

CONTENTS

	Page
<b>Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration (continued):</b>	
(i) Annual report of the Administering Authority for 1955 (T/1246, T/1248, T/1253);	
(ii) Petitions circulated under rule 85, paragraph 2, of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council (T/PET.11/L.18 to 24, T/COM.11/L.177);	
(iii) Report of the United Nations Advisory Council for the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian Administration (T/1245)	
General debate (concluded).....	71
Appointment of the Drafting Committee.....	74
<b>Examination of petitions (continued):</b>	
Hearing of the representatives of the Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala People (T/PET.5/L.34 and Add.1 and 2 (continued).....	74
<b>Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued):</b>	
(i) Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1955 (T/1244, T/1254);	
(ii) Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific, 1956 (T/1255)	
Questions concerning the Trust Territory and replies of the special representative.....	77
Adoption of the report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly (T/L.683) (continued).....	79

**President:** Mr. Rafik ASHA (Syria).

**Present:**

The representatives of the following States members of the Trusteeship Council: Australia, Belgium, Burma, China, France, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Italy, New Zealand, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

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

**Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration (continued):**

- (i) Annual report of the Administering Authority for 1955 (T/1246, T/1248, T/1253);
- (ii) Petitions circulated under rule 85, paragraph 2, of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council (T/PET.11/L.18 to 24, T/COM.11/L.177);
- (iii) Report of the United Nations Advisory Council for the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian Administration (T/1245)

[Agenda items 4 (e), 5 and 16]

At the invitation of the President, Mr. de Holte Castello (Colombia), Mr. Salah (Egypt) and Mr.

Baradi (Philippines), representatives of States members of the United Nations Advisory Council for the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian Administration, and Mr. Zadotti, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory, took places at the Council table.

GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)

1. Mr. SALAH (Egypt), member of the United Nations Advisory Council for Somaliland, replying to the statement made by the Ethiopian representative at the 708th meeting, said he was at a loss to understand why the Ethiopian representative had taken exception to his statement at the 704th meeting relating to the delimitation of the frontier between the Trust Territory of Somaliland and Ethiopia. The facts and views expressed in that statement had been based on a thorough study and understanding of the Territory's problems. Moreover, he had accurately quoted the Ethiopian representative's communication of 22 July 1955 to the Secretary-General (T/1198), and had not lifted his words out of context, as that representative had claimed.

2. He would not now reopen the substance of the frontier question, but would merely remind the Ethiopian representative of what had been said in the course of six years in the General Assembly and the Trusteeship Council about the seriousness of the problem, the necessity of reaching an agreement as early as possible, the anxiety caused by the prolonged delay in reaching such agreement and the various resolutions and recommendations adopted on the subject.

3. The joint official communiqué of 3 May 1956 to which so much importance had been attached did not convey a clear impression that noticeable progress had been made with regard to the delimitation of the frontier, in spite of the careful diplomatic language in which it was drafted. He would, however, be only too glad if he were mistaken, and if the two Governments concerned could inform the General Assembly at its eleventh session that the long-awaited agreement had been reached and a definite frontier established.

4. He felt it had been clear from his closing remarks at the 704th meeting that he was asking the United Nations to assure the Somalis that their independence was guaranteed and thus to dispel their anxieties. He had not mentioned any particular State or Power. The Ethiopian representative had chosen to interpret those words in a certain way and he was of course free to do so.

5. The Egyptian delegation had been glad to hear the Ethiopian representative's expression of fraternal sentiments and good wishes for the future of Somaliland, but he was sure that the Council and the Somali people would appreciate it still more if those wishes and sentiments were translated into action.

6. In making his statement he had had no intention whatsoever of offending Ethiopia, which was a good neighbour of Egypt. Egypt was anxious to maintain and strengthen those relations, but he saw no contradiction between that sentiment and the fulfilment of his duty

as a member of the United Nations Advisory Council for Somaliland to defend the rights of Somaliland and express the views of its people before the Trusteeship Council.

*At the invitation of the President Mr. Heywot, Permanent Representative of Ethiopia, took a place at the Council table.*

7. Mr. HEYWOT (Ethiopia) asked the Council's permission to reply to the Egyptian representative's statement at a later date.

8. The PRESIDENT said that the Ethiopian representative would have an opportunity to make his reply when the Council took up the report of the Drafting Committee on Somaliland.

9. Mr. GRILLO (Italy) expressed his delegation's appreciation of the fact that the majority of the representatives on the Council had acknowledged that Italy was loyally discharging its task of creating a viable independent State in Somaliland. His delegation had been gratified with most of the statements that had been made. In some, however, the recognition of Italy's work and the burden it was bearing had been surrounded by general considerations of a political nature and remarks which had only an indirect connexion with Somaliland. Moreover, he had the impression that opinion had not been unanimous on some points.

10. He would leave the special representative to reply more fully on specific points, but would refer to three of a more general character.

