

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



(Closing meeting)

 Friday, 13 March 1959,
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 13:	
The future of the Trust Territories of the Cameroons under French administration and the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration: special report of the Trusteeship Council (concluded)	
Consideration of draft resolutions (concluded) . . .	767
Draft report of the Fourth Committee	772
Completion of the Committee's work	772

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

AGENDA ITEM 13

The future of the Trust Territories of the Cameroons under French administration and the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration: special report of the Trusteeship Council* (A/4092, A/4093/Rev.1, A/4094, A/C.4/395, A/C.4/L.590, T/SR.953-963) (concluded)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS
(concluded)

1. Mr. MAGHERU (Romania) explained that his delegation had been prepared to vote at the previous meeting for the draft resolution submitted by the African countries (A/C.4/L.581) because it considered that the right to independence of peoples which were not yet self-governing must be recognized and that the United Nations had the great responsibility of ensuring that that independence was genuine and lasting. It was the African countries which were chiefly interested in an equitable solution of the Cameroonian problem and their draft resolution, which had been withdrawn, had contained the provisions necessary to ensure that the aims of the Charter were attained and that the new State would come into existence in the best possible conditions. For the same reasons, his delegation had voted in favour of the amendments submitted by the African countries (A/C.4/L.584/Rev.1), the ninth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.580/Rev.1, which took note of the readiness of the Cameroons for independence, and paragraph 1 of that resolution, which established 1 January 1960 as the date for the independence of the Cameroons under French administration and for the termination of the trusteeship.

2. Nevertheless, that draft resolution, which had been submitted by the United States and other delegations, had omitted to specify the measures which the United Nations was under an obligation to take before the Territory achieved independence, with a view to ensuring that the new State would be genuinely independent. The draft resolution made no reference to unification, for which the people were asking and which would

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

repair the injustice done when their country had been divided up as the spoils of the war; it did not mention the elections by means of which the Cameroons would have obtained a representative assembly, or the full and unconditional amnesty and the abrogation of the decrees outlawing certain political parties—steps which would have helped to bring about a return to normal political life in the country by enabling the Union des populations du Cameroun (UPC) to take part in political activities. The new State would thus be left at the mercy of political differences which would weaken it. Again, the draft resolution said nothing about the withdrawal of French troops. On the other hand, it had a series of preambular paragraphs which recorded verbal undertakings given by the local authorities. In accepting those undertakings, the General Assembly was shirking its duty towards the Trust Territory. Moreover, the preamble included some inaccuracies, such as the statement that freedom of association existed in the Cameroons under French administration; the least one could say of that statement was that it was paradoxical, since one of the main subjects discussed by the Committee had been the banning of the UPC. Lastly, the preamble repeated word for word the arguments put forward by France, without taking into account the statements made by the petitioners, who had given proof of such patriotism and ability, or the desires of the African countries. For those reasons, his delegation had voted against the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.580/Rev.1 as a whole.

3. His delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution concerning the Cameroons under British administration (A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1) for the following reasons. That draft did indeed embody the positive idea that there should be a consultation, under United Nations supervision, of the people of the Territory, but it provided for separate plebiscites in the two zones of the Territory; moreover, the questions to be put in the northern part of the Territory were tendentious and were designed to influence the people so that they would vote for the continuation of the artificial partition of the country, an objective which was contrary to what they wanted. His delegation had welcomed the Liberian amendment (A/C.4/L.587/Rev.1). Women in the adjacent northern region of the Cameroons under French administration already had the right to vote and it was impossible to believe that customs in the two regions differed so much. Respect for custom was not the real issue and the case provided yet another proof that in colonial territories discrimination was openly practised against women, for political reasons.

4. His delegation was concerned to see the Committee taking so dangerous a path and creating a precedent which might well lower the prestige of the United Nations among the peoples of Trust Territories and Non-Self-Governing Territories. There was a risk

that in so doing it would be standing aside from the current of history, which was with the peoples struggling for real independence and freedom. His delegation hoped that the Cameroonian people would nevertheless take advantage of what had been done in order to advance towards a happy future and to bring about genuine independence.

5. Mr. MATSUDAIRA (Japan) said that, although his delegation had voted against the Liberian amendment (A/C.4/L.587/Rev.1), that did not alter in any way the position of his Government in upholding the principle of equal political rights for both sexes.

