

UNITED NATIONS  
TRUSTEESHIP  
COUNCIL



UN LIBRARY

MAY 20 1960 ✓

COLLECTION PROVISIONAL

T/PV.1088  
19 May 1960

ENGLISH

Twenty-sixth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE THOUSAND AND EIGHTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Thursday, 19 May 1960, at 3 p.m.

President: U Tin MAUNG (Vice-President) (Burma)

1. Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories: Camercons under British administration /32/ (continued)
2. Future of the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration /17/ (continued)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.1088 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

## AGENDA ITEMS 3c and 17

EXAMINATION OF ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITIES ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF TRUST TERRITORIES: CAMEROONS UNDER BRITISH ADMINISTRATION (T/L.956 and Add.1; T/1499, 1524, 1527; T/PET.4/L.12 to L.83; T/PET.4 and 5/L.35 to L.74; T/COM.4/L.33, 36-38, 40, 42-47, 49-52; T/COM.4 and 5/L.4-6)

FUTURE OF THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE CAMEROONS UNDER UNITED KINGDOM ADMINISTRATION. (GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 1473 (XIV); T/1562, 1530, 1531)

At the invitation of the President, Mallam Ali Akilu and Mr. Field, Special Representatives for the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration, took places at the Trusteeship Council table.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (interpretation from Russian): My first question this afternoon relates to part IV of document T/1530. In paragraph 17 of that document, reference is made to the fact. that the local administration in the Northern part of Nigeria is being performed by an autonomous organ which is known as the Native Authority and that the overwhelming majority of Native Authorities are normally headed by an Emir or Chief. We should like to know what the situation is at the present time in the Trust Territory -- what these Native Authorities are, by whom they are headed, and what changes have occurred in recent times.

Mallam Ali AKILU (Special Representative): As the Council will have seen from the report, these Native Authorities for the Northern Trust Territory are being formed now and therefore do not have heads, as is the case with the other Native Authorities. It is hoped that, when these councils are constituted, consultation will take place between the councils and the Government of the Northern Region as to the form which the heads of the Native Authorities should take.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (interpretation from Russian): We would wish to know the view of the Administering Authority on this score. What is the plan? How will they act? As we understand it, the city and other councils in the Trust Territory were formerly set up not by means of direct

election. Now, these councils have been removed, as the Administering Authority tell us, and it is intended to hold elections in May for regional councils, and subsequently, from the members of these regional councils, it is intended to elect members of councils for the Native Authority. Thus, as we see it, there is some sort of plan. We would wish to know how the heads of these councils, the chairmen or presidents, will be selected. Are there any plans in that regard on the part of the Administering Authority?

Mallam Ali AKILU (Special Representative): The custom or practice in these matters where there is a dispute or uncertainty as to how the head of a Native Authority should be constituted is to have the matter resolved under the Native Authority Law, section 48, which I would be very pleased to show the representative of the Soviet Union. But the main system is for the Council of the Native Authority to make a declaration as to what the custom is in this matter, or what the Council would like to have accepted as the custom, and such declaration is made by the Council of the Native Authority and confirmed by publication in the Northern Region Gazette.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Would it be correct then to assume and interpret the situation in the following way: that in this respect no substantial changes have occurred. In other words, the same set-up exists and the same customs prevail as those which existed in the past -- or have new reforms been introduced?

Mallam Ali AKILU (Special Representative): I would say that the facts are contradictory to the implication in the question. What has been set up is a new democratic system of local government, and until these councils are formed, it will not be proper for the Northern Regional Government or the Administering Authority to give direction as to how the heads of the Native Authorities are to be appointed. What is being done is to await the constitution of the councils and then to ask them to declare how they would like the heads of their Native Authorities to be appointed.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): I just wanted to suggest that perhaps it would be of interest if the Special Representative would indicate, in reply to this question, what the system in these same areas was before this inquiry. I will not do it, because he can do it much better than I could.

