

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTEENTH SESSION
Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE 872nd
MEETING**

Monday, 9 March 1959,
at 8.50 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 13:	Page
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 (<i>continued</i>)	
Requests for supplementary hearings (<i>continued</i>)	713

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

In the absence of the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Eilan (Israel), Rapporteur, took the Chair.

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.580, A/C.4/L.581, A/C.4/L.582, T/SR.953-963) (*continued*)

**REQUESTS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY HEARINGS
(*continued*)**

1. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) expressed appreciation of the support given by the Swedish and Irish representatives at the previous meeting to the request for a supplementary hearing made by Mr. Tchoumba Ngouankeu, the representative of the Bureau national kamerunais de la Conférence des peuples africains, who wished to speak on behalf of the Association bamiléké du Kamerun and the Association des notables du Kamerun, whose representatives had been unable to come to New York. The Committee had appeared willing to grant Mr. Tchoumba Ngouankeu's request; his delegation, however, saw no reason to make the hearing subject to any restrictions.

2. The opposition which had been expressed to the similar request made by Mr. Moumié of the Union des populations du Cameroun appeared to be prompted mainly by prejudice. Praiseworthy efforts were being made between meetings of the Committee to find a compromise between the contending points of view; Mr. Moumié's second statement might prove useful in that connexion. It might also clear up certain points that remained obscure. Furthermore, since Mr. Moumié had last spoken, the Committee had held a long discussion and many petitions had been received. He therefore appealed to the Committee to grant the request made by Mr. Moumié, who had been struggling for his country's independence since 1946.

3. The gentleman's agreement limiting statements by petitioners to fifteen minutes had not been applied rigidly. The main reason for that agreement—the time factor—had lost much of its force, so there was even less reason to apply it rigidly now.

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

4. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) felt that, since the present session was probably the last occasion on which the Committee would have before it a large number of petitioners from a Trust Territory, it should not grudge them its time. The gentleman's agreement mentioned by the representative of the United Arab Republic had been concluded in the anticipation that the period from March to May 1959 would be taken up with preparations for a popular consultation; since there was to be no consultation, the length of hearings need not be restricted. His delegation supported the grant of a hearing to Mr. Moumié and to any other petitioner who might request one.

5. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) considered that it would be ungracious for the Committee to refuse a second hearing to the leader of the Opposition. Furthermore, Mr. Moumié should be given an opportunity to reply to the very interesting statement made by Mr. Ahidjo, the Prime Minister of the Cameroons under French administration, regarding the amnesty and reconciliation.

6. It was to be hoped that the last paragraph of the preamble of the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.580, which read: "Having heard the views of the petitioners", did not imply that the sponsors would oppose further hearings.

7. Mr. SYLVAIN (Haiti) assured the Venezuelan representative that the sponsors of the draft resolution had no such intention.

8. Mr. GOEDHART (Netherlands) suggested that the Committee should grant Mr. Moumié a hearing subject to the conditions indicated by the Jordanian representative at the previous meeting, namely that the speaker should not comment on statements made in the Committee by the representatives of Member States or on draft resolutions before the Committee, and that he should not speak for more than fifteen minutes.

9. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) pointed out that at the previous meeting he had put some questions for either the Administering Authorities or the petitioners to answer. He considered that any petitioner who requested a hearing should be heard, and that there should be no limitation of subject-matter except as provided by the rules of procedure; nor should there be any time-limit on statements by representatives of a country which would shortly become a sovereign State.

10. Mr. EL-RIFAI (Jordan) stated that he had not intended to lay down any formal conditions for the granting of a hearing to Mr. Moumié.

11. Mr. SYLVAIN (Haiti) associated his delegation with the Uruguayan representative's position.

12. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) appealed to the Committee to grant Mr. Moumié a hearing without taking a vote.

13. After a procedural discussion in which Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland), Mr. GOEDHART (Netherlands), Mr. KELLY (Australia), Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay), Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom), Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic), Miss BROOKS (Liberia), Mr. RASGOTRA (India) and Mr. SOPIEE (Federation of Malaya) took part, Mr. GERIG (United States of America) proposed that the Committee should decide to grant a new hearing to Mr. Moumié on the understanding: (a) that he should not comment on any statements made by representatives of Member States in the Committee; (b) that he should not comment on any draft resolution or draft amendment now before the Committee; and (c) that his statement should be limited to fifteen minutes.

14. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) asked for separate votes on parts (a), (b) and (c) of the United States proposal.

15. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) felt that the conditions were an integral part of the United States proposal and would affect the votes of many delegations; in his opinion, therefore, it would be inappropriate to vote on them separately.

16. Mr. HOOD (Australia) felt that the only point which the Committee was called upon to decide was whether or not to grant Mr. Moumié a hearing. The conditions under which he was to be heard, if at all, should be left to the Chair.

17. Sir Claude COREA (Ceylon) supported the Sudanese representative's appeal to the Committee to grant Mr. Moumié's request without a vote. The first condition laid down in the United States proposal—that the petitioner should not comment on statements by the representatives of Member States—was a reasonable provision, designed to preclude him from embarking on a debate with members of the Fourth Committee. The third condition—the time-limit—could be left to the Chair's discretion. On the main issue of whether to grant a hearing, the Committee appeared to be almost unanimously in favour.

18. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) observed that as the Committee seemed prepared to grant Mr. Tchoumba Nguankeu a hearing without imposing conditions, it should be prepared to do the same in the case of Mr. Moumié. The petitioner, in his own interest, would avoid abusing the Committee's good will.

19. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said that the Committee need do no more than decide whether or not Mr. Moumié was to be heard. Mr. Moumié had understood that the fifteen-minute time-limit would continue to apply, and it was therefore unnecessary to lay it down as a condition. With regard to the principle that there should be no reference to statements made by members of the Fourth Committee, he pointed out that in his first statement (852nd meeting) Mr. Moumié had referred to a statement by Mr. Kémajou, speaking for the French delegation; there had been no objection on the earlier occasion, and there was therefore no reason why Mr. Moumié should not have the same freedom if he spoke again. The third condition, namely that Mr. Moumié should make no reference to draft resolutions or amendments before the Committee, was unrealistic, since the drafts in question dealt with all aspects of the Cameroonian problem and it would therefore be perfectly possible to refer to the contents of

the draft resolutions without referring specifically to the draft resolutions themselves.

20. He therefore proposed that the Committee should vote on the simple issue of whether or not Mr. Moumié should be heard.

21. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) said that he would withdraw his request for a separate vote on the three conditions on which Mr. Moumié was to speak if the representative of the United States would withdraw his proposal in favour of the proposal made by the representative of Iraq.

22. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) said that although there was some force in the observations made by the representative of Iraq, it would not be in accordance with United Nations practice to allow a private individual to have the final word in a general debate by the representatives of Member States. If Mr. Moumié did comment on statements by representatives, those representatives would presumably be entitled to reply, and that would entail reopening the general debate. The United States favoured granting the hearing on the understanding that the Chairman would so protect the rights of members of the Committee as to make it unnecessary to reopen the general debate. He did not consider that it was necessary to take three separate votes on the conditions of the hearings, which had been proposed on the grounds of common sense and the general practice of the Committee.

23. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that although the representatives of the Cameroonian Governments were members of the delegations of France and the United Kingdom respectively, she did not believe that it was appropriate to invoke the prerogatives of Member States in barring petitioners from referring to statements by representatives of the two Cameroonian Governments.

24. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) considered that a hearing hedged about with restrictive conditions was tantamount to no hearing at all.

25. Mr. SHANAHAN (New Zealand) considered, on the basis of the views expressed by the representative of the United States, that Mr. Moumié should not be heard. It was clear that if he was heard, it would be difficult for him not to refer to statements made by representatives in the general debate, and it would not be proper for petitioners to be assimilated to the representatives of sovereign Governments. Rights granted to petitioners were for the purpose of enabling them to explain a particular point of view. Mr. Moumié had had the opportunity of so doing. If he was not given a second hearing, he could deal with any further points he wished to raise by circulating documents to the Committee. The New Zealand delegation agreed with the representative of the United States that even if Mr. Moumié exercised caution, there was a danger that the general debate might be reopened, and supported the Australian view that the Committee should decide the simple question of whether or not Mr. Moumié should be heard.

26. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland) asked the representative of the United States whether, if Mr. Moumié spoke again, and raised questions on which representatives wished to comment, they would have the right to do so. He did not see how members of the Fourth Committee could be discriminated against in favour of petitioners.

27. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) moved the closure of debate on the United States proposal under rule 118 of the rules of procedure.

28. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland), supported by Mr. GOMES PEREIRA (Brazil), opposed the closure of debate on the ground that he had received no answer to his question to the representative of the United States.

The motion for the closure of the debate was adopted by 22 votes to 15, with 26 abstentions.

29. Mr. BOULOS (Lebanon), supported by Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic), proposed that the Committee should vote first on the question of whether or not Mr. Moumié should be heard, before voting separately on the three proposed conditions of the hearing.

30. After a brief procedural discussion in which Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom), Mr. SOPIEE (Federation of Malaya), Mr. EL-RIFAI (Jordan) and Mr. HOOD (Australia) took part, the CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal that Mr. Moumié should be granted a hearing.

At the request of the representative of Romania, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Sudan, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia.

Against: Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark.

Abstaining: Greece, Honduras, India, Iran, Israel, Japan, Laos, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, Thailand, Austria, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, Finland.

Present and not voting: France.

The proposal was adopted by 34 votes to 17, with 23 abstentions.

31. Mr. RASGOTRA (India), supported by Mr. HOOD (Australia) and Mr. EL-RIFAI (Jordan), said that the first two parts of the remainder of the United States proposal, on which the Committee was about to vote, involved the rights of sovereign Member States. There could be no objection to leaving it to the Chairman to protect the rights of Member States during the hearing of Mr. Moumié, but India considered that to vote on questions involving those rights would be to establish a dangerous precedent.

32. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) asked the representative of the United States if he was prepared to withdraw the remainder of his proposal.

33. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) said that he was inclined to agree with the views expressed by the representative of India. The intention of the United States proposal had been that Mr. Moumié should be heard on the understanding that the rights of the members of the Fourth Committee would be protected by the Chairman, but as a result of the request for separate votes on those aspects of the proposal, the proposal had assumed a certain rigidity and finality which his delegation had not intended it should have.

34. After a procedural discussion in which Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq), Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom), the CHAIRMAN, Mr. RASGOTRA (India), Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan), Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) and Mr. EL-RIFAI (Jordan) took part, Mr. GERIG (United States of America) said that he thought it would be unwise for the Committee to continue with a vote on the remainder of the proposal. He would therefore withdraw the remaining parts of the proposal on which a vote had not yet been taken.

35. The CHAIRMAN stated that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee was in favour of granting the request for a hearing made by Mr. Tchoumba Ngouankeu.

It was so decided.

36. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) asked whether the fact that the Committee had agreed to grant a second hearing to two petitioners meant that other petitioners could also put in requests for second hearings.

37. The CHAIRMAN said that there had been no further requests but that that did not necessarily mean that none would be received.

The meeting rose at 10.45 p.m.