6. Mr. ABIKUSNO (Indonesia) said that he would begin by explaining his delegation's votes on the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.580/Rev.1, concerning the Cameroons under French administration.

7. His delegation had voted against the eighth preambular paragraph, in which the General Assembly merely took note of the statement of the Prime Minister of the Cameroons under French administration that there would be general elections after independence since such elections would then be necessary in order to settle various constitutional questions; in its view, the Committee's decision was tantamount to expressing an opinion on the way in which the present Cameroonian Government, which would then be the sole sovereign power in the Territory, should settle its problems.

8. For the same reasons, his delegation had abstained on operative paragraph 2, which was also concerned with the elections and which furthermore prejudged the form of independence the Cameroons would attain.

9. His delegation had voted in favour of all the sentences and paragraphs dealing with the attainment of independence by the Territory and its admission to the United Nations, because they were in accord with its views concerning the political emancipation of all dependent peoples.

10. His delegation had abstained on the draft resolution as a whole because there was a risk, even if only implicit, that some of the measures which it recommended might affect the situation in the Territory after independence, and because his delegation considered that the United Nations had full powers under the Trusteeship Agreement, which was still in force, to create the conditions required for full and complete independence in the Territory.

11. He went on to explain his vote on the draft resolution on the Cameroons under British administration (A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1).

12. His delegation had voted in favour of that draft resolution because it did not preclude the possibility of either zone eventually joining the former Cameroons under French administration. In so doing, his delegation had not lost sight of the two basic issues on which the peoples of the Cameroons under British administration would have to give their decision, namely, the uniting of the two zones and their unification with what had been the Cameroons under French administration. The second alternative to be offered to the Northern Cameroons in the plebiscite would give its people a chance to reflect and to await developments in the Southern Cameroons and in the Cameroons now under French administration. To ask the Northern Cameroons to join the Cameroons now under French

administration forthwith would be tantamount to admitting that the two parts of the Cameroons under British administration had separate identities, and for that reason his delegation had abstained on the amendment appearing in document A/C.4/L.589. It would have voted in favour of that amendment if the plebiscite in the Northern Cameroons could have been preceded by the one to be held in the Southern Cameroons, followed by a simultaneous plebiscite in both zones. Accordingly, his delegation had voted in favour of the second alternative to be put to the electorate of the Northern Cameroons, since it left open the possibility of organizing a second plebiscite there once the people of the Southern Cameroons had expressed their views and since it did not prevent the inhabitants of the Northern Cameroons from joining their brethren in the southern zone and in the Cameroons under French administration.

13. His delegation had voted in favour of the Liberian amendment (A/C.4/L.587/Rev.1) not only because of Indonesia's position regarding women's suffrage but also because it considered that no satisfactory solution could be found in the Northern Cameroons unless it had the support of the whole population, both male and female.

14. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) recalled that her country, in common with the other African States which had proposed amendments (A/C.4/L.584/Rev.1) to the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.580/Rev.1, had wished to see two steps taken before the Cameroons under French administration achieved independence. The first was the abrogation of the Decree of 13 July 1955 dissolving certain political parties, which was the only way to enable the members of those parties to resume normal political activity. The second was the holding of general elections under United Nations supervision to replace the present Legislative Assembly, which was not fully representative. Nevertheless, her delegation had felt that it could not vote against a draft resolution which provided for the attainment of independence by the Cameroons under French administration and for its entry into the United Nations as a Member State.

15. In the case of the Cameroons under British administration, her delegation had agreed that plebiscites should be held, but it had thought it anomalous that the people should be asked only whether they wished to become part of Nigeria and not whether they wished to join an independent State of the Cameroons, and it had also considered that, in accordance with Article 76 c of the Charter, the United Nations should uphold the principle of the right of women in the Territory to vote.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that under rule 129 of the rules of procedure he could not allow the sponsor of a proposal or an amendment to explain his vote on it.

17. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that she wished to explain her vote not on her amendment (A/C.4/L.587/Rev.1), which had been rejected, but on the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1. For the reasons which she had just set forth she had voted against the second and third parts of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution as they had been put to the vote at the previous meeting and had abstained from voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

18. Mr. VIDIC (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation had always favoured the accession of the still dependent peoples to independence at the earliest possible date and felt that it was the duty of the United Nations to use all available means to help those peoples to exercise their rights in that connexion.

19. As far as the Cameroons under French administration was concerned, his delegation had taken an unequivocal stand in favour of the termination of the trusteeship and the proclamation of independence on 1 January 1960. It considered, however, that in view of the obligations of the United Nations towards peoples under trusteeship it was the duty of the General Assembly to make recommendations which would help to restore normal conditions in the Territory and to re-establish national unity before the proclamation of independence. It had therefore spoken in favour of elections under United Nations supervision before independence, the granting of a general and unconditional amnesty and the abrogation of the Decree of 13 July 1955. Those measures would have constituted the best means of completing the process of reconciliation and would have made it possible to establish the internal conditions most favourable to independence. His delegation, like many others, had appealed to the Cameroonian representatives to try to reach an understanding which would have enabled the members of the Committee unanimously to welcome the realization of the national aspirations of the Cameroonian people. Unfortunately no such understanding had been reached.

20. Consequently his delegation had supported the amendments submitted by the African countries (A/C.4/L.584/Rev.1) and, as they had been rejected, it had been unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.580/Rev.1 as a whole. It had, however, voted in favour of paragraphs 1 and 3, which provided for the termination of the trusteeship on 1 January 1960 and recommended the admission of the Cameroons to membership of the United Nations. It had thus expressed its faith in the political maturity of the Cameroons and in the future of a free Cameroonian State. Its abstention on the draft resolution as a whole had been dictated by its reservations concerning the procedure adopted.

21. In the case of the draft resolution concerning the Cameroons under British administration (A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1), his delegation had supported the amendment of the African countries (A/C.4/L.589) to paragraph 2, which would have offered a genuine second choice to the people of the Northern Cameroons. The Committee having rejected that amendment, his delegation had accepted the wording proposed in the draft resolution itself, which was the next possible choice after the rejected amendment. It had also supported the Liberian amendment (A/C.4/L.587/Rev.1) concerning the establishment of universal adult suffrage. It felt that the right of women to vote was a question of principle and it had not expected the United Nations to accept anything other than universal adult suffrage. It understood the difficulties in that respect in the Northern Cameroons but it felt that it would have been possible for the United Nations commissioner in organizing the plebiscite to adapt the principle of universal adult suffrage to the conditions peculiar to that area.

22. His delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1) because it felt that it

was appropriate in the light of the existing possibilities. As that draft resolution left the United Nations' task unfinished, it was to be hoped that when the General Assembly examined the question again it would fulfil its obligation to assist the peoples of the Cameroons under British administration to make a final decision concerning their future.

23. Mr. GRYAZNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation had supported the proposals designed to ensure that the Cameroons under French administration would become truly independent and to satisfy the desire of the Cameroonian people to achieve unification of the Cameroons by 1 January 1960 at the latest. It had therefore voted in favour of the amendments submitted by the African countries calling for an unconditional amnesty in the Cameroons under French administration, the abrogation of the Decree of 13 July 1955, the unification of all parts of the Cameroons in a single independent State and the holding of general elections to the Legislative Assembly of the Cameroons under French administration, supervised by the United Nations, during 1959. Such elections would have made it possible to solve the problems with which the new State would be confronted and in particular to normalize political life in the Territory.

24. The draft resolution which had been adopted at the previous meeting did not guarantee true independence to the Cameroons under French administration and it deprived the United Nations of its right to supervise the manner in which the future of the Territory was to be settled. Despite the proofs to the contrary furnished by the petitioners, it affirmed that the Territory enjoyed freedom of the Press, freedom of assembly and other fundamental freedoms. Yet it was known that certain democratic parties were still banned, that peaceful demonstrations were dispersed by force and even that certain petitioners had not been able to come to the United Nations to expound the views of the Cameroonian people.