Mallam Ali AKILU (Special Representative): The system before these reforms was that these areas of the Trust Territory were under Native Authorities, part of whose areas lay in Nigeria, with the exception of the Dikwa Native Authority, which is entirely in the Trust Territory. These other areas which were formerly under Northern Nigerian Native Authorities have now been separated from them and have been set up as independent Native Authorities.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Perhaps there is some misunderstanding simply because I do not seem to be able to obtain an answer to my question. I shall formulate it in a different way then. We understand that now Native Authorities have been set up which are separate from the Native Authorities in Nigeria. The separation has taken place. These now are independent Native Authorities. But we wish to know the actual character of the elections or appointments in these Native Authorities. We would like to know the nature of the elections or appointments of the regional councils, and so on; in other words, their internal structure and the principles of the elections or appointments. Have these principles remained as they were formerly, or have new changes been introduced during recent times? That is what we wish to know.

We have already ascertained the fact that the separation has taken place or is in the course of taking place, and now we wish to know whether there are any changes in the principles themselves which govern the composition and organization of these District and City Councils of the Native Authorities?

Mallam Ali AKILU (Special Representative): The main difference is that formerly there were traditional Native Authorities which were not constituted by elections but had been there through history and for at least the past century. These Native Authorities no longer have any jurisdiction in the area and the system which is being introduced is that there will be elections, in the first place, to the District Councils. We have had District Councils before, but they were not through direct elections. The election then was under the electoral college system. But these elections which are going to be conducted now are direct secret elections by adult male suffrage. From the District Councils, further members will be elected who will form the Native Authority Councils. The Native Authority Councils will then be asked to say how they would like the head of the Native Authority or Chairman of the Native Authority Council to be appointed.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Thus the conclusion can be drawn that now the actual procedure is known in regard to these district or regional councils and later the question will be solved of how the councils of local authorities will be elected and how the chiefs or leaders will be appointed. That is how we understand the situation.

The next question is directly connected with the previous one. In paragraph 19 of the report it is stated:

"All district, town and outer councils in the Trust Territory which were established under the method of indirect elections have been abolished. New elections will be completed by the end of May..." (T/1530, page 10)

In paragraph 25 we read:

"The separation of the Adamawa Trust Territory from the Administration of Adamawa Native Authorities means that the area has temporarily no indigenous local authority for its day-to-day administration." (Ibid., page 12)

Our question, then, is as follows. Is this lack of Native Authorities something that is typical only of the Adamawa region or is this phenomenon common to the whole of the northern part of the Trust Territory, and if that is not completely so, then we should like to know what temporary measures have been provided for the regions of the Trust Territory other than the Adamawa region?

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): I do not want to reply to this last question. But I did not gather, from what the representative of the Soviet Union said was his interpretation of the reply to the previous question, that he had quite understood the position. Just to make sure, I will repeat it as I understand it.

The system of election to the District Councils has been settled. This is direct election; secret ballot; adult male franchise. The system of election to the Native Authority Councils has been settled. They are composed of members elected from the District Councils. The only thing which has not been settled -- and it cannot be settled until these elections have taken place -- is how the heads or chairmen of the Native Authority Councils shall be appointed or chosen or elected. This will be a matter for consultation with those Councils when they have been elected, so that effect can be given to the wishes of the Councils in that respect. I do not wish to answer the other question.



Mallam Ali AKILU (Special Representative): As regards the other part of the question, there are no indigenous Native Authorities in the area, because they have been separated, and the interim measure which has been taken is to appoint administrative officers under the Native Authority law to be the temporary Native Authorities until these elections are concluded.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I should like to direct my next question to the representative of the Administering Authority, and the question is as follows. How is the unity of the Trust Territory, both southern and northern parts of it, realized in practice, and what will the situation be in this respect after the administrative separation of the Cameroons from Nigeria?

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): The answer is very simple. It is not realized, nor has it ever been realized. The two areas of the Trust Territory have always been administered separately, as the Council is well aware. This situation in that respect will remain after the independence of Nigeria.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): In regard to this last comment, of course, we will make a general statement in the course of the general debate. At this stage we should like to clarify this question because the Trusteeship Council has adopted recommendations on numerous occasions the purpose of which was to unite and to create some sort of unity between the northern and southern regions. If now the representative of the Administering Authority refers to the fact that that is the way it always was, that does not at all mean that that was right. Again I say that in regard to this we shall make our comments in due course during the general debate.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): If my friend will pardon me, I should like to comment on that. I should be very grateful if he would draw my attention by number to any resolutions of the Trusteeship Council designed to secure the unification of the administration of the Northern and Southern Cameroons.