11. Firstly, the representative of the Soviet Union had expressed dissatisfaction with the answer given to him by the special representative on the question of the transfer of land. He wished to make it clear that when the United Nations had entrusted Italy with the administration of Somaliland the land ownership situation had been well defined. Italy had changed nothing in that respect; any transfer of land property was made for the same reason, with the same procedures and formalities and under the protection of the same legal principles as land transfers in all free and democratic countries. There was no resettlement, no planned migration, no discrimination of any kind. The whole question of the holding or alienation of land was regulated by article 14 of the Trusteeship Agreement and the loyal implementation by the Administering Authority of the provisions of that article had not as far as he knew been challenged by anyone.

12. Secondly, the Indian representative had raised doubts regarding the counsellors selected to assist the ministers in the Somali Government. He would remind that representative that Italy had been under no obligation to form a Somali Government at the present time, three full years ahead of the date of Somali independence. In doing so Italy had been inspired by a sincere desire to put the Somali people on the road to full and sole responsibility in government matters and to that end it had thought well to provide the ministers in the initial phase of their activity with ministerial counsellors. It would be for the future Government of independent Somaliland to decide whether or not their services should be retained. Mr. Folchi, the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, in a speech at Mogadiscio in April, on the occasion of the inauguration of the Legislative Assembly, had said that it was the desire of the Government of Italy that nothing in its conduct should ever compromise or limit the future independence of Somaliland. The President of the Italian Republic, in his message to the Legislative Assembly, had declared that it was Italy's firm intention

that Somaliland should become a nation with democratic institutions worthy of assuming its rightful place among the free nations of the world. The future relations between Italy and Somaliland would be those agreed upon between free nations. Italy would in no way attempt to influence the decisions of the Somali people.

13. Thirdly, with regard to the delimitation of the frontier between Ethiopia and Somaliland, the Italian Government fully understood the concern of members and sincerely hoped that the problem might be solved before 1960. He failed, however, to understand the statement that Italy's responsibility was to wipe out any legacy of colonialism. He could not see what colonialism had to do with the problem. The responsibility of Italy with regard to the question of the frontier formed a part of its mandate under the Trusteeship Agreement to promote the political, social and economic welfare of the Somali people. Political welfare obviously implied the possibility of living in peace within well-defined and internationally recognized borders. He could not see what more Italy could do than enter into negotiations with Ethiopia while protecting the interests of the Somali people. He referred representatives to his earlier statement about the negotiations (704th meeting).

14. With regard to the Territory's economy, the Italian delegation agreed that there was still much to be done. The question, however, was largely one of means. Italy was already contributing to the utmost of its ability. His delegation had taken note of the recommendations to consolidate the economy of the Territory in order to enable the Somali Government to proceed without undue difficulty. In any event, those recommendations were directed mainly towards the United Nations, inasmuch as the future of Somaliland was its ultimate responsibility, as had been clearly stated by a number of representatives. The views expressed in that connexion were in perfect agreement with those voiced by the Administrator, who had maintained that without substantial outside aid Somaliland would not be economically viable.

15. The suggestion had been made that all the economic aspects of Somaliland must be taken into consideration as soon as possible in the light of the forthcoming report of the mission sent to the Territory by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. While welcoming that suggestion, he endorsed the point made by the Administrator that it was essential for Italy as Administering Authority to know that outside financial assistance would be given to Somaliland after 1960. That knowledge was fundamental not only for any long-term economic planning but also so as to permit Italy in the remaining three years of its trusteeship to take steps which would be in keeping with such planning.

16. A number of representatives had expressed the hope that Italy would continue to give financial assistance to the future independent State of Somaliland. The Council was aware that Italy was making a substantial effort, but because of its democratic Constitution every plan involving financial commitments must be approved by Parliament, and the Italian Government could not, therefore, make any long-term international commitments of that nature. He was convinced, however, that the Italian Government would never refuse its share of responsibility in any plan of assistance and that the Italian people would do their best to help a young and friendly nation. On the other hand, Italy hoped that the United Nations itself would continue to offer tangible proof of its interest in the development of the new State.

17. Mr. ZADOTTI (Special Representative) said he would deal with the three main subjects on which the attention of many representatives had been focused: the electoral system, the powers of the Legislative Assembly and the powers of the Somali Government.

18. The original electoral law had been largely modified and finally unanimously approved by the Territorial Council. It was not perfect but at least there was, for the first time in the history of the country, a fairly accurate representation of the trends of opinion among the people. Both the Administration and the Somali Government would bear that experience in mind when new legislation was prepared for the next elections.

19. The representatives of Haiti and the USSR had expressed concern as to the representation of foreign groups in the Legislative Assembly. The decision had been taken by the Territorial Council on its own responsibility; the number of seats for foreign groups had been granted rather in the light of their participation in and contribution to the progress of the Territory than of their numerical strength. The Administration would, however, bring the opinions expressed by various representatives on the subject to the attention of the Legislative Assembly and the Government.

20. Some representatives, including those of Burma and Haiti, had expressed views concerning universal adult direct suffrage. Due note would be taken of their suggestions but he would point out that in the solution of such a complicated problem there were issues at stake, such as that of women's votes, which could be solved by the Somalis alone.

21. Some delegations, including that of Burma, had regretted the absence of a census in the Territory. In view of the high proportion of nomads among the population the problem was obviously a difficult one, but the Administration would continue to seek for a solution.

