



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Twenty-fourth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Friday, 17 July 1959,  
at 10:40 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Examination of petitions (continued)	
Two hundred and thirty-fourth report of the Standing Committee on Petitions: petitions concerning Ruanda-Urundi . . . . .	353
Two hundred and thirty-fifth report of the Standing Committee on Petitions: petitions concerning Western Samoa . . . . .	354
Two hundred and thirty-sixth report of the Standing Committee on Petitions: petitions concerning the Cameroons under French administration . . . . .	354

President: Mr. Max H. DORSINVILLE (Haiti).

Present:

The representatives of the following States: Australia, Belgium, Burma, China, France, Haiti, India, Italy, New Zealand, Paraguay, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; World Health Organization.

Examination of petitions (T/L.913, T/L.916, T/L.924)  
(continued)

[Agenda item 4]

**TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FOURTH REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS: PETITIONS CONCERNING RUANDA-URUNDI (T/L.913)**

1. The PRESIDENT asked the Committee to vote on the five draft resolutions appearing in the annex to the two hundred and thirty-fourth report of the Standing Committee on Petitions (T/L.913).
2. Mr. ANTONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that when draft resolution I had been considered in the Standing Committee his delegation had proposed two additional paragraphs noting the discrimination and arbitrariness which continued to exist in Ruanda-Urundi and recommending that the Administering Authority should implement expeditiously the recommendations of the twenty-first session of the Trusteeship Council with respect to the separation of administrative and judiciary powers (A/3822, Vol. II, p. 43). That proposal was in keeping with the recommendations which the Trusteeship Council had for years made to the Administering Authority and he asked for it to be put to the vote.
3. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the proposal of the USSR given in paragraph 18 of section I of the report (T/L.913).

The Soviet Union proposal was rejected by 7 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

4. Mr. ANTONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), turning to draft resolution II, recalled that the petitioner had complained to the Council that he had been dismissed from his employment and was in difficult straits. The USSR delegation had proposed a paragraph, given in paragraph 16 of section II of the report, recommending to the Administering Authority that it should give the petitioner employment satisfactory to him and in accordance with his qualifications. He requested that that proposal should be put to the vote.

5. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) thought that in each case the Council should vote first on the draft resolution approved by the Standing Committee on Petitions and then on any other proposals which delegations might introduce.

6. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) said that it seemed more logical to him to vote first on the paragraph proposed by the USSR and then on the draft resolution as a whole.

7. The PRESIDENT pointed out that, under rule 61 of the Trusteeship Council's rules of procedure, proposals to add or delete a part of a draft resolution were to be considered as amendments and an amendment was to be voted on first. The USSR representative was therefore entitled to request that his text should be put to the vote first.

The USSR amendment was rejected by 7 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

8. Miss TENZER (Belgium) asked for a separate vote on paragraph 4 of draft resolution II and said that her delegation would vote against it. It had gone as far as it could in giving the assurances appearing in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution and it had informed the Standing Committee on Petitions of the procedure the petitioner should follow in seeking employment. It did not see what useful purpose would be served by the Administering Authority's informing the Council of the results of its efforts in assisting the petitioner.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 6 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

In successive votes, draft resolutions III and IV were adopted unanimously.

Draft resolution V was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

9. The PRESIDENT asked the Council to vote on the recommendation of the Standing Committee in paragraph 3 of the introduction to the report (T/L.913).

The recommendation was adopted unanimously.

TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIFTH REPORT OF  
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS: PE-  
TITIONS CONCERNING WESTERN SAMOA (T/L.916)

10. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Standing Committee on Petitions, said that the two hundred and thirty-fifth report of the Committee (T/L.916) dealt with the action taken by the Committee on six petitions concerning Western Samoa which the Administering Authority had agreed to have examined at the present session. The six draft resolutions approved by the Committee were to be found in the annex.

11. Mr. ANTONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in the Standing Committee his delegation had proposed, for draft resolution I, a more strongly worded recommendation to the Administering Authority regarding training facilities for nurses (T/L.916, Section I, para. 8). As that recommendation had been rejected, his delegation had voted in favour of the next most constructive proposal, that of the United Kingdom. He would not ask the Council to vote on his delegation's recommendation but would urge the members of the Council to consider the possibility of a stronger recommendation than that appearing in the draft resolution.

12. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had taken note of the USSR representative's statement and that, since he had made no formal proposal with regard to the text of draft resolution I, the Council would vote on it as it stood.

Draft resolution I was adopted unanimously.

13. Mr. ANTONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in the Standing Committee the USSR delegation had proposed for draft resolution II, a recommendation that the Administering Authority should raise the standard of health services in the Territory so that by the time it became independent they might be adequate to satisfy the needs of the population (T/L.916, Section II, para. 15). Upon the rejection of that proposal his delegation had voted in favour of the next most constructive proposal. As the recommendation referred not only to nurses but to all medical services in Western Samoa, it would like the Council to vote upon it.

The Soviet Union amendment was rejected by 7 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.

Draft resolution II was adopted unanimously.

Draft resolution III was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

14. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand) said that his delegation would abstain from voting on draft resolution IV because the petition was concerned mainly with the question of land tenure, a matter which was within the competence of the Territorial Government and not of the Administering Authority. The question of living conditions raised in the petition was also largely the concern of the Territorial Government.

15. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) asked whether the New Zealand representative would be able to vote in favour of the draft resolution if it were altered to read: "Recommends to the Territorial Government, through the Administering Authority, that it investigate further the possibility...".

16. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand) thanked the representative of the United Arab Republic for his sugges-

tion. Even with that amendment, however, his delegation would be obliged to abstain, for to vote in favour of the draft resolution would imply that living conditions in the Territory were seriously in need of improvement, which was not the case.

17. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) said that in that case it seemed to him that the New Zealand representative's position was dictated by other considerations.

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

In successive votes draft resolutions V and VI were adopted unanimously.

18. The PRESIDENT asked the Council to vote on the recommendation of the Standing Committee in paragraph 3 of the introduction to the report (T/L.916).

The recommendation was adopted unanimously.

TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SIXTH REPORT OF  
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS: PE-  
TITIONS CONCERNING THE CAMEROONS UNDER  
FRENCH ADMINISTRATION (T/L.924)

19. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Standing Committee on Petitions, introduced the two hundred and thirty-sixth report of the Committee (T/L.924). The Committee had unfortunately been unable to reach unanimity on that report, one delegation having voted against its adoption. The report covered all the petitions concerning the Cameroons under French administration which were on the agenda of the twenty-fourth session, as well as some which were not on the agenda because of the two-month time-limit, but to whose consideration the Administering Authority had agreed.

20. Mr. ANTONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had been obliged to vote against the report, firstly because the Committee had not examined the 763 petitions in question, and secondly because it had refused to give any consideration whatever to the petitions from the democratic organizations that had been forced underground by the Administering Authority. In order to prevent the consideration of those petitions the Administering Authority, together with the representatives of Belgium, the United Kingdom and Italy in the Committee, had resorted to various manoeuvres, violating the United Nations Charter and the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council.

21. At its present session the Trusteeship Council had received more than 1,500 petitions concerning the two Trust Territories of the Cameroons and more than 700 petitions concerning the Cameroons under French administration, all of which should have been considered by the Committee according to the established procedure. Some of them had been sent as early as 1957, but in an effort to prevent their examination the Administering Authority had delayed in submitting its observations on them, thus violating rule 86, paragraph 4 of the rules of procedure. The observations which it had finally submitted (T/OBS.5/119 and T/OBS.5/120) were entirely unsatisfactory. The Administering Authority had even stated that some of the petitions had already been examined by the Trusteeship Council. That was obviously incorrect, for had that been the case they would not have been included in the agenda of the twenty-fourth session.

22. The form in which the Administering Authority's observations were presented constituted a violation of the rules of procedure, for no serious consideration was given to the issues raised in the petitions. His delegation in the Standing Committee on Petitions had hoped that the representatives of the Administering Authority would give more detailed explanations, but the special representative had merely repeated the earlier unsatisfactory replies and had refused to answer any of the questions put to him by the Soviet Union delegation.

23. The accumulation of so large a number of petitions was the result of a violation of rules 90, paragraph 4, and 92 of the rules of procedure, for the Administering Authority had failed to send a special representative to the Standing Committee on Petitions since the twenty-second session of the Trusteeship Council and had not agreed that the petitions should be considered without the presence of a special representative.