I myself do not recollect such recommendations, and I wonder whether he is in a position to name any such recommendation.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I am always ready to assist the representative of the Administering Authority to refresh his memory. If he wishes, we shall in a little while present a series of paragraphs from the reports of the Visiting Mission and from recommendations of the Council, and I would request that the representative of the Administering Authority quote accurately what we say. We have stated that the Trusteeship Council and many delegations in the Trusteeship Council and the Visiting Mission itself have spoken of the necessity to create some sort of internal unity. I did not speak of the unification of the administration. I was speaking of the internal unity of the Territory. That is why I would request that he quote what I said accurately. If any concrete recommendations and opinions are necessary, I am quite prepared to refer to specific places and specific documents. Apparently the representative of the United Kingdom himself will remember what these passages are.

In any event, our question is as follows. Now we are coming to the balance-sheet, as it were, of the administration of the United Kingdom in this Trust Territory. As a result of all the actions of the Administering Authority, has any sort of unity been achieved in the Territory? We know that the Administering Authority divided the Trust Territory into two regions a long time ago. It is divided geographically into two regions. But we should like to know whether, as a result of all the activities of the Administering Authority over a long period of years, any degree of unity has been achieved in the Territory. Of course, if it cannot be done, it cannot be done. That is something else again.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): In other words, when did you stop beating your wife? I know that kind of question, but I will do my best. In the first place, there was a slight misunderstanding, I think, through a difference in translation. The previous remark by my friend came over as a reference to recommendations of the Trusteeship Council. But I now appreciate that what he said was not "recommendations of the Trusteeship Council" but "statements by delegations in the Trusteeship Council".



I am perfectly aware that certain delegations in the Trusteeship Council have on some occasions said that we ought to unite the Trust Territory, a view with which the Administering Authority entirely disagrees. If the representative of the Soviet Union will look back at speeches of mine in earlier years he will find full explanations of why we take that view. I do not expect him to agree with them, but at any rate he will find them there. I do not think that there are any recommendations of the Trusteeship Council for the unification of the system of administration in the Trust Territory. It is possible there may be some statements of Visiting Missions, but if so I am not aware of them, and I shall be very interested to see anything other than individual expressions by individual delegations. I am perfectly aware that the delegation of the Soviet Union and certain other delegations have expressed this view and I do not want to put the representative to the trouble of drawing my attention to that, but if he can find any recommendations of the Trusteeship Council or even of Visiting Missions I shall be interested to see them. I do not expect that there will be any but I will be interested to see them.

I believe I must say a little more, because the representative of the Soviet Union asked me what is our balance sheet, what have we achieved on the basis of unification. Well, we seem to be talking at cross purposes. He tells us that we divided the Territory. We never did anything of the sort. Of course, the Territory was never united at any stage in history and any suggestion that it ever was united is entirely contrary to all the facts of history. It so happens that after the First World War these two areas, the North and South, which are contiguous at one narrow point, were placed under Mandate of the League of Nations, which was entrusted to the United Kingdom Government. From the start we took the view, I believe perfectly rightly, that the proper way of administering these was to administer one in connexion with Northern Nigeria and the other with what was then Southern Nigeria. At a much later stage, it was separated off as the Southern Cameroons. I do not believe it would have been conducive to the welfare, advancement or progress towards independence of the people to unite these two strips of territory nor do I believe that one would find many people in the Territory who would be interested in this.

Therefore, it may be said quite frankly that in our balance sheet we will not find that we have taken measures for the unification of the system of administration, because we never attempted to do this. We always made it perfectly clear to the Mandates Commission and the Trusteeship Council that we did not intend to do this. This view was in fact accepted by the Trusteeship Council, not necessarily by all members but it was certainly accepted by the Trusteeship Council. This perhaps puts a rather more accurate complexion on the question.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I would merely wish to mention that it might perhaps be better to come to final conclusions if we are able to recall what has happened in the past. We have always had the impression that there was a single Trust Territory of the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration. There was a single Territory, there was one Trusteeship Agreement and in that single Trusteeship Agreement for that Territory this Trust Territory was mentioned. The Trusteeship Council was always interested in the situation in the Trust