22. A number of delegations had expressed the view that the powers of the Legislative Assembly and the Administrator should be defined in more detail; others, including those of Haiti, India and the Soviet Union, had voiced concern as to the limitation of the powers of the Somali Government in respect of the reserved matters and the functions of the Italian advisers.

23. With regard to the first point, the reserved matters were those for which under the Trusteeship Agreement the Italian Government was solely responsible. That would not, however, prevent the Administration from securing the co-operation of the Somali Government. He stressed the temporary and exceptional character of the limitation of parliamentary initiative under article 10 of Ordinance No. 2 of 5 January 1956 (T/1248, annex II) according to which the Administrator's sanction was required before the Assembly could take the initiative of bringing up new draft laws for discussion.

24. The question of the limitation of the activities of the Somali Government had, however, been considered mainly in connexion with the functions and powers of the advisers, which had caused concern to some delegations. The Administration felt that apart from its responsibility for seeing that the Somalis were properly prepared in the art of government, the persons who had so far carried out those activities should advise the Somali ministers. Moreover, the word "advisers" clearly defined their function, which was to give advice when asked, while the authority and responsibility were entirely the ministers.

25. Turning to economic questions, he said that he would confine himself to a few comments, since the

Administration's views had already been clearly expressed.

26. The delegation of Haiti had suggested that a reduction of salary should be considered in respect of non-Somali personnel. That move would, however, have little ultimate bearing on the balancing of the 1960 budget, since at that time all non-Somali personnel would be repatriated and any experts the Somali Government might wish to engage would be on an entirely different footing.

27. He would not go again into the question of new taxation and readjustment of salaries and wages, but would merely point out that the problem was a very difficult and complicated one which the Somali Government would have to consider and try to solve.

28. Without going deeply into the causes of nomadism, he would stress that it had made possible the establishment, under unfavourable conditions, of Somaliland's main resource, i.e. cattle. The problem was not how to settle the nomads, which would require many years, but how to enable them to exploit that considerable capital. Any other policy, at least for the time being, would inevitably lead to the deterioration and loss of that important source of wealth.

29. The Administration would see to it that the report of the mission of the International Bank was considered by the responsible Somali bodies, including the Somali Economic Council.

30. The Administration would do its best to attract new investment to the Territory. That had been the purpose of the Administering Authority in concluding the oil agreements, the conditions of which resembled those agreed to by other countries whose circumstances were similar to those of Somaliland.

31. When dealing with social questions, some delegations had mentioned the lack of data concerning the incidence of tuberculosis in the Territory and had claimed that the medical facilities were insufficient. With regard to the first point, pending the report of the World Health Organization (WHO), to which he had referred at the 703rd meeting, the only data available were those given in the annual report,<sup>1</sup> which covered all cases treated in the hospitals and infirmaries in the Territory. The part of the population which had not so far been examined would be dealt with during the vaccination campaign. With regard to the second point, the WHO mission which had visited the Territory in 1954 had found the medical facilities to be more than adequate. In connexion with the petition submitted to the Council by some patients at the tuberculosis hospital at Mogadiscio (T/PÉT.11/582), he drew the attention of the Burmese representative to his statement at the 353rd meeting of the Standing Committee on Petitions.

32. Some delegations had shown a great interest in the new educational plan. The plan had already been considered in collaboration with Professor Henri Grandjean of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and would be ready as soon as the experts' observations were available. It would contain some modifications of the old plan. The problem of the education of nomads had caused concern not only to the delegations represented on the Council but also to the Administering Authority. A UNESCO expert was now in the Territory and the

<sup>1</sup> *Rapport du Gouvernement italien à l'Assemblée générale des Nations Unies sur l'administration de tutelle de la Somalie, 1955, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Rome, Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato P. V. (Transmitted to members of the Trusteeship Council by the Secretary-General under cover of document T/1246).*

Administration would do its utmost to assist him in carrying out his work.

33. He would point out to the Burmese representative that specific figures concerning the *Corriere della Somalia* had not been mentioned in the report because they had been mentioned in the previous one; the number of copies issued daily by that newspaper was 1,500.

34. All the delegations in the Council had expressed their opinions on the question of language; the Administration's position had also been clearly defined and he would merely say once again that that was a question which the Somalis themselves must solve.

35. He thanked the various delegations for their appreciation and assured them that their views and suggestions would be carefully considered by the Administration of Somaliland.

#### APPOINTMENT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE

36. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had concluded its discussion of Somaliland and should now appoint a Drafting Committee. He suggested that the members should be Belgium, Burma, Guatemala and New Zealand.

*It was so decided.*

*Mr. de Holte Castello (Colombia), Mr. Salah (Egypt) and Mr. Baradi (Philippines), representatives of States members of the United Nations Advisory Council for the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian Administration, Mr. Heywot, Permanent Representative of Ethiopia, and Mr. Zadotti, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Somaliland, withdrew.*

#### Examination of petitions (continued)

[Agenda item 5]

HEARING OF THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NGONDO, TRADITIONAL ASSEMBLY OF THE DOUALA PEOPLE (T/PET.5/L.84 AND ADD.1 AND 2) (continued)

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Betoté Akwa, Mr. Kingué-Jong and Mr. Loko Mbondé, representatives of the Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala People, took places at the Council table.*

37. Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) drew attention to paragraph 9 of the annex to the report of the Drafting Committee on conditions in the Cameroons under French administration (T/L.622), which referred to the Territorial Administration and the Territorial Assembly. He would like to hear the petitioners' comments on the recommendation contained in that paragraph and to know how the proposed constitutional reforms had been received by the population of the Cameroons.

38. Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala People) said there had been much uncertainty regarding the Territorial Assembly's powers. The Assembly had been elected under an Act passed in 1946, ten years previously. A further Act had been adopted on 6 February 1952 giving the Assembly much wider powers, and the Administering Authority had promised that those powers would be put into effect in July 1952. However, that had not been done up to the present and the Trusteeship Council's recommendations had therefore not been implemented.

39. With regard to the population's views concerning the promised constitutional reforms, he read out an extract from an article written by himself and published

in a local newspaper under the auspices of the Ngondo, which had been approved by the majority of the population. In that article he pointed out that while the *loi-cadre* adopted on 23 March 1956 provided for a plebiscite in Togoland under French administration to decide between the continuation of trusteeship regime and adoption of a status defined by legislative decree after consultation with the Territorial Assembly, it also provided that the decree would define the respective powers of the French State and the Territory; thus the possibility of independence envisaged in the Trusteeship Agreement was excluded. Furthermore, while the *loi-cadre* provided for institutional reforms in the Cameroons, the nature of those reforms was not specified. It thus appeared likely that the Cameroons would continue to be administered in the same way as the specifically French overseas territories. It was difficult to see wherein lay the revolutionary nature of the *loi-cadre*. If the draft had been presented to the Cameroonian people shortly after the events of 25 May 1955 it would have had a marked effect. France, however, had allowed itself to be outdistanced by events. The present Government was paying for the mistakes of its predecessors and was now faced with an entirely new situation, since what the Cameroonians wanted was a genuine government responsible to a parliamentary assembly, the administration being under the effective control of that government.

40. He had nothing to add to what he had said in that article.

41. Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) thanked the petitioner. He assumed that the first part of the Council's report to the General Assembly would merely say that the request from the Ngondo for a hearing (T/PET.5/L.84) had been received during the seventeenth session but that the Council had been unable to grant a hearing until its eighteenth session, and that the second part of the report would contain a special chapter concerning the hearing.

42. He proposed that the debate on the question should not be closed for the time being and that the Council should come to a decision the following week.

43. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) recalled that at the previous meeting the representative of the Ngondo had spoken of the possibility of a French-Cameroonian community; he wondered how the inhabitants of the Cameroons under British administration would view that possibility if the two Cameroons were reunited, as the petitioners wished.

44. Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala People) had little to add to the reply he had given to a similar question asked at the previous meeting: the bonds which would link the Cameroons with France would, it was hoped, be the same as those which would link it with the rest of the world. The Cameroonian people had not been responsible for the partition of their country and they relied on the United Nations to help them both regain their unity and establish peaceful relations with all countries.

45. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) observed that from the petitioners' statement it appeared that the question of reunification took precedence in their minds over that of independence. It would be very difficult, however, to reunify the Cameroons while the two parts were still Trust Territories, for that would necessitate revision of the Trusteeship Agreements and the establishment, perhaps, of a joint trusteeship. He wondered if the petitioners had considered that fact.

46. Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala People) said that they had not

thought of that difficulty; they had thought only in terms of their immense desire for the two Cameroons to be reunited. They would, however, hope that the Trusteeship Council would help them to attain the independence which appeared to be the necessary preliminary to reunification, in accordance with the well-defined principles of the United Nations.

47. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) was glad that the petitioners realized that independence must precede unification; in that connexion he wondered whether the plebiscite they spoke of was intended to relate to independence.

48. Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala People) recalled that at the previous meeting the petitioners had suggested the holding of a plebiscite on the matter of independence in order to clear up any doubts remaining in the minds of members of the Council. They were perfectly willing for a plebiscite to be held, now or later, on the matter of unification, but in view of what members of the Council had said he wondered if that would be a correct procedure.

49. In reply to a further question from Mr. RIFAI (Syria), Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala People) said that in stating, at the previous meeting, that the Cameroonian community had never expressed a desire to be separate, he had been referring exclusively to the Cameroons under French administration.

50. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether there had been any petitions from the Ngondo among the 21,848 petitions received by the United Nation's Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of the Cameroons under British administration and the Cameroons under French administration, 1955, during its sojourn in the Territory. The Visiting Mission had stated in its report (T/1231) that not many petitions had been received on the subject of reunification.

51. Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala People) said that in the Cameroons under French administration, at least, the desire for unification was overwhelming. The Ngondo had submitted a petition to the Visiting Mission on 12 November 1955 (T/PET.5/L.84/Add.1) in which it had expressed a desire for the complete independence of the two Cameroons and their subsequent entry into a free association with each other.

52. In reply to a further question from Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), relating to paragraph 134 of the Visiting Mission's report, Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala People) said that the petitioners did not really think it necessary to propound a concrete programme when they asked for independence. However, as he had stated at the previous meeting, they would urge the immediate establishment in the Territory of a United Nations commission to supervise the creation of the organs of government of the new Cameroonian State and of an executive committee which should serve as a provisional government, and also the preparation of general elections to form a national constituent assembly of the Cameroons.

53. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it was generally believed in the Council that certain conditions—political, economic, social and so on—should be fulfilled in a Trust Territory before it could be considered ripe for independence. He wondered whether the organization represented by

the petitioner felt that the Cameroons was, in that sense, prepared for independence.

54. Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala People) thought that the preparation of the Territory for independence had been the responsibility of France during its forty years' administration of the country. The Cameroonians themselves had always been ready to learn from France; they had constantly asked for a time-limit to be set and for a time-table to be drawn up. If that had not been done, that was not the fault of the Cameroonians, but indeed it could be said that independence was itself the best apprenticeship for political life in a country.

55. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wondered whether, as it was unlikely that the Council would at its present session take any radical decision regarding the independence or unification of the Cameroons, the petitioners could suggest what recommendations it might make to the Administering Authority to enable the people to play a more active part in the Territory's political life.

56. Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala People) said that his delegation would go back satisfied if the Trusteeship Council were to recommend to the Administering Authority the immediate establishment of a legislative assembly and of a government council composed chiefly of Cameroonians and responsible to the legislative assembly.

57. Mr. JAIPAL (India) recalled that in the statement made at the previous meeting the petitioners had declared themselves in favour of respect for the traditional institutions and, at the same time, of the establishment of modern political organs. At first sight there would appear to be a contradiction in that statement, but it was perhaps the petitioners' desire to institute modern democratic institutions while retaining what was best in the old order and would not conflict with the new.

58. Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala People) agreed. Moreover, for the Cameroonians, and indeed for Africans in general, tradition meant not barbarism and slavery but what was respected by all people, those ways and practices which were good and in many cases genuinely democratic.

59. In reply to a further question from Mr. JAIPAL (India), Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala People) regretted that he could not illustrate with concrete examples the general charges which had been levelled at the Administration at the previous meeting, for fear of jeopardizing the safety of the delegation on its return to the Territory.

60. Mr. JAIPAL (India) asked whether the petitioners had any proof of their statement, at the previous meeting, that the Administering Authority was preparing, as in the case of Togoland under French administration, to integrate the Cameroons into a French federal republic.

61. Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala people) said that the fact was so well known that it needed no proof; indeed, definite plans had been made by French statesmen and also by the French Parliament, about which the representative of France could no doubt inform the Council. The Cameroonian people, however, were prepared to enter such an association only of their own free will and after the attainment of independence.

62. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) noted that the authors of the communications in documents T/COM.5/

L.157/Add.1 and T/COM.5/L.158, in the one case the organization known as the Coordination des indépendants camerounais known as (INDECAM), and in the other one a certain Thomas Noumabué, had raised strong objections to the presence of the representatives of the Ngondo in the Council and had alleged that they were not qualified to speak on behalf of the Cameroonians. He wondered if the petitioner could state whether the authors of those communications themselves represented important sectors of the population, politically speaking.

63. Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala people) did not think that the people took such parties as INDECAM, the Evolution sociale camerounaise (ESOCAM) and the Unité camerounaise (UNICAM) very seriously. Political opinion in the Territory was still fluid and that situation was taken advantage of in order to create parties artificially for certain definite ends, as the Administering Authority well knew.

64. He did not know the author of the other communication, but would study the document in question.

65. Mr. SEARS (United States of America) pointed out that the functions of the Trusteeship Council were mainly advisory. The petitioners would be doomed to disappointment if they expected other action from it.

66. He asked what the Ngondo representative had meant when he had stated that France wished to integrate Togoland and the Cameroons under French administration in the French Union.

67. Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala People) said that the integration of States into a larger body was not a new idea and could work perfectly satisfactorily, provided that each State retained its independence. He therefore had no objection to the integration of the Cameroons under French administration into the French Union, provided that its independence was recognized and that it was on an equal footing with France and the other States of the French Union. For that to be possible, the present organization of the French Union, in which all States were not equal, would have to be revised. A semblance of cohesion could be produced by bringing pressure to bear on some States, but real solidarity could spring only from the full equality and freedom of all the partners. The problem had never been clearly stated, but in the Cameroons under French administration it was obvious that the French Government intended to integrate the Territory in the French Union. Parties like UNICAM, which were in favour of integration, had given the Council the erroneous impression that the Ngondo were not important.

68. Mr. SEARS (United States of America) said that his delegation had asked the French delegation, on a number of occasions, whether integration in the French Union implied giving up the right to secede from it. The French delegation had always given assurances that the right of secession would be retained by any States joining the French Union. If a plebiscite were held in the Cameroons under French administration to decide between integration and independence, the result would be the same in the long run, whatever the people decided at the plebiscite. They could always regain their independence if, having decided on integration, they later wished to secede.

69. Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala People) pointed out that the cases of such countries as Indo-China, Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria showed that it was not easy to exercise the right to secede from the French Union.

70. Mr. SEARS (United States of America) asked what action the petitioners would like the Council to take.

71. Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala People) said they hoped the Council would recommend the immediate establishment in the Cameroons of a legislative assembly and of a government council, the latter comprising a majority of Cameroonians and being responsible to the legislative assembly.

72. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) asked why the Ngondo representative was recommending a government council comprising only a majority of Cameroonians. It would have been more consistent with his general attitude to have recommended an entirely Cameroonian Government.

73. Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala People) said that there was no inconsistency in recommending that a provisional government, which would manage the Territory's affairs until it became independent, should comprise some French representatives and a majority of Cameroonians. France was the Administering Authority and should therefore have a voice in the government. That was why the Ngondo petitioners had always made it clear that they were willing to co-operate with the French Administration until the country achieved its independence. Some sectors of the population would object to French participation in the provisional government, but he felt that such a solution was feasible, provided there was only a minority of French representatives. The people would not accept a government council composed of an equal number of French and Cameroonian representatives.

74. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) said that the petitioners appeared to have shifted emphasis from the demand for immediate independence and the establishment of a constituent assembly for the two Territories to a proposal for the establishment of a legislative assembly in the Cameroons under French administration alone.

75. Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala People) said that the unification and independence of the Cameroons was their dearest wish, but they had realized that they could not force the hand of the Trusteeship Council and had been influenced by the statements made in the course of the debate. They were therefore willing to accept the establishment of a legislative assembly and a government council as a temporary compromise. They would tell their people that unification and independence were not attainable for the time being, but would be achieved at a later date.

76. Mr. JAIPAL (India) assumed that the purpose of the plebiscite which the petitioners had called for was to decide the relationship between the Territory and France and that it would be held at about the same time as the Territory achieved independence. Integration of a Territory with another country was not one of the objectives of the Trusteeship System; it would be for the people to decide when they had become independent.

77. Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala People) said that the plebiscite was intended to clarify the attitude of the Cameroonian people and dispel any misunderstanding of their wishes. A plebiscite was not required to ascertain the wishes of the people, which were quite clear: they wished for independence. The future Cameroonian Government could decide what form the relationship with France

would take, or a plebiscite could be held immediately, if France wished.

78. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) said that the French delegation had taken no part in the questioning of the Ngondo representatives, although it had listened to the debate with deep interest, because the Territory under discussion was under French trusteeship.

79. As the French delegation had indicated at the previous session that it would welcome the Ngondo petitioners, its attitude could not be misinterpreted. The petitioners had therefore been able to speak quite freely. The Council should, however, remember that, although the Douala people played an important part in the South Cameroons, the Ngondo represented only a small section of it. Therefore, the petitioners could not speak for all the Douala people, much less for the whole Cameroons. Furthermore, the recent election of the Douala Deputy, Manga Bell, Traditional Chief of the Bells, who were at variance with the Akwa (with whom the Ngondo was connected) showed that the Ngondo was not well supported by local public opinion.

80. He strongly objected to Mr. Kingué-Jong's insinuation that he was unable to speak freely for fear of reprisals when he returned. He would not trouble to refute that or any of the other accusations the petitioner had made.

*Mr. Betoté Akwa, Mr. Kingué-Jong and Mr. Loko Mbondé, representatives of the Ngondo, Traditional Assembly of the Douala People, withdrew.*

*The meeting was suspended at 4.15 p.m. and resumed at 4.35 p.m.*

#### **Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued):**

- (i) **Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1955 (T/1244, T/1254);**
- (ii) **Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific, 1956 (T/1255)**

[Agenda items 4 (d) and 7]

81. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) protested against the absence of French translations of the documents under discussion. He understood the difficulties of the Secretariat, but he felt that the use of English texts only imposed an unnecessarily heavy burden on his delegation; he asked for the French texts to be circulated as soon as possible.

82. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) and Mr. DE CAMARET (France) supported the Belgian representative.

83. The PRESIDENT said that the Secretariat would make every effort to supply translations as soon as possible.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nucker, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, took a place at the Council table.*

#### **QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE TRUST TERRITORY AND REPLIES OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE**

##### *Political advancement*

84. Mr. THORP (New Zealand) referred to paragraph 289 of the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific, 1956 (T/1255), and asked why the Acting High Commissioner had felt that the inter-district conference held at Truk in 1953 had not been as useful as had been hoped.

85. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that discussion with different Micronesian leaders concerning the results of that conference had convinced him that it had been premature. The representatives who had attended the conference had had no awareness of Territory-wide problems and it had been difficult for them to understand what was expected of them. There had also been difficulty in providing interpretation from the different languages.

86. Another meeting of district leaders, to be held in Guam within the next two months, was expected to yield better results, as the leaders were now more aware of the Territory's problems and English had become more familiar to them. The Administration would inform the leaders of different aspects of its work and invite their comments. It was hoped that a conference of political leaders from the different districts might, in 1957, yield good results.

87. Mr. THORP (New Zealand) asked whether the new procedure for the recruitment of personnel mentioned in paragraph 310 of the Visiting Mission's report had been put into operation and, if so, whether it had proved effective.

88. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that, although the new procedure had been authorized as from 1 April 1956, initial organization difficulties had prevented its application until very recently, except for the recruitment of lower grade staff. At that level, it had proved effective and it would probably be equally successful at higher levels.

