

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/SR.940
11 November 1958
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

Agenda 2
Final hearing 19 Aug 97
(Houmanie 10 Aug 97)
Terms of ref. of the V.M.
to
11
Ninth Special Session

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND FORTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 6 November 1958, at 10.45 a.m.

CONTENTS

- Adoption of the agenda (T/1415)
- Requests by petitioners for hearings (T/1416, T/1417 and T/1418)
- Terms of reference of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, 1958 (T/L.888)

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the two working languages (English or French), preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. Corrections should be sent in duplicate within three working days to the Chief, Meeting Services, Office of Conference Services, Room 1104, and also incorporated in mimeographed copies of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED AT 0930 HOURS ON 11 NOVEMBER 1958,
THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 0930 HOURS ON 14 NOVEMBER 1958.

Publication of the final printed records being subject to a rigid schedule, the co-operation of delegations in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

PRESENT:

President:

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium)

Members:

Mr. KELLY Australia

Mr. SMOLDEREN Belgium

U TIN MAUNG Burma

Mr. M. KIANG China

Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET France

Mr. VELA)
Mr. VALADARES) Guatemala

Mr. DORSINVILLE Haiti

Mr. RASGOTRA India

Mr. VITELLI Italy

Mr. EIMONIS New Zealand

Mr. LOBANOV Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics

Mr. MUFTI United Arab Republic

Sir Andrew COHEN United Kingdom of Great
Britain and Northern Ireland

Mr. MCGREGOR United States of America

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mr. METALL)
Mr. PAYRO) International Labour
Organisation

Mr. SAISAMENDI United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural
Organization

Dr. SAKS World Health Organization

Secretariat:

Mr. PROTITCH Under-Secretary for
Trusteeship and Information
from Non-Self-Governing
Territories

Mr. WIESCHHOFF Secretary of the Council

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (T/1415)

The PRESIDENT said that the Trusteeship Council had been convened in special session in accordance with the request made to the Secretary-General on 30 October 1958 by the French delegation. The Secretary-General had communicated the request to the members of the Council by telegram on 31 October 1958. Eleven members of the Council had signified their agreement, and the special session had therefore been convened.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the question before the Council was of vital importance. New facts had been brought to the notice of the United Nations since the Council had considered the situation in the Cameroons under French administration at its last regular session. The new problems which had emerged were under consideration in the Fourth Committee, and many delegations desired to reserve judgement until they had heard the representatives of the inhabitants of the Territory. It was to be hoped that the debates there would lead to clear decisions, which the Trusteeship Council would have to take into account. It was therefore not advisable for the Council to examine the problem while the Fourth Committee was engaged on it and had not yet completed its work on the subject.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that the question at issue was the adoption of the agenda of the special session of the Trusteeship Council. The statement of the USSR representative did not appear to contain any arguments against the adoption of the agenda.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that item 2 of the provisional agenda was extremely important, and the Visiting Mission's terms of reference could not be determined until the problem of the Cameroons under French administration had been examined as to substance.

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

REQUESTS BY PETITIONERS FOR HEARINGS (T/1416, T/1417, T/1418)

The PRESIDENT announced that the Visiting Mission, which was now in the Cameroons under British administration, was to go to the Cameroons under French administration on 14 November. The French delegation had requested that

/...

(The President)

the terms of reference of the Visiting Mission as set forth in the Trusteeship Council resolution 1907 (XXII) should be amended in the light of the resolution adopted by the Cameroonian Legislative Assembly on 24 October 1958 and the statement of the French Government. The Secretary-General had also received three requests for hearings by the Trusteeship Council from Mr. Moumié; Mr. Ngounga and Mr. Doo Kingue; and Mr. Ntumazah. They were reproduced in documents T/1416, T/1417 and T/1418.

Mr. McGREGOR (United States of America) said that his delegation always felt that petitioners desiring to state their views on the conditions existing in the Trust Territories should be heard by the Trusteeship Council in the first place. If the petitioners had genuinely desired to promote the welfare of the inhabitants of the Territory they claimed to represent, they could have requested a hearing by the Trusteeship Council at a much earlier stage. Their present request indicated that they sought to use the Council for propaganda purposes.