25. There was no doubt that the Cameroonian people desired independence. His delegation had accordingly voted in favour of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.580/Rev.1), which related to the termination of the trusteeship. For the reasons which he had indicated, however, it had been unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

26. As far as the Cameroons under British administration was concerned, his delegation had spoken in favour of a plebiscite under United Nations supervision in both parts of the Territory. The amendment submitted by the African countries (A/C.4/L.589) would have made it possible to ascertain the real wishes of the people with regard to the future of the Northern Cameroons, whereas the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1) did not afford them an opportunity of expressing their views on the formation of a unified Cameroonian State. His delegation had therefore voted in favour of the amendment submitted by the African countries, which would have remedied that omission. The purpose of the draft resolution which had been adopted was to safeguard the interests of the Administering Authority. Moreover, his delegation could not agree that the plebiscites should take place at different times in the Northern and Southern Cameroons. That procedure was designed to oblige the people of the Cameroons to renounce their desire for

unification. Finally, his delegation had voted in favour of the Liberian amendment (A/C.4/L.587/Rev.1) under which women would have been given the right to take part in the plebiscite, in accordance with the principles of the Charter. The United Nations could not sanction violations of human rights and it lay with the United Nations, and not the Administering Authority, to decide the conditions under which the plebiscite was to be held.

27. For those reasons his delegation had been unable to support the draft resolution concerning the Cameroons under British administration and had abstained from voting on the text as a whole. It was to be regretted that the Committee had not responded to the hopes of the Cameroonian people.

28. Mr. DUMAS (Canada), explaining his delegation's vote on the Liberian amendment (A/C.4/L.587/Rev.1), said that in his opinion the principle of universal suffrage was not at issue; the question was simply whether the United Nations should impose universal suffrage on the Northern Cameroons when the representatives of that area had indicated that the population was not ready to accept it.

29. While his country considered that democracy shall be based on universal suffrage, it did not think that local customs should be abolished without the full consent of the peoples concerned. The question of the right of women to vote had been discussed at length during the Nigeria Constitutional Conference and the leaders of the two parts of the Cameroons under British administration had reached agreement on the present procedure. It would be unwise for the United Nations to go against their decision. If the reform were imposed it would simply be likely to cause dissatisfaction.

30. His delegation therefore felt that it would be reasonable to maintain the system sanctioned by custom in the Northern Cameroons for the present. It hoped that in the near future that area would accept the principle of universal suffrage.

31. Mr. TABIBI (Afghanistan) said that he would first explain his delegation's vote on the draft resolution concerning the Cameroons under British administration (A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1).

32. His delegation had voted in favour of operative paragraph 1, which recommended a plebiscite in both areas, because it was firmly attached to the principle of the right of peoples to decide their own future. It had voted in favour of the first part of operative paragraph 2, which recommended that the plebiscite should take place in the Northern Cameroons in November 1959, but had voted against the second part, under which the plebiscite would put only two questions to the electorate. His delegation felt strongly that the people should be given the opportunity to express their views with regard to all legitimate possibilities. It had therefore voted against the paragraph as a whole.

33. His delegation had requested a separate vote on the word "two" in operative paragraph 4. Seventeen delegations had been in favour of deleting that word, only thirty-three voted against the deletion and twenty-three had abstained. The retention of the word by such a small majority had led his delegation to vote against the paragraph as a whole. It had done so in the conviction that it was not only premature but also undesirable

to limit the alternatives to be put to the Southern Cameroons, inasmuch as they were to be considered by the General Assembly at its fourteenth session. His delegation had therefore abstained from voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

34. With regard to the draft resolution concerning the Cameroons under French administration (A/C.4/L.580/Rev.1), his delegation, being a firm supporter of the right of self-determination of peoples, had voted in favour of operative paragraph 1 providing for the accession of the Territory to independence and for the termination of the trusteeship. It had likewise voted in favour of operative paragraph 3 recommending the admission of the Cameroons to membership of the United Nations after 1 January 1960. It had, however, abstained from voting on the draft resolution as a whole because the Committee had not adopted certain amendments which would have improved the text. It thought that the draft resolution should have been studied more carefully by the Committee in order to secure the legitimate right of all Cameroonians to a satisfactory decision concerning their future and to enable the Member States to reach closer accord on that important issue.