89. Mr. THORP (New Zealand) asked whether the decentralization of such services as those of health and education had given rise to any administrative problems and whether other government departments might be decentralized.

90. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that it had proved very helpful for the Directors of Health and Education to have their offices in the field; it was hoped that the office of the Director of Agriculture would also be moved within the next two years. For the present, it was more convenient for it to be located in Guam, as new personnel were being recruited and the entire agricultural programme was being organized from Guam, which entailed frequent consultation with the Acting High Commissioner. When the time came for implementation, it would be more convenient for the Director of Agriculture to be in the field. Any slight administrative difficulties which might be caused by the decentralization of the three services he had mentioned were offset by increased contact with the Micronesians.

91. Mr. THORP (New Zealand) congratulated the Administration on its success in transferring families from overcrowded to other areas, which was all the more remarkable as communities of that kind were usually averse to changing their environment. He asked what techniques had been used to persuade such groups to accept transfers.

92. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that the question was discussed with the leaders of the communities involved, who explained it to their people and then recommended the families to be moved. There was never any suggestion of compulsion to move; members of the community were taken to see the lands on which they would settle and then returned home to discuss the matter. That sometimes required some considerable time, but when the family moved, it moved of its own free will.

93. Mr. THORP (New Zealand) asked whether any resolutions other than those mentioned in paragraph 60

of the report of the Visiting Mission and by the special representative in his opening statement (709th meeting) had been passed by the Palau Congress since January 1955, and whether any draft legislation had been considered by the Congress without the passing of a resolution.

94. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) explained the procedure followed in the Congress: after a preliminary discussion of the items introduced, the Congress assigned them to committees for study. In several cases, committees had reported that further consideration was required and had not submitted draft resolutions. Two or three items which were to be discussed at the next session of the Congress were now in committee.

95. Mr. KIANG (China) asked the special representative to comment on paragraph 307 of the Visiting Mission's report.

96. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) pointed out, in connexion with the suggestion that it might be better for Saipan to be under civilian administration, that the district had been transferred from civilian to naval administration in 1953, at which time the Administering Authority had weighed the need for that move. He knew of no real reason for transferring it back to a civilian agency. In any event, the matter was one for the United States Government as Administering Authority to determine in terms of total issues rather than for him as special representative to recommend in terms of his administrative responsibility.

97. As for the statement that "military requirements have in fact been met in the Marshall Islands without the need for establishing a district naval administration in any part of that district", there was no area in the Marshall Islands under the administration of the Navy which carried with it the responsibility for administering Micronesians. In Saipan, however, there were over 5,000 Saipanese, so that the comparison with the Marshall Islands was not quite complete.

98. Mr. KIANG (China) noted from paragraph 132 of the Visiting Mission's report that a chief in the Truk district had complained of the constant turnover in the administrative staff. Some adjustment had apparently been made by extending civil service status to United States citizens employed in the administration of the Trust Territory, but that would not necessarily remedy the problem of a constant turnover until the basis of the two-year contract was changed. He wondered whether exceptions to the two-year contract could be made for those United States officials whose continuing service was deemed necessary from the point of view of administrative efficiency.

99. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that such exceptions could be made; indeed, the Administration was pleased to renew the contracts of any employees who desired to continue their work in the Trust Territory. The change to full civil service status would permit the Administration to retain more employees for longer than the two-year term for which they signed. There were already some employees in the Trust Territory who had been there for four or six years and had therefore renewed their contracts two or three times. He hoped that, as time went on, more of the Administration's employees would renew their contracts.

100. Mr. KIANG (China) noted from paragraph 57 of the Secretariat working paper on conditions in the Trust Territory (T/L.685) that at its fourteenth session the Council had been informed of the Adminis-

tering Authority's intention to enact an organic law for the Trust Territory not later than 1960. He wondered if any progress had been made in that respect.

101. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that the Micronesians and United States citizens in the Territory had learned a great deal more about each other. Discussions were constantly taking place between United States district administrative staff and the various congresses, councils and local advisory groups on the problems which would have to be resolved when the organic act was submitted to such groups. Within the next year or two the Administration would be in a very good position to start a serious discussion of proposed drafts for organic legislation and it should be able to meet the target date of 1960 without too much difficulty.

102. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) understood that the municipality was the basic unit of government. Municipal organization generally depended on the people's degree of advancement. It would be interesting to know how the Administration furthered such advancement, whether Western forms of municipal government existed, and whether municipal development was willingly accepted by the population.

103. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that in the Trust Territory a municipality might be an entire island, part of an island or two or three islands in the same atoll group. The people understood the municipal form of government better than any other because it was in keeping with their age-old method of governing. The people living in isolated communities had chiefs and regulations governing their activities within that limited area. The transition to Western forms of government consisted essentially in electing a magistrate rather than accepting an appointed chief. The same areas and the same type of rules and regulations were involved. The Administration had been spending considerable time in developing the municipal technique of government because from there it could proceed to develop local government at the district level.

104. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) noted from the Administering Authority's annual report<sup>2</sup> that changes in local government organization would be made when the expressed needs and desires of the people concerned justified such changes. He wondered how the Administering Authority would ascertain those needs and desires.

105. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that essentially it would be done by the magistrates making those desires known to the advisory councils in the districts, to the district administrator or, in the case of the outer islands, to the field-trip party representing the district administrative staff. There was very little difficulty in ascertaining the people's wishes. As a municipality desired a change, it made that fact known to the Administration. In addition, officials of the Administration visited the outer islands and discussed such matters as the budget, sanitation, health and schooling. Sometimes, the municipalities set up a small community programme for the building of bridges etc. and such actions were reported back to the Administration's headquarters.

<sup>2</sup> *Eighth Annual Report on the Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, July 1, 1954 to June 30, 1955, Transmitted by the United States of America to the United Nations Pursuant to Article 88 of the Charter of the United Nations*, Department of State Publication 6243, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1956. (Transmitted to members of the Trusteeship Council by the Secretary-General under cover of document T/1244).



106. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) considered that the transfer of the Administration's headquarters to Guam was a great step forward. He noted, however, that certain departments such as health and education were decentralized. Such decentralization must be rather inconvenient and he wondered whether the Administering Authority did not intend eventually to group all the departments in Guam.

107. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) agreed that it was sometimes inconvenient to have the directors of the various departments scattered throughout the districts. On the other hand the benefits of being in direct contact with the people outweighed the disadvantages, and he would like to send more staff into the districts so that they could work more closely with the Micronesians, particularly in those types of activity directly affecting the life of the people, such as health, education and agriculture.

108. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) drew attention to paragraph 302 of the Visiting Mission's report, dealing with a request received from the people of Rota. That request was based on the fact that freedom of movement was apparently restricted. A person living on Rota who wanted to go to Guam or Saipan had to obtain travel documents. He would like further information on the type of documents concerned and to know whether they were difficult to obtain, whether they had ever been refused and, if so, why.

109. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that any resident of the Trust Territory who wished to visit Saipan must obtain special travel papers in addition to those required for visiting other districts. The Saipanese themselves had asked the Administering Authority to set up a system which would permit them to know who was visiting them. Visitors arrived by boat, and the port where they landed was five miles from either of the two communities which the majority of visitors desired to visit. Arrangements had therefore to be made for their transportation. In addition, it was not unusual for ten persons in one family to descend without warning upon a local family in Saipan, which might not be in a position to care for them at that time.

110. With regard to visitors to Guam, no more restrictions were placed on residents of the Trust Territory visiting Guam than on any individual visiting the island. No request to visit Guam or Saipan had been turned down; on the contrary there had been extremely good co-operation and, although administrative difficulties sometimes arose and the individuals concerned were put to some inconvenience, no injustice had been done.

*Mr. Nucker, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, withdrew.*

#### **Adoption of the report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly (T/L.683) (continued)**

[Agenda item 18]

111. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) recalled that the decision to publish the Council's report to the General Assembly in two instalments (701st meeting) had been taken solely for administrative reasons and not because of any shortcomings in the normal format. It was important that the unity of the report should not be prejudiced, as he felt that it would be were the outline suggested by the Secretariat in document T/L.683 adopted. Not a single chapter in the proposed part I was complete and anyone wishing to get a full picture of the organization of the Council, for example, would

have to consult both instalments. In his view, administrative requirements might be met while retaining the unity of the report, if it were to appear in three volumes: volume one would consist of part I of document T/L.683, together with the corresponding part of the second instalment, thus keeping together all that part of the report which dealt with organizational and administrative questions; volume two would contain the five chapters which the Secretariat proposed to include in part II of document T/L.683, in other words, the chapters dealing with conditions in the Trust Territories discussed at the previous session; volume three would consist of the chapters dealing with conditions in the Trust Territories discussed at the current session. The material for volume two had already been approved by the Council and could be published immediately. It represented a considerable portion of the Council's report and its early publication should help to alleviate the Secretariat's difficulties. Volumes one and three could be published at the end of the current session. Since part I of document T/L.683 was not extensive, it should cause no great administrative inconvenience to delay its publication until the picture of that side of the Council's work was complete. He was not making a formal proposal, but merely a suggestion on which he would like to hear the views of the members of the Council and the Secretariat.

112. Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) agreed that the Australian representative's suggestion would certainly preserve the unity of the report from a formal point of view better than the two volumes proposed by the Secretariat. On the other hand, he wondered whether the advantage of maintaining a formal unity was sufficient to counterbalance the obvious disadvantage of having three volumes rather than two. It was an excellent idea to publish part II of document T/L.683 immediately, but it might perhaps be preferable to combine what the Australian representative had referred to as volumes one and three in a single volume.

113. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) saw no real objection to that idea, although he felt that it might be better to keep the administrative volume of the report separate from either of the volumes on conditions in the Trust Territories. The main point, however, was that the whole administrative story of both the previous and the present session should appear in one place rather than be divided between the two instalments of the report as suggested by the Secretariat.

114. Mr. JAIPAL (India) recognized some merit in the Australian representative's suggestion so far as retaining the unity of the report was concerned, but he felt that having three volumes would only add to the confusion of the Fourth Committee and to the problems of documentation and distribution to which the Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories had referred at the 701st meeting. His delegation would prefer to