24. A majority of the Committee had attempted to force through a new procedure for the consideration of petitions, on the basis of the working paper of the Secretariat, which had been prepared not in accordance with the classification established by the Committee on Classification but according to quite different principles. Petitions had been grouped together, their numbers only and not their contents being given. The Soviet Union delegation had wanted all the petitions bearing the symbol T/PET... to be given direct consideration, but the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Petitions had ruled that the Committee should follow the order provided in the working paper, which in one instance included some 700 petitions under a single classification. Such procedure was in violation of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council, which did not entitle the Standing Committee on Petitions to introduce a new type of classification.

25. A large number of petitions from various democratic organizations in the Cameroons had not been included in the working paper. The fact that the Administering Authority had outlawed some of those organizations did not mean that the United Nations should not consider petitions from them. At the 516th meeting of the Standing Committee on Petitions a motion had been introduced to the effect that those petitions should not be considered because the Administering Authority had made no comments on them. Yet document T/OBS.5/119, despite its inadequacies, purported to be the observations by the Administering Authority on those petitions and they could therefore have been discussed.

26. In the Standing Committee on Petitions the Soviet Union delegation had recommended the immediate consideration, in accordance with the normal procedure, of all petitions forwarded to the Committee. As that suggestion had not been supported, the Soviet Union delegation had submitted draft resolutions, the text of which were reproduced in document T/L.924. They had all been rejected by the majority of the Committee and it had therefore been impossible to give the petitions proper consideration. His delegation felt that the General Assembly should be informed of the manner in which the petitions concerned had been handled by the Committee.

27. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Standing Committee on Petitions, wished to make it

clear that the Committee had been entirely satisfied with the manner in which the Secretariat of the Committee had prepared the documentation. It had acted in accordance with the wishes of the Committee at every step and responsibility for the procedure adopted rested with the Committee. He deprecated any attempt by a minority to blame the Secretariat for decisions with which it did not agree.

28. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) asked that under rule 56, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (g) of the rules of procedure further discussion of the question should be postponed for a maximum of forty-eight hours, to allow his delegation to study the Committee's report and the Soviet Union representative's statement, and to enable the parties against whom charges had been made to prepare their replies.

29. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that the Council had long been familiar with the arguments put forward by the representative of the Soviet Union and that there was no need to postpone consideration of the question. He requested an immediate vote on the Committee's report, which the Council had had ample time to examine.

30. Mr. RASGOTRA (India), speaking as a member of the Standing Committee on Petitions, said that he was not prepared to admit the validity of any of the charges made against the Committee and hence did not feel called upon to put up a defence. The action taken by the Committee had been entirely in conformity with the rules of procedure. By examining the Committee's report, the Council would have an opportunity to judge the Committee's work.

31. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) said that his delegation had received the report only that morning. He was therefore not ready to discuss it or to adopt a position with regard to the various charges made by the Soviet Union delegation.

32. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that there seemed to be a keen desire on the part of some delegations to bring to a close as soon as possible the discussion of the petition relating to the Cameroons under French administration. The representative of the United Arab Republic had very properly proposed that consideration of the report might be postponed in order that he might acquaint himself with the document. It was evident that the procedure followed in considering those petitions had not been in accordance with the usual procedure of the Council. Thus the Council was entitled to inquire how the Standing Committee on Petitions had handled the matter and to ask the Chairman of the Committee why the procedure approved by the Council had not been observed in the case of the petitions from the Cameroons under French administration.

33. It appeared from the report that the Standing Committee had considered 763 petitions in the course of four meetings. Now the Council was being invited to endorse that statement. It was obvious that it was impossible to consider so many petitions in so short a time. The Soviet delegation in the Committee had therefore proposed that the Standing Committee on Petitions should continue to meet at least for a further month to enable it to consider in a business-like manner as many petitions as it could. Otherwise the Council could scarcely justify its position in the eyes of the petitioners themselves. If there were delegations

which did not wish to consider the petitions, his delegation refused to be their accomplice. He would ask the Chairman of the Committee on Petitions why he had continually permitted violations of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council which he had no authority to change, and under what rule of procedure he had felt himself entitled to refuse to put the USSR proposal to the vote.

34. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) said that it was clear that the representative of the Soviet Union had not had an opportunity either to read the report of the Standing Committee or to read the records of its proceedings, which provided answers to all his questions.

35. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, on the contrary, he had been kept fully informed of the proceedings of the Standing Committee and of the actions of its Chairman, who had prevented the Soviet Union representative from asking questions, had allowed him to move only some ten resolutions, although there were 763 petitions, and had refused to put one of the Soviet Union proposals to the vote. Calling attention again to the proposal of the United Arab Republic, he suggested that the Council should not go into the substance of the report now but should allow time for those representatives who had not been members of the Standing Committee on Petitions to study it, as had already been proposed.

36. Mr. DORMAN (United States of America) moved the closure of the debate on the proposal made by the representative of the United Arab Republic.

The motion was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The proposal of the United Arab Republic was rejected by 7 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.

37. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft resolutions I and II proposed by the Soviet Union delegation and appearing at the end of the report of the Standing Committee on Petitions (T/L.924).

38. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) said that his delegation would not take part in the vote, since it had not had time to consider the agenda item in sufficient detail.

Draft resolution I proposed by the USSR was rejected by 10 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

39. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) asked for draft resolution II to be voted on paragraph by paragraph.

In successive votes, paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) were rejected by 10 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph (d) was rejected by 9 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

In successive votes, paragraphs (e) and (f) were rejected by 8 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

40. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the draft resolutions which were to be found in the annex to the report (T/L.924).

In the successive votes, draft resolutions I, II and III were adopted by 12 votes to 1.

41. Mr. ANTONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a vote to be taken on the draft resolutions proposed by his delegation on various petitions and appearing in section I, paragraph 12 of the report.

42. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that he had no objection to those draft resolutions being put to the vote. Nevertheless, he wished to record his deep regret and indignation at those proposals, which took no account of the statements made in the General Assembly, the petitioners who had been heard there, the decisions reached there and the investigations carried out in the Cameroons by highly respected representatives of Members of the United Nations. During the debate at the resumed thirteenth session of the General Assembly there had been a thorough discussion of the whole matter and all views had been heard. Those very petitions had been examined and judged on their merits, in the presence of some of those who had written them. Yet the representative of the Soviet Union continued to repeat the same allegations and the same slanders. Some might say that they were merely propaganda; but it was propaganda designed to present lies as truth, through constant repetition, and which reflected on the Council and on the integrity of the members of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, 1958. International public opinion, and more especially African public opinion, would not, however, be misled by such an attack on the liberty and security of a new State which was striving to attain the independence guaranteed to it by France.

43. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that although the French representative's words had amounted almost to a provocation, his delegation did not propose to reply to them. He thought that the French representative would regret having spoken those words which were beneath the dignity of the French delegation.

44. All that the USSR representative on the Standing Committee on Petitions had asked was that the petitions should be considered according to the procedure approved by the Trusteeship Council. The majority of the members of that Committee could have approached the Council and asked for the procedure to be amended because of the large numbers of petitions that had been received, but the Standing Committee had not chosen to take that course. His delegation had adduced concrete facts which revealed to what an extent the normal procedure had been ignored. What the Soviet Union representative on the Committee had desired was that each of the petitions should be considered, since they all contained complaints referring to specific dates, specific incidents and specific people. The representative of France had, however, preferred to group them all together and to say that they constituted nothing but lies and propaganda.

45. The established procedure laid down that those petitions must be considered, for they had been classified and listed. Yet the Standing Committee had refused to examine them and the Soviet Union representative had received no replies to his questions; indeed the special representative had refused to answer them. Thus the regular procedure established by the Council had been violated.

46. The sole purpose of the draft resolution proposed by his delegation was to satisfy the legitimate requests of the petitioners and to put an end to the repression and violence by the French colonial authorities, reports of which were constantly appearing in petitions and in the Press. Had the representative of France given a specific reply in connexion with each petition,

the Council would be able to take specific action in each case. As it was, the Council was faced with a clear-cut violation of the rules of procedure where the examination of those petitions was concerned. That was why his delegation had asked for its statement to be recorded and to be included in the Council's report to the General Assembly. The refusal of the majority of the members of the Council to meet the perfectly proper request made by the representative of the United Arab Republic for time to consider the report had been a sorry episode.

47. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) asked that his statement might also be recorded.

48. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolutions proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which appeared in section I, paragraph 12 of the report of the Standing Committee on Petitions (T/L.924).

Draft resolution (1) was rejected by 9 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

Draft resolution (2) was rejected by 10 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

In successive votes, draft resolutions (3) and (4) were rejected by 9 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

In successive votes, draft resolutions (5), (6), (7), (8), (9) and (10) were rejected by 11 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

49. In reply to a question by the PRESIDENT, Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he would not ask for a vote on the further draft resolution proposed by his delegation and reproduced in section II, paragraph 11, of the Committee's report.

50. The PRESIDENT asked the Council to vote on the recommendation of the Standing Committee in paragraph 3 of the introduction to the report (T/L.924).

The recommendation was adopted by 12 votes to none.

51. Mr. KOCIANCICH (Italy), speaking as a member of the Standing Committee on Petitions, associated his delegation with the remarks made by the representative of India concerning the work of that Committee and the attitude taken by the delegations there represented.

52. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) wished to explain the various votes his delegation had cast and to make a few general remarks concerning the proceedings of the Standing Committee on Petitions, which the Indian delegation had supported.

53. Referring to the draft resolutions appearing in the report (T/L.924) under the heading "Draft resolutions proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics", the first draft resolution alleged violations of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council by the Administering Authority and, by implication, by the members of the Standing Committee on Petitions in approving the draft resolutions annexed to the report. His delegation did not concur with that view. With regard to the second draft resolution, he had voted against paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) because they proposed in substance that the Standing Committee on Petitions should resume consideration of the petitions on which it had submitted the draft resolutions which had just been adopted by the Trusteeship Council. Furthermore, paragraphs (d), (e) and (f) referred

to petitions which were not included in the Council's agenda and had not been examined. It was not at all clear to what petitions reference was made and his delegation had abstained in the vote on those paragraphs because of their lack of clarity.

54. He had abstained in the vote on some of the ten USSR draft resolutions appearing in section I paragraph 12, of the report because he had felt there was not much point at that stage in voting upon them. He had voted against others because they purported to condemn "repressive acts", "provocative" measures and so on. The Indian delegation did not consider that at the present stage of development of the Cameroons condemnations of any kind were likely to help the people of the Territory or to promote good relations between the Administering Authority and the Cameroonian Government and people.

55. In connexion with draft resolution I proposed by the Standing Committee on Petitions, it had been stated that the Standing Committee had not examined the large number of petitions that resolution covered. The Indian delegation had very carefully examined each of the 700 petitions in question, and so, he believed, had many other delegations. If the Standing Committee itself were to examine every single petition its examination would overrun the date for the attainment of independence, which would be most undesirable. The substance of the grievances and complaints dealt with in the petitions had been given careful consideration by the General Assembly at the resumed thirteenth session. Many delegations, including his own, had asked numerous questions on the relevant aspects of the Territory's development. A detailed examination of the petitions at the present stage would merely reopen old wounds which the General Assembly had tried to heal. Such a procedure would certainly be of no assistance to the people of the Territory. The Council's aim was to promote the successful achievement of the objectives of the Trusteeship System in the Trust Territories. Condemnation could not serve any constructive purpose.

56. The resolution approved by the Committee on Petitions recalled, *inter alia*, the statements made in the Fourth Committee by Mr. Ahidjo, the Prime Minister of the Cameroons, in the course of which he had said that his office at Yaoundé was always open to all Cameroonians and had repeatedly stated that he would do his utmost to bring about a complete reconciliation among the different sections of the population.

57. For many years the Council had been urging the Administering Authority to grant autonomy to the Cameroonian people. That had now been done and the Administering Authority had no longer any part to play in the internal affairs of the Territory. Any complaints and grievances must be rectified by the Cameroonian Government. The adoption of resolutions such as those proposed by the USSR delegation would be tantamount to an expression of lack of confidence in the Prime Minister of the Cameroons.

58. Both the Trusteeship Council and the Standing Committee on Petitions should endeavour to bring about the independence of the Territory in circumstances of peace, order and stability. The assurances given by the Prime Minister of the Cameroons covered not only the points raised in the petitions but many others besides. He was confident that any personal grievances there might be would be rectified.