The statements of the petitioners in the Fourth Committee had been reproduced in full, and if the Trusteeship Council decided to hear them again, the work of the Fourth Committee would be delayed.

On the other hand, the Visiting Mission was to go to the Cameroons under French administration very shortly, and the Trusteeship Council had met to amend the Mission's terms of reference. A decision on the subject should therefore be taken as soon as possible.

The petitioners who had spoken in the Fourth Committee had touched on two main political questions which were on the verge of being settled. The Administering Authority and the Government of the Cameroons had reached an agreement under which that Territory would soon attain independence. The reunification of the two Territories of the Cameroons would depend on the wishes of the inhabitants themselves, who would be consulted. Lastly, one of the petitioners who described himself as President on the UPC, would have a further opportunity of stating his views in the Fourth Committee on the matter if he so desired.

The United States delegation had no wish to deprive petitioners of their rights, but it considered that the responsibilities and obligations of the United Nations must also be taken into account and found itself accordingly constrained to vote against granting the hearings.

/...

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) expressed surprise at the observations of the United States' delegation, which had in the past been liberal in its attitude towards questions considered by the Trusteeship Council.

Although it was true that the petitioners had previously been heard in the Fourth Committee and that the Trusteeship Council was master of its own procedure, it was not quite correct to state that the petitioners had already spoken on the question before the Council. The question on the agenda - the issuing of fresh instructions to the Visting Mission - was a new one which had not been discussed in the Fourth Committee. The Council worked under the authority of the General Assembly and should act in conformity with the latter's decision that requests for hearings should be granted. To accuse petitioners of using such hearings for the purposes of propaganda was to call into question the soundness of the decision taken by the General Assembly.

The delegation of the United Arab Republic would vote in favour of granting the petitioners a hearing. It considered that the Council would be failing in its duty if it voted against doing so.

Mr. SMOLDRENN (Belgium) said that the Belgian delegation had always taken the view that petitioners should be given a hearing either by the Standing Committee on Petitions or by the Trusteeship Council, provided of course that the rules of procedure were observed. In the present instance, the Council had met to consider a clearly defined question: they had simply to decide whether to adopt or reject an amendment to a resolution. Petitioners could not be given the right to take part in discussions of that kind; indeed it was difficult to see what they could have to say on the subject. Furthermore, the Visiting Mission had been asked to receive petitions and was therefore in a position to keep itself informed of all the currents of opinion in the Territory. Lastly, the petitioners had already been given a hearing in the Fourth Committee and would be heard again there; and since all representatives in the Trusteeship Council also took part in the Committee's work, a further hearing of the petitioners - who incidentally represented something less than a minority view - would lead to new delays and be a waste of time.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that for some time now, every time a request for a hearing was made it gave rise to lengthy discussion. Some representatives sought to block one of the essential functions of the United Nations. The time wasted on procedural discussions could have been more usefully employed in hearing the petitioners, who had an inalienable right to be heard by the United Nations. The Administering Authorities seemed to be afraid of what the petitioners might say, and preferred to violate the Charter rather than come face to face with the true representatives of the peoples for which they were responsible. Hence they had first opposed the granting of hearings by the Fourth Committee on the ground that the petitioners should be heard by the Trusteeship Council; now they were also opposing their being heard by the Council. It was an inconsistent attitude. If the question before the Council was already under discussion in the Fourth Committee, there was no need to convene a special session. If, however, the problem was not the same, it was important that the petitioners should be heard, since the fact that political liberties did not exist in the Territory and that the parties which represented the people were prohibited there made it impossible for the Visiting Mission to determine the real views of the indigenous population. It would be unjust to refuse to allow the petitioners the right to state their own points of view when it was impossible for them to meet the Visiting Mission in the Territory.

The Soviet delegation would therefore vote in favour of granting the hearings.

Mr. KELLY (Australia) drew attention to some inconsistencies in the statement made by the representative of the Soviet Union. He had first of all urged the Council not to discuss the question of the Cameroons under French administration and was now advocating the hearing of petitioners. Contrary to what the representative of the Soviet Union had said, petitioners did not possess an inalienable right to be heard by the Trusteeship Council. They had the right to request a hearing, but the Trusteeship Council had the right to make its own decisions and was under no obligation automatically to grant a hearing whenever one was requested.