Territory. We did not consider separately the situation in the northern part at one session of the Council and the situation in the southern part of the Cameroons at another session. Therefore, we were interested whether, as a result of this administration over many years by the United Kingdom, any unity or unification has been achieved between these two regions. The Visiting Mission has always stressed the fact that the northern region was distinct from the southern region and that it has been lagging behind in many respects. Statements have been made in the Trusteeship Council and recommendations made by members to the effect that it was necessary to adopt measures to establish some type of consolidation and to create an internal unity within the Trust Territory. However, that, of course, is a matter of opinion. If we are told that the Trust Territory has never been divided because it had never been united in the first place, then of course it is rather difficult to argue against such statements. We, at least, have always based ourselves upon the premise that there was a single Trust Territory, namely, the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration.

My final question relates to the following matter. Document T/CCM.4/L.49 contains a communication from the leader of the opposition, Southern Cameroons House of Assembly, in which reference is made to the Philipson's report on the financial and economic implications of secession from the Federation of Nigeria. We would be most grateful if the Special Representative could provide some additional information in explanation of this report.

Mr. FIELD (Special Representative): When the present party in power in the Southern Cameroons came into power, what it wanted at the time was separation from Nigeria and a period of continued trusteeship. It requested some type of investigation into the financial, economic and administrative consequences of such separation. Sir Sidney Philipson undertook this investigation and submitted a report. The investigation was based on the basic assumption on which the ministers had asked him to proceed, namely, that separation would take place and that there would be a period of continued trusteeship. Sir Sidney Philipson worked on the assumption, since he had to

select some period, that trusteeship would continue for five years. The report went into questions of how separation could take place and how the various services in the Southern Cameroons could be carried on. Needless to say, a great deal of Sir Sidney Philipson's report, although valuable in drawing attention to the problems of separating the Southern Cameroons from the Federation of Nigeria, lost a considerable amount of its point when the General Assembly decided that the future of the Territory should be settled at the forthcoming plebiscite. The period of continued trusteeship which Sir Sidney Philipson had been asked to assume, of course, no longer arose, and the report was therefore no longer to that extent applicable to the circumstances as they turned out.

It was a survey of the problems against that context. He went into the various departments and activities of government. He suggested that in a number of cases it would be of advantage to the Southern Cameroons if they separated instead of setting up separate services, to enter into a contractual basis with the existing Federal Government to have them carry it on, and to some extent that by modification is what is at the present moment proposed. The report is fairly long and deals with financial aspects, but again on a basis which is not arising. I do not think there would be much point in going into further detail about the report. If there is any particular point on which the representative of the Soviet Union would like further clarification, I would be very happy to provide it, if I am in a position to do so.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The answer to my last question we consider to be completely satisfactory. This was simply an over-optimistic estimate of a five-year extension of Trusteeship, and on the basis of that calculation this report was prepared.

I should like to thank Mallam Akilu and Mr. Field for the answers which they have given to our questions. As for the exchange of views with the representative of the Administering Authority, that, of course, was more in the nature of an exchange of opinions rather than provision of any supplementary factual information.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): I have just one further comment. The representative of the Soviet Union has referred to the fact that there is one Trust Territory and one Trusteeship Agreement. That, of course, is obvious, and we, like everybody else, fully recognize that, as far as this Trust Territory as an international entity is concerned, there is a single Territory and a single Agreement. But it has always been our view that there is nothing in this Agreement which in any way militates against administering and developing two parts of the Territory separately; in fact, the terms, for example, of article 6 of the Agreement require us to have regard to the circumstances of the people, among other things, and that is what we have done. We, of course, maintain that by so doing we have enabled these parts of the Territory to approach the final stages of independence, which would not have been easy to do, even if it had been possible, by any other means.

The PRESIDENT: If no other representative wishes to put questions in the political field, and before proceeding to questions in the economic and social fields, I think we should consider the request for an oral hearing contained in document T/1531. The subject matter of this request concerns the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under United Kingdom Administration.

I give the floor to the representative of the Administering Authority for any observations he may care to make.



