusteeship Council that the elections of December 1956 had been significant in so far as they had clearly shown that the inhabitants wished to acquire independence. The only point on which the political parties disagreed was the rate of progress and the time which should elapse before independence was achieved. Thus, the objective sought was not self-government, which was the stage that had been reached, but independence.

27. He welcomed the fact that the seven Powers had taken the Haitian delegation's suggestions into account in the revised text of their first amendment (A/C.4/L.516/Rev.2, para.1). As far as he could see, the amendment they were now submitting did not conflict with the draft resolution. The sponsors of the amendment recognized, as did the sponsors of the draft resolution, that whatever was done in the Cameroons would be the fruit of the combined efforts of the Administering Authority, the Government of the Cameroonian people and the United Nations.

28. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said he had no distrust or suspicion of the Administering Authorities. He was convinced that they had striven to apply the Trusteeship Agreements to the best of their ability and that, thanks to their action, the peoples of the two Territories had made more rapid progress. He had proposed amendments only in order to facilitate the working of the Trusteeship System.

29. Mr. ARAMBURU (Peru) was happy to note that the Guatemalan delegation had accepted some of the suggestions he had made at the 730th meeting. Nevertheless, he would be unable to vote for the proposed text (A/C.4/L.526), because he had no doubt that the Administering Authorities did guarantee the free expression of the wishes of the people and because the words "including unification" would prejudice the choice which the inhabitants of the Cameroons would be called upon to make.

30. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) asked the Guatemalan representative whether he would agree to replace his text by the following: "Invites the Administering Authorities concerned to ensure the free expression of the wishes of the people of both Territories on all alternatives regarding their future status".

31. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) said he preferred his own text.

32. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) asked the Pakistan representative not to press his suggestion, as, if he did so, the Syrian delegation would be obliged to reintroduce the text it had withdrawn (A/C.4/L.521, para.3) in favour of the Guatemalan amendment.

33. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) thanked the representative of Haiti for his clarification. It was precisely for the reasons the Haitian representative had given that the French delegation would vote against the seven-Power amendment (A/C.4/L.516/Rev.2, para.1), for the Committee could not solve the problem without consulting the Cameroonians themselves, and would also vote against the Guatemalan amendment (A/C.4/L.526), which implied that the constitutional measures taken did not facilitate the free expression of the wishes of the people.

34. Mr. EILAN (Israel) requested a vote by roll-call on all the amendments which had been circulated.

The first three paragraphs of the preamble of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.521/Rev.3) were approved unanimously.

35. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote by roll-call the amendment proposed by Syria (A/C.4/L.521, para.2) providing for the insertion of a new preambular paragraph.

The Federation of Malaya, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia.

Against: Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,

United States of America, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg.

Abstaining: Malaya (Federation of), Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Sudan, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Brazil, Cambodia, China, Costa Rica, El Salvador.

The amendment was approved by 33 votes to 30 with 13 abstentions.

The two final paragraphs of the preamble of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.512/Rev.3) were approved unanimously.

Operative paragraphs 1 and 2 were approved unanimously.

36. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote by roll-call the amendment to operative paragraph 3 proposed by the Philippines (A/C.4/L.524, para.2) as orally revised by the sponsor.

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

In favour: Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal.

Against: Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg.

Abstaining: Sudan, Uruguay, Venezuela, Cambodia, Malaya (Federation of).

The amendment was rejected by 37 votes to 34, with 5 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.512/Rev.3) was approved unanimously.

37. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote by roll-call the amendment to operative paragraph 4 proposed by the Philippines (A/C.4/L.524, para.3 (b)), as orally revised by the sponsor.

The Federation of Malaya, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia.

Against: Malaya (Federation of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,

United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg.

Abstaining: Cambodia, Haiti.

The amendment was rejected by 41 votes to 33, with 2 abstentions.

38. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) asked for a separate vote on the word "political" before the word "parties" in operative paragraph 4.

39. Mr. QUIROS (El Salvador) observed that the proposal did not affect the Spanish text in which the word "partidos", meaning "political parties" was used.

40. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that the same applied to the French text.

41. Mr. EL HAMID (Egypt) proposed the deletion of the words "by all political parties" and the corresponding words in the French and Spanish texts.

The Egyptian proposal was rejected by 38 votes to 30, with 7 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.512/Rev.3) was approved by 60 votes to 10, with 7 abstentions.

42. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote by roll-call the first seven-Power amendment (A/C.4/L.516/Rev.2, para.1), and said that the proposed new paragraph was to be inserted after operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

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

In favour: Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Malaya (Federation of), Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Turkey.

Against: Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France.

Abstaining: Honduras, Pakistan, Panama, Thailand, Uruguay, Cambodia.

The amendment was not approved, 35 votes being cast in favour and 35 against, with 6 abstentions.

43. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment proposed by Guatemala (A/C.4/L.526) as revised by the sponsor, which provided for the insertion of a new paragraph after operative paragraph 4.

44. Mr. LOVERA (Venezuela) requested a separate vote on the words "including unification"

A vote on the words "including unification" was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Morocco, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: India, Malaya (Federation of), Nepal, Pakistan, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, Uruguay.

The words were rejected by 35 votes to 32, with 8 abstentions.

A vote on the revised Guatemalan amendment, as amended by the deletion of the words "including unification", was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Lebanon, Liberia, Malaya (Federation of), Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq.

Against: Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan.

Abstaining: Peru, Sudan, Thailand, Argentina, Brazil, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Honduras.

The amendment, as amended, was approved by 37 votes to 31, with 8 abstentions.

45. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote by roll-call the second seven-Power amendment (A/C.4/L.516/Rev.2, para.2), to the effect that the final operative paragraph of the draft resolution should be replaced by two new paragraphs.

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

In favour: Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Malaya (Federation of), Mexico, Morocco,

Nepal, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania.

Against: Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium.

Abstaining: China, Pakistan, Thailand.

The amendment was rejected by 37 votes to 36, with 3 abstentions.

The final operative paragraph of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.512/Rev.3) was approved unanimously.

46. Mr. PRADO (Ecuador) observed that, in view of the adoption of the amendment proposed by Guatemala, neither the present title of the draft resolution nor the one proposed by Syria in its amendments (A/C.4/L.521, para.1) was suitable. He therefore proposed that the title should read: "Situation in the Trust Territories of the Cameroons under French administration and the Cameroons under British Administration".

47. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) supported the proposal and withdrew his amendment.

48. Following an exchange of views, in which Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico), Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti), Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) and Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) took part, concerning the order in which the two Territories should appear

in the title and text of the draft resolution, the CHAIRMAN put to the vote the new title proposed by the representative of Ecuador.

That title was approved by 53 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

49. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote by roll-call the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.512/Rev.3), as a whole, as amended.

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

In favour: Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Malaya (Federation of), Mexico, Nepal, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia.

Against: Finland, France, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Denmark.

Abstaining: Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Morocco, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Egypt.

The draft resolution (A/C.4/L.512/Rev.3), as amended, was not approved, 23 votes being cast in favour and 23 against, with 30 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.