(Mr. Kelly, Australia)

It should also be born in mind that the present request for a hearing was a belated one, and the petitioners could have put their views before the Fourth Committee. They had not previously requested a hearing on the subject in question and they had shown a certain lack of respect towards the Council. It was undesirable to encourage such an attitude.

The Council was responsible to the General Assembly in a number of ways and it should do nothing which would delay the work of the other organs of the United Nations. Moreover, the question before it was entirely a matter for the Council's members. Lastly, the Visiting Mission could receive oral and written petitions and it was therefore wrong to argue that petitioners would be deprived of the right to state their points of view.

The Australian delegation would oppose granting the hearings requested and urged the other members of the Council to take the same view in order to maintain the authority and dignity of the Council as one of the principal organs of the United Nations.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) stated that he also was anxious to maintain the dignity and authority of the Trusteeship Council, but if that was to be done, the Council must act with justice and equity.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), commenting on the statements made by the Australian delegation maintained that there was no reason for holding the present meeting of the Trusteeship Council, having regard to the stage of advancement of the Fourth Committee's work. However, as the discussions had begun, it was the usual procedure for all the members of the Council to set forth their points of view. Apparently some delegations wished the Council to be nothing more than a rubber-stamp for approving resolutions drafted by the Administering Authorities. In everything it had said, the aim of the delegation of the Soviet Union had been to maintain the dignity of the Council, whose prestige would be enhanced by agreeing to hear the petitioners.

Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) flatly denied all the allegations which had been made with regard to the situation in the Cameroons under French administration; the French delegation has nothing to fear from any statements the petitioners might make.

/...

Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said it had not surprised him that Belgium and other delegations were opposed to granting the hearings. They had used similar arguments on previous occasions, but the interpretation which their delegations gave to the Charter and to the Council's rules of procedure was hardly acceptable.

He also regretted that for the first time, the United States delegation had departed from its liberal attitude towards hearings. There was nothing in the terms of the Charter or in the Council's rules of procedure to prevent the Trusteeship Council from hearing the petitioners and the Council had already granted such hearings in the past.

The Indian delegation could not accept the argument that the petitioners wished to make use of the Trusteeship Council for propaganda purposes. None of the statements they had so far made before the Committee justified such derogatory allegations.

The hearing of petitioners was the only way in which the United Nations could ascertain the views of a considerable section of the population of the Territory in question, since the party which represented those views had been dissolved. It was quite obvious that the petitioners could not now return to the Territory and submit petitions to the Visiting Mission. The fact that they had already been given a hearing in the Fourth Committee was no reason why the Trusteeship Council should refuse to grant them a further hearing: they might have new information to communicate to the Council, since the question under consideration had not been discussed in the Committee.

The Belgian representative claimed that the petitioners only represented a small part of the population. There was nothing to justify that assertion, and in any case there was no reason to deprive a minority of the people of the right to express its views through the intermediary of the petitioners. The Indian delegation would therefore vote for granting the hearings.

Mr. McGREGOR (United States of America), replying to the representative of India, said that the reason why his delegation was against granting the hearings was that the petitioners had already been heard in the Fourth Committee. The Trusteeship Council must take the decisions called for at any given time if it was to do its work properly.

(Mr. McGregor, United States)

He assured the representative of the USSR that the Administering Authorities were in no way uneasy at the idea of the Trusteeship Council hearing the petitioners; the full text of their statements in the Fourth Committee had already been distributed. There was no question of making the Trusteeship Council a body run by the Administering Authorities; but care should be taken that it did not serve aims other than those for which it had been established.

Mr. KIANG (China) said that the Trusteeship Council had met in special session at the request of France in order to discuss the terms of reference of the Visiting Mission which was shortly to go to the Cameroons. In his view, the requests for hearings by the petitioners did not come within the scope of rule 76 of the rules of procedure, and he was therefore unable to support them.

Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium) said that certain delegations questioned the intentions of the Administering Authorities, and maintained that the Trusteeship Council and the Fourth Committee were shifting the responsibility from one to the other with regard to the requests for hearings. Actually, it was the Trusteeship Council that should grant hearings, provided that rule 76 of the rules of procedure was respected. In the present instance the Council had before it an amendment to a resolution, and that was a matter on which petitioners had never been asked to give their views.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) pointed out that the Trusteeship Council had met in special session as a result of a decision, jointly agreed on by France and the Government of the Cameroons, which made it necessary to review the terms of reference of the Visiting Mission to the Cameroons under French administration. The petitioners were not being refused the right to be heard, since they had been heard at length, and would be heard again, in the Fourth Committee, where the real debate was taking place. The United Kingdom delegation therefore considered that it would not be appropriate to grant them a hearing in the Trusteeship Council.

Mr. VALADOREZ (Guatemala) considered that the terms of reference of the Visiting Mission were not wholly unrelated to the requests for hearings from petitioners; it was on that point that they wished to be heard, and they might

/...

(Mr. Valadores, Guatemala)

perhaps furnish the Council with information that had not been supplied to the Fourth Committee. The Trusteeship Council could not be used for propaganda aims, since the President could keep the debate under control. Furthermore, it had been stated in the Fourth Committee that the petitioners would be heard by the Trusteeship Council, and that right could not be infringed.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) felt sure that the petitioners would confine their statements to the clearly-defined questions on which they had asked to be heard.

Replying to the representative of China, he pointed out that the terms of reference of a Visiting Mission were established in the light of the conditions existing in the Territory it was to visit; by giving the Mission terms of reference which were not relevant to the situation, the Council would run the risk of receiving a report which was not in line with the actual circumstances. The United Arab Republic therefore considered that in the present case the petitioners would be able to provide very useful additional information.

The PRESIDENT said that he would put the requests for hearings (T/1416, T/1417, and T/1418) to the vote.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) asked for a roll-call vote.

Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) asked for a separate vote on each request.

The request by Mr. Mounié for a hearing (T/1416) was put to the vote.

Belgium, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Burma, Guatemala, India, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic.

Against: Belgium, France, Italy, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia.

Abstaining: China, Haiti.

Mr. Mounié's request for a hearing was rejected by 7 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

The request by Mr. Ntumazah for a hearing (T/1418) was put to the vote.

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

In favour: Guatemala, Haiti, India, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Burma.

Against: France, Italy, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium.

Abstaining: China.

Mr. Ntumazah's request for a hearing was rejected by 7 votes to 6, with 1 abstention.

The request by Mr. Doo Kingue and Mr. Ngounga for a hearing (T/1417) was put to the vote.

Haiti, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Haiti, India, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Burma, Guatemala.

Against: Italy, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, France.

Abstaining: China.

The request by Mr. Doo Kingue and Mr. Ngounga for a hearing was rejected by 7 votes to 6, with 1 abstention.

TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO TRUST TERRITORIES IN WEST AFRICA, 1958 (T/L.888)

The PRESIDENT pointed out that a correction should be made in the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution T/L.888 submitted by Italy: the date of Trusteeship Council resolution 1907 (XXII) was 28 July 1958, not 29 July 1958.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) said that he had not received the document in question.

/...

Mr. PROTITCH (Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories) said that two general distributions of document T/L.886 had been made to delegations, one on the previous evening, and one that day, before the Council met. In addition, to facilitate the work of members of the Council the Secretariat had had the document specially distributed to them during the meeting of the Fourth Committee, as was the practice in such cases.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) considered the distribution of the document as a violation of the rules of procedure, since it related to an item on the agenda of the Council which had not yet been adopted.

Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that the terms of reference of the Visiting Mission shortly to go to the Cameroons under French administration, as established by the Trusteeship Council in its resolution 1907 (XXII), and fully accepted by the French delegation at that time, were no longer in keeping with existing circumstances, in view of a major development in political conditions in the Cameroons.