59. For those reasons his delegation had been glad to support the report of the Standing Committee on Petitions.
60. Miss TENZER (Belgium), speaking as a member of the Standing Committee on Petitions, protested categorically against the allegations that had been made concerning the conduct of that Committee's work.
61. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Republics), replying to the remarks made by the representative of India concerning the draft resolutions proposed by the USSR, pointed out that it had been open to any delegation which disliked the wording of those draft resolutions to propose amendments to them. But unfortunately no delegation had presented any amendments before the vote had been taken in the Council.
62. He agreed with the Indian representative that once the Cameroonian people had achieved independence they would be able to rectify the injustices which had been committed by the Administering Authority. Unfortunately, the Administering Authority, which was responsible for those injustices, had refused to do so.
63. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) pointed out that in the Standing Committee on Petitions his delegation had raised objections to resolutions using such expressions as "condemns".
64. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) thanked the Council for expressing through its voting its confidence in the work of the Standing Committee on Petitions. He wished to reply to specific points raised earlier by the USSR representative.
65. Firstly, that representative had said that the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Petitions had refused to allow a vote on the draft resolutions of the USSR representative given in the report under the heading "Draft resolutions proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics". In fact, as could be seen from the report, the Committee had decided, by five votes to none, that it was unnecessary to vote on the proposals, for reasons which were entirely in accordance with the rules of procedure.
66. Secondly, the USSR representative had alleged that the Chairman had refused to allow more than eleven of the draft resolutions proposed by the USSR representative in the Committee to be put to a vote. In fact, however, on more than one occasion he had urged delegations to put forward proposals. He had also arranged for a four-day interval between the conclusion of the discussion and the taking of a vote on the draft resolutions, in order to give delegations time to formulate any proposals they wished. He had, indeed, been surprised when the Committee had been called upon to vote on only eleven USSR draft resolutions.
67. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the majority of the members of the Standing Committee on Petitions, including its Chairman, had decided that it was unnecessary to vote on the USSR proposals appearing under the heading "Draft resolutions proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics". Therefore, as he had stated, those proposals had not been put to the vote.
68. The fact that the USSR delegation had proposed only eleven draft resolutions illustrated the manner in which the Committee's work had been conducted. At the beginning petitions had been properly dealt with; twenty petitions had been examined, members of the Committee had asked questions of the special representative, who had replied, and draft resolutions had been submitted. Subsequently the new procedure had suddenly been introduced and the USSR representative had been prevented from submitting draft resolutions concerning the various petitions.
69. Mr. YANG (China) wished to associate himself with the Belgian representative's remarks concerning the unwarranted allegations that had been made about the work of the Petitions Committee and its Chairman. He recalled the exhaustive debate which had taken place during the resumed thirteenth session of the General Assembly and drew attention to the position his delegation had taken in the Standing Committee on Petitions to the effect that to rake up complaints and grievances of bygone days at a time when the Government of the Cameroons was embarking on a policy of reconciliation and preparing the country for independence was, to put it mildly, not in accord with the spirit of resolution 1349 (XIII) which the General Assembly had adopted on 13 March 1959.
70. Since the twenty-fourth session would be the last occasion on which the Trusteeship Council would concern itself with the examination of petitions from the Cameroons under French administration, he wished to express his delegation's appreciation of the efforts of the French delegation to assist the Petitions Committee in its preliminary examination of the petitions listed in the document which the Council had just considered. He also wished to express appreciation of the assistance given to the Committee by Mr. Pinon, the special representative for the Trust Territory, and to ask him on his return to Yaoundé to tell Mr. Ahidjo, the Prime Minister of the Cameroons, that the Chinese delegation was confident that under his leadership his Government was quite capable of watching over the interests of the Cameroonian people.
71. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) said that he had voted against all the draft resolutions submitted by the USSR delegation because they accused the Administering Authority and the Petitions Committee of violating the rules of procedure. Such allegations could not be entertained by the Council.
72. Furthermore some of the draft resolutions included the word "condemns". In that connexion, he associated himself with the views expressed by the Indian representative.
73. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) wished to inform the Council that he would communicate to the Cameroonian Government the verbatim record of the discussion which had taken place and of the votes which had been cast during the current meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.