## REQUEST FOR ORAL HEARING

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): The only observations I have are as follows. This request, as I read it, is based on the view that one of the questions to be put in the plebiscite in the Northern Cameroons should be changed. These questions were fixed by the General Assembly, at its last session, under the resolution which has been referred to a number of times here in our discussion, and it seems to me that the attention of the petitioners ought to be drawn, on behalf of the Council, to the fact that these questions have been settled by the General Assembly and that the Council has no power to alter these questions. They ought to realise this.

Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France)(interpretation from French): With respect to the opinion of the representative of the United Kingdom, I feel that if a further examination is to be made of the questions in the plebiscite, it would be up to the General Assembly which laid down the terms of those questions; it would not be up to the Trusteeship Council to do this.

Mr. JHA (India): It is quite right, as has been pointed out, that the Assembly has fixed two questions, and that is embodied in the resolution of the General Assembly. But it seems to us that at this stage discussion as to whether a third question should be added or whether it is constitutional to consider a third question is rather premature. We have a petition before us. It has been the practice of this Council not to refuse to hear petitioners. Constitutionally speaking, if we should be satisfied, after hearing the petitioner and after considering the matter further, that we should make a further recommendation to the General Assembly, there is nothing to bar us from doing so. The General Assembly can alter or modify its own resolution. I am not advocating that that be done; I am speaking only of the constitutional aspect. Therefore, it does not seem to me desirable that we should prevent the petitioners from being heard and refuse their request just because they want, not that a third question be added, but that the second question be reworded in a particular manner. I do not express any opinion on the validity of that contention or that proposal, but surely we



should not refuse, in accordance with the traditions of our Council, an oral hearing to a petitioner. It would certainly not add much to the burden of the Council. The petition itself seems to be rather brief, and we should give the petitioners an opportunity to be heard.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): I did not express any opinion, in point of fact, as to whether the petitioners should be heard or not, and we certainly do not wish to oppose a hearing. All I am suggesting is that in any communication which is sent, if the Council decides to grant a hearing, the point about the position of the Council ought to be made. That is my only suggestion.

Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic): I should like to associate my delegation with the remarks just made by the representative of India with regard to the petition before us. I think that it could be made clear to the petitioners that, as far as the Trusteeship Council is concerned, the Council will not be in a position to alter the questions that are going to be put in the forthcoming plebiscite. However, this should not in any way be construed as debarring the petitioners from appearing before us here if they wish to come and express their views or give us the reasons why the questions should be altered or modified in one way or another.

Also, I think certainly we must take into consideration that the petitioners may represent one section of the population, and that we have to take other views into account when we come to recommend any modification in this connexion.

However, I should like to point out that it is certainly our duty to tell the petitioners that we are ready to listen to their petition, if they think they have anything to add to what is already contained in the petition before this Council today. However, if they are going to come and make that long journey only to state what is already stated in this petition, I think it would probably not serve a useful purpose, especially in view of the fact that this Council can make a recommendation to the General Assembly but cannot alter the decision of the General Assembly at this stage.

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Like the representative of the United Arab Republic, I too wish to associate myself with and support the statement made by the representative of India. We consider that the Trusteeship Council, in adopting a decision at the present time, should in no sense at all create the impression that the Trusteeship Council is declining the request of the petitioners for an oral hearing. That is why it seemed to us that the request of the petitioners should be granted, that they should be heard if they wish to be heard. Apparently, however, it would be useful to inform the petitioners of the procedural situation in which the Council finds itself, namely, that the Council does not have the right to change or reject decisions of the General Assembly, so that the petitioners may not have any illusions of any kind on that score.

But once again I wish to repeat that it seems to us we should adopt such a decision as would make it quite clear to the petitioners that the Trusteeship Council is willing to hear them if they wish to be heard.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): It seems to me that probably what the representative of the Soviet Union has just said can be adopted without a division and without any further debate. I do not think that there is going to be any difference of opinion on this.

Mr. JHA (India): I am sorry to intervene again, Mr. President, but before you ask us to consider this, I should like to know what precisely the proposal is. It should be formulated. Perhaps the representative of the Soviet Union would formulate it, or the representative of the United Kingdom would do so on his behalf.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I should like to ask whether it is known if the petitioners are here at Headquarters, or if they are in the Trust Territory. This might make some difference.