At the proposal of the Government of the Cameroons, the Cameroonian Legislative Assembly had on 24 October 1958 adopted a resolution which he had already transmitted to the Fourth Committee (A/C.4/381) and which he felt it his duty to submit officially to the Trusteeship Council. The text of the resolution was as follows:

"The Legislative Assembly of the Cameroons, aware that it is expressing the unanimous feeling of the peoples of all the regions of the Cameroons,

"Notes with satisfaction:

"The negotiations carried on by the Prime Minister which have resulted in conformity with the resolution of 12 June 1958, in the transfer to the State of the Camercons of all powers relating to the conduct of internal affairs as from 1 January 1959;

"The agreement of the French Government that the procedures for the termination of international trusteeship should be initiated;

"Solemnly proclaims the will of the Cameroonian people that the State of the Camercons should attain full national independence on 1 January 1960;

/...

(Mr. Kosciusko-Morizet, France)

"Reaffirms its attachment to the principle of the reunification of the two Cameroons and urges that all steps be taken to ensure that the peoples concerned may, in complete freedom, express their will concerning such reunification before 1 January 1960;

"Therefore calls on the Cameroonian Government to request that France should bring before the General Assembly of the United Nations, during its present session, the matter of the abrogation of the Trusteeship Agreement concomitant with the independence of the Cameroons;

"Opposes any attempt which may be made to delay the attainment of full sovereignty by the Cameroonian people;

"Pays a tribute to the work accomplished by France in the Cameroons and renews the wish which it expressed on 12 June that an independent and sovereign Cameroons should participate in a free and amicable association with France in the interest of the two countries."

After the resolution had been adopted, the French Government had published the following statement (A/C.4/381):

"France intends to present to the United Nations General Assembly, at its present session, a memorandum in which it will affirm, with the complete agreement of the Cameroons Assembly and Government, its desire that trusteeship should be ended through the accession of the Cameroons to complete independence after consultation of the Cameroons population, under United Nations supervision and under conditions of which the principle might be decided by the General Assembly and the specific forms of application determined by the Trusteeship Council, account being taken of the report of the Visiting Mission which is to go to the Cameroons in November next."

In view of the functions of the Trusteeship Council, the French delegation had thought it necessary to bring those documents before it since it considered that some addition should be made to the Visiting Mission's terms of reference, to enable it to concentrate more especially on the problems arising from the imminent attainment of the objectives of the Trusteeship System, and to report on the matter. That was why his delegation had asked for a special session of the Council.

Mr. VITELLI (Italy), presenting his delegation's draft resolution (T/L.888), said that at the request of the United Kingdom the Council had adopted operative paragraph 5 of resolution 1907 (XXII) to make quite clear the terms of

/...

(Mr. Vitelli, Italy)

reference of the Visiting Mission to the Cameroons under British administration. The draft resolution was designed to add to the operative part of resolution 1907 (XXII) a sixth paragraph establishing the terms of reference of the Visiting Mission with regard to the Cameroons under French administration. The slight differences between the wording of paragraph 5 of the resolution and the proposed paragraph 6 were due to the fact that conditions in the Cameroons under French administration were somewhat different from those prevailing in the Cameroons under British administration. His delegation hoped that its draft resolution would secure wide support.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India) suggested that the last two lines of the draft resolution be amended, the words "to express their views concerning the termination of the trusteeship" to be replaced by "to express, at the appropriate time, their wishes concerning their future." The text, as amended, would be more in keeping with the resolution adopted concerning the Cameroons under British administration and with the provisions of Chapter XII of the Charter. The proposed consultations should enable the people of the Cameroons to express their wishes concerning the attainment of the objectives of the trusteeship system, i.e., self-government or independence, and not in regard to the question of the termination of that system, a question which would settle itself when either of those objectives had been attained.

Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) thought that it was contrary to all democratic principles to say that the people of the Cameroons should not express their views concerning the termination of trusteeship. Accordingly, he could not accept the Indian amendment, especially as the Togoland Legislative Assembly had itself raised the question of the abrogation of the Trusteeship Agreement. But he would agree to amending the end of the draft resolution to read: "to express their views concerning their future and the termination of the trusteeship".

Mr. VELA (Guatemala) supported the Indian amendment. The termination of trusteeship would be the natural outcome of the attainment of the objectives of the Trusteeship System. The situation was not clear enough, particularly

/...