35. Mr. ZENKER (Austria) said that his delegation had been glad to vote in favour of the draft resolution providing for the attainment of independence on 1 January 1960 by the Cameroons under French administration and the holding of plebiscites in both parts of the Cameroons under British administration. In view of the conclusion of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, 1958, and the recommendations in Trusteeship Council resolution 1925 (XXIII) and of the fact that no delegation and no petitioner had questioned the will of the people of the Cameroons under French administration to achieve independence, and in view also of the statement by Mr. Ahidjo, the Prime Minister of the Cameroons, that elections would be held after the attainment of independence, the Austrian delegation had not supported the proposal that elections should be held in the Territory before 1 January 1960. On behalf of the Austrian Government and people he addressed the most sincere good wishes to the people of the Cameroons.

36. Mr. HESSELLUND-JENSEN (Denmark) said that the Danish Government was firmly attached to the principle of equality of the sexes in every sphere. His delegation had, however, voted against the Liberian amendment (A/C.4/L.587/Rev.1) because it had not considered that that principle was at stake and because it felt that the main thing was not to delay the achievement of independence by the two Trust Territories of the Cameroons.

37. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) said he would confine himself to explaining his delegation's vote on the draft resolution concerning the Cameroons under British administration (A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1), since his delegation had already defined its attitude regarding the draft resolution on the Cameroons under French administration (A/C.4/L.580/Rev.1) during the general debate (864th meeting).

38. The delegation of the United Arab Republic had voted against those parts of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1) which related to the questions to be asked of the people of the North-

ern Cameroons in the plebiscite and to the electoral register to be used in the plebiscite. It did not consider that a choice which included the possibility of a continuation of the trusteeship over the Northern Cameroons for an indefinite period offered the people any genuine alternative. Certain delegations had maintained that the Northern Cameroons were even less ready than the Southern Cameroons to choose between integration into Nigeria and reunification with the other parts of the Cameroons. The logical conclusion of that argument would have been to suggest that the plebiscite in the Northern Cameroons should be postponed. The delegations in question had, however, confined themselves to asserting that the people of that region were on the whole in favour of integration into Nigeria, and that was also the contention of the Administering Authority.

39. Furthermore, the delegation of the United Arab Republic did not consider that the register compiled for the elections to the Federal House of Representatives of Nigeria should be used in the plebiscite in the Northern Cameroons. Apart from the fact that the register could not be verified by the United Nations, it had two drawbacks: it deprived the women of the Northern Cameroons of the right to vote, whereas there was universal suffrage in the Southern Cameroons; and it enabled Nigerians who held tax receipts to take part in the plebiscite without the need for any residence qualification. The delegation of the United Arab Republic thought it entirely wrong that Nigerians should be able to take part in a plebiscite on the subject of the integration of the Cameroons into Nigeria. Those delegations which were anxious that the plebiscite should be accompanied by adequate safeguards should think twice before voting in plenary session for provisions that had consequences going far beyond the question of the women's vote.

40. The delegation of the United Arab Republic had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole for the reasons he had explained and, more generally, because that draft treated the two parts of the Cameroons under British administration as if they constituted separate entities.

41. Mr. ARAMBURU (Peru) said that he had not voted in favour of the Liberian amendment (A/C.4/L.587/Rev.1) because the Committee was called upon to come to a decision not on the principle of universal suffrage but on the future of the two Trust Territories of the Cameroons. It was clear that the people of the Northern Cameroons were not ready to accept universal suffrage, and in the light of the provisions of Article 76 b of the Charter its wishes on that point should be taken into consideration. The vote cast by the Peruvian delegation was without prejudice to his country's attitude with regard to the principle of equal political rights for both sexes.

42. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) stated that his vote on the Liberian amendment (A/C.4/L.587/Rev.1) should not be interpreted as a stand by the Government of Ceylon on the principle of the equality of the sexes. The only question before the Committee was that of the future of the two Trust Territories of the Cameroons.

43. Mr. GOMES PEREIRA (Brazil) had abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.580/Rev.1 because he con-

sidered that according to the terms of Article 4, paragraph 2, of the Charter the initiative in recommending that a State should be admitted to membership of the United Nations was within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Security Council. It was hardly necessary to say, however, that Brazil hoped that the Cameroons would become a Member of the United Nations as soon as possible after its attainment of independence.

44. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that his delegation's vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1 had been guided by three essential considerations: the unanimous desire of the people of the Cameroons under French administration that the Cameroons should be reunified, the determination of the leaders of the Cameroons under French administration to refrain from exerting any pressure on their brothers in the Cameroons under British administration, and the desire that all possibilities of reunification should remain open. It had not voted in favour of the Liberian amendment (A/C.4/L.587/Rev.1) because in its view the principle of universal suffrage was not at issue. Moreover, the representative of the Administering Authority had explained that, as matters stood, the only effect of that amendment would be to delay the holding of the plebiscite in the Northern Cameroons and would thus be contrary to the end in view. The French delegation would have voted for the five-Power amendment (A/C.4/L.589) if the sponsors of the draft resolution had not amended their original text (A/C.4/L.582). With the revised text the choice of the people of the Northern Cameroons remained free. After the leaders of the Southern Cameroons had made their position more clear, the people of the Northern Cameroons would know how to decide.

45. As far as the Cameroons under French administration was concerned, the French delegation had accepted the compromise proposed in the seven-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.583) because that proposal took into account the statements made by Mr. Ahidjo, the Prime Minister of the Cameroons, and amounted to a motion of confidence in Cameroonian democracy. He was glad that the amendment concerning the admission of an independent Cameroons to the United Nations (A/C.4/L.584, para. 2 (c)) had been incorporated in the revised text of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.580/Rev.1) because, as he had stated, France would sponsor the admission of the new State. In that connexion he was glad to be able to announce that France, in full agreement with Mr. Olympio, the Prime Minister of Togoland under French administration, would also request the admission of Togoland to membership of the United Nations.

46. In conclusion, he thanked the sponsors of the draft resolutions which had been adopted by the Committee at the previous meeting and all those who had paid a tribute to the work carried out by France in the Cameroons and had offered their support to the young Cameroonian State.

47. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) stated that he was not entirely satisfied with the form and contents of the two draft resolutions which had been adopted, and he expressed regret that the Committee had rejected all the proposed amendments. The Philippine delegation had nevertheless voted in favour of the two draft resolutions as a whole because, despite their defects, it was convinced that the objectives of the International

Trusteeship System would shortly be attained by the two Trust Territories of the Cameroons.

48. Mr. VILAIHONGS (Laos) explained that his vote against the Liberian amendment (A/C.4/L.587/Rev.1) did not mean that his Government was opposed in principle to the granting of the vote to women. Indeed the women of Laos exercised that right.

DRAFT REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE
(A/C.4/L.590)

49. Mr. EILAN (Israel), Rapporteur, presented the draft report of the Fourth Committee (A/C.4/L.590). The report was divided into three parts: the first gave a brief account of the proceedings in the Committee, and the second and third outlined the Committee's consideration of the draft resolutions and amendments concerning the Cameroons under French administration and the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration, respectively. The two draft resolutions which had been adopted were reproduced at the end of the report.

50. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) observed that paragraph 27 of the draft report related to a statement by the Secretary-General (A/C.4/L.585) on the financial implications of the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.582/Rev.1. At the 876th meeting his delegation had made certain reservations with regard to the number of observers to be sent to the Northern Cameroons. In the light of those remarks, the Secretary of the Committee had stated (877th meeting) that the figures given were merely provisional and could be revised. His delegation would like the short discussion which had taken place on the subject to be mentioned in the report; it felt that since the area and population

of the Northern and Southern Cameroons were approximately the same there was no reason why there should be only seven observers in the North and fifteen in the South.

51. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) regretted that the report did not mention the views expressed by the petitioners.

52. After an exchange of views in which Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic), Mr. EILAN (Israel), Rapporteur, Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom), Mr. RASGOTRA (India), Mr. UDOVICHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico), Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon), Mr. SOPIEE (Federation of Malaya), Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) and Miss BROOKS (Liberia) took part, the CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should leave it to the Rapporteur to amend the report in the light of the remarks that had been made.

That proposal was adopted by 63 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

53. The CHAIRMAN stated that if there were no objections the Committee's report would be taken to be adopted subject to the amendments that had been suggested.

It was so decided.

Completion of the Committee's work

54. The CHAIRMAN thanked the members of the Committee and the Secretariat staff for their co-operation and declared the Committee's work concluded.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.