The PRESIDENT: It is my understanding that the letter was forwarded from Mubi in the Northern Cameroons. Is the representative of the Soviet Union prepared to make a definite proposal to the Council?

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I began my statement by saying that I supported the comment of the representative of India and I do not wish to take priority over him in any sense. I think it would be better for me not to attempt to formulate better than he would the thoughts that the representative of India expressed and which I supported. However, on the basis of what has been said by the representative of India, the representative of the United Arab Republic, as well as by other representatives, including the representative of the United Kingdom, perhaps it might be well to prepare a single text for the Secretariat which could be read out by the President. There are no differences of views, as I understand it.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that the text will be prepared by the Secretariat tomorrow and members will have an opportunity of studying it, after which we should be able to take a decision on the matter. Is that satisfactory to the Council?

(The President)

We can now resume the questioning of the Special Representatives in the economic field; or, perhaps, if there is no objection, we could take up the remaining fields together. Does any representative wish to put questions in the economic field?

From the silence, I conclude that representatives are not prepared to ask questions in the economic field. Would representatives be prepared to ask questions in the economic and other fields tomorrow? Otherwise, we shall have to begin our debate on the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration. Are there any comments?

Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic): I should like to have some clarification. If no representative is prepared to ask questions in the economic, social or educational fields, does it mean that we must proceed immediately to the general debate, or shall we go according to schedule and wait until Monday, 23 May? Shall we have the next two days for preparation, Mr. President, or do you wish us to proceed to the general debate immediately?

The PRESIDENT: It is for the Council to decide. If representatives are prepared to ask questions, the Council can listen to what they have to say.

Mr. JHA (India): I do not intervene for the purpose of asking any questions. I should like to make it clear that the fact that my delegation does not propose to enter into any question about economic and social matters does not mean that we are not interested, but because the independence of the Territory is so near, we really cannot, by our endeavours here, expedite certain aspects of the economic life and educational conditions in the Territory. But it does not mean that we are not interested. I wished to make that clear. I wish also to support the representative of the United Arab Republic. This is an important Territory whose conditions we are examining, and we have before us the very important documents that have been submitted by the Administering Authority. The questioning period has been very useful, very instructive and, if I may say so, very analytical. The answers also have been very full, and I think that we should go through all these before entering into the general debate.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): The representative of the United Arab Republic will no doubt expect me to say that we must rush on with our work, but I am glad to be able to inform him that I am going to support his suggestion. I think also that what the representative of India has just said is quite correct. If in fact it is the case that the questioning period is over -- and I do not want to make any observations about that -- it seems to me that it would be useful to representatives to wait until Monday, 23 May, and start the debate on Monday morning, if that is your intention, Mr. President. I know that we are looking forward to hearing the statement by the representative of Australia tomorrow afternoon on New Guinea, and perhaps there will be one or two other small matters of business. There are certain Committees which have to get down to work, and I think that this will be convenient to all concerned. Therefore, I would support the suggestion of the representative of the United Arab Republic.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It seems that we shall have only one meeting tomorrow, at which time the representative of Australia will make his closing statement on New Guinea. I would make the following suggestion. Perhaps, after hearing this statement, representatives might have questions to ask in the economic, social or educational fields. If not, we might proceed to take up some less difficult matters. At any rate, our impression is that members of the Council will be given an opportunity tomorrow of asking questions in the economic, social and educational fields in relation to the Trust Territory of the Cameroons.

The PRESIDENT: Do any members of the Council wish to put questions to the Special Representatives in the social and educational fields?

If there are no questions, we will meet tomorrow afternoon at 2.30 p.m., at which time those delegations who wish to put questions to the Administering Authority will have the opportunity of doing so. Perhaps they could do so after hearing the closing statement of the Administering Authority of New Guinea. I do not know whether it will be possible for the members of the Council to make any general statements on the Cameroons, but I would like to know whether they could do so tomorrow. They could indicate that now or tomorrow, because there will be time after the closing statement for the members of the Council to make statements on the Cameroons.

Since no other representative wishes to put questions or make observations at this time, the meeting is adjourned until tomorrow at 2.30 p.m.

The meeting rose at 4 p.m.