(Mr. Vela, Guatemala)

with regard to the question of the unification of the two parts of the Cameroons, to refer exclusively to the abrogation of the Trusteeship Agreement regardless of the measures needed before that abrogation took place.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) thought that the object of the Italian draft resolution was to restrict the freedom of action of the Visiting Mission by limiting its investigations to the question of the termination of trusteeship. In order to supplement the terms of reference of the Mission, the Italian draft resolution drew upon the resolution adopted by the Cameroonian Legislative Assembly on 24 October 1958 and on the statement made by the French representative in the Fourth Committee. The resolution of the Cameroonian Legislative Assembly (A/C.4/381, pages 2 and 3) referred to several questions, in particular the transfer to the State of the Cameroons of all powers relating to the conduct of internal affairs, the will of the Cameroonian people to attain full independence, its attachment to the principle of the reunification of the two Cameroons and the consultation on that point which was to be held before 1 January 1960. The statement of the French representative (A/C.4/381, page 3) indicated that the Administering Authority intended to present to the United Nations General Assembly a memorandum in which it would affirm its desire that trusteeship should be ended through the accession of the Cameroons to complete independence after consultation of the Cameroons population, under United Nations supervision and "under conditions of which the principle might be decided by the General Assembly and the specific forms of application determined by the Trusteeship Council". The Italian draft resolution comprised an initial decision on those forms of application, whereas it was not desirable to take up any position on them until they had been examined by the Fourth Committee, and until the General Assembly had given an opinion on the principle of consultation.

Consequently, his delegation supported the Indian amendment, which did not stress the termination of trusteeship, did not restrict the freedom of action of the Visiting Mission and was in conformity with the terms of reference laid down for that Mission with regard to the Cameroons under British administration. He would vote against the amendment proposed by France, because he thought that the matter of abrogation of the Trusteeship Agreement should not be taken up

/...

(Mr. Mufti, United Arab Republic)

before the Administering Authority's memorandum had been received and the statement which the Prime Minister of the Cameroons was shortly to make in the Fourth Committee had been heard. If the Indian amendment was not adopted, his delegation would vote against the Italian draft resolution.

Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) said he had noted with satisfaction the French representative's statement and the resolution of the Cameroonian Legislative Assembly appearing in document A/C.4/381 but he thought that essential data were still lacking. They would be provided by the memorandum of the Administering Authority and by the Prime Minister of the Cameroons, who would inform the United Nations direct as to the measures proposed for the attainment of independence by 1 January 1960.

The Italian draft resolution emphasized only the termination of trusteeship. That would raise no problem once the Cameroons had attained independence. The primary concern was to enable the Visiting Mission to deal with the measures to be taken prior to independence.

He saw no objection to the Indian amendment, which gave the United Nations an opportunity to judge whether such measures were satisfactory. As, however, the representative of France had proposed a form of wording which would make it possible for him to accept that amendment, the Haitian delegation would now propose a further change by the addition of the word "possible", making it read: "to express their views concerning their future and the possible termination of the trusteeship".

Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) pointed out that the French Government was only concerned with meeting the wishes of the Cameroonian people, and wanted the Visiting Mission to have full freedom of action. He would accordingly accept the proposal put forward by the representative of Haiti.

After an exchange of views in which Mr. RASGOTRA (India) and Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) took part, the PRESIDENT proposed that the debate on the Italian draft resolution should be continued the following day.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS
Office of Public Information
Press and Publications Division
United Nations, N. Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

Trusteeship Council
Ninth Special Session

Press Release TR/1446
6 November 1958

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL CONSIDERS ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS
FOR VISITING MISSION NOW IN WEST AFRICA

The Trusteeship Council met in special session this morning to consider a French request for the issuance of additional instructions to the Council's visiting mission to west Africa.

The mission, which left New York on 18 October, is now in the British Cameroons and is due to arrive in the French Cameroons on 14 November.

Jacques Kosciusko-Morizet (France) explained this morning that he had requested the special session because of events which had taken place in the French Cameroons since the terms of reference for the mission were approved by the Council at its last session on 28 July 1958.

He recalled that he had informed the General Assembly's Fourth (Trusteeship) Committee on 28 October of the motion adopted by the Cameroonian Legislative Assembly on 24 October. In that motion, the Cameroonian Assembly proclaimed the will of the people that the state of the Cameroons should attain full national independence on 1 January 1960; reaffirmed attachment to the principle of the reunification of the two Cameroons; and requested France to propose to the current UN General Assembly the termination of the trusteeship simultaneously with the attainment of the independence of the Cameroons.

Mr. Kosciusko-Morizet also recalled that, following negotiations between the governments of France and of the Cameroons, complete agreement was reached on 1 January 1960 as the date for independence. France had also agreed, in accordance with the wishes of the Cameroonian Government and Assembly, to propose that the trusteeship be terminated through the accession of the Cameroons to complete independence after consultation of the population under United Nations supervision.

Before the Council was a draft resolution (Doc.T/L.888), submitted by Italy, which would have the Council decide to send the following additional instructions to the visiting mission now in west Africa:

"Further requests the visiting mission to set forth its views on the procedure for organizing the consultation which will enable the people of the Cameroons under French administration to express their views concerning the termination of the trusteeship."

(more)

Girolamo Vitelli (Italy), who was the sponsor of the original terms of reference for this visiting mission, recalled that the terms as approved provided that, at the request of the United Kingdom Government, the mission should study the method of consultation which should be adopted when the time came for the people of the British Cameroons to express their wishes concerning their future.

For the reasons explained by the representative of France, Mr. Vitelli said he was now proposing, at the request of France, that the Council approve additional instructions to the mission in the form set forth in his proposal.

M. Rasgotra (India) felt that the terms proposed by Italy were too restrictive and he proposed that the text be amended. His amendment would have the proposed consultation enable the people of the French Cameroons to express, at the appropriate time, their views concerning their future. (The underlined words would replace the last part of the Italian text.)

Mr. Kosciuszko-Morizet (France) said the version proposed by Italy was more in line with the motion adopted by the Cameroonian Legislative Assembly. However, in a spirit of compromise, he would accept the Indian amendment if, after the words "concerning their future," the following words were added: and the termination of the trusteeship.

This wording, however, was not acceptable to the representative of India.

Max H. Dorsinville (Haiti), after pointing out that, although the United Nations had been informed of the motion adopted by the Cameroonian assembly and the agreement reached between the Cameroons and France, that did not preclude the United Nations from appraising the various elements involved concerning the independence of the Cameroons. As a compromise, he suggested the addition of the word "possible" before the words "termination of the trusteeship."

Mr. Rasgotra (India) suggested that members be given time to consider the various amendments, and the Council then adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow, 7 November.

[The members of the visiting mission to west Africa are Benjamin Gerig (United States), Chairman; Rikhi Jaipal (India), Georges Salomon (Haiti), and W. G. Thorp (New Zealand). Further details, including the terms of reference and tentative itinerary of the mission, are given in Press Release TR/1442 of 16 October 1958.]

At the outset of the meeting, the Council rejected the requests of Cameroonian petitioners, now being heard by the Assembly's Fourth (Trusteeship) Committee, for hearings in the Council in connection with the question under consideration. These

(more)

petitioners are: Felix Moumie, of the Union des populations du Cameroun; N'deh N'tumazah, of the One Kamerun, and Jean Ngounga and Doo Kingue, of the Union Nationale des Etudiants Camerounais.

The Council rejected Mr. Moumie's request by a roll-call vote of 5 in favor (Burma, Guatemala, India, USSR, United Arab Republic) to 7 against (Australia, Belgium, France, Italy, New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States) with 2 abstentions (China and Haiti).

Mr. N'tumazah's request was rejected by a roll-call vote of 6 in favor (Burma, Guatemala, Haiti, India, USSR, United Arab Republic) to 7 against (Australia, Belgium, France, Italy, New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States) with 1 abstention (China).

The request of the other two petitioners were rejected by the same vote.

During the discussion which preceded the voting, those opposing the hearings emphasized that their opposition was not motivated by a wish to stifle the hearings. In their view, the petitioners, in their hearings before the Assembly's Fourth (Trusteeship) Committee, had already been fully heard.

Those favoring the hearings contended that the question under consideration by the Council was new, that it had not been discussed in the Fourth Committee, and that the views of the petitioners should be heard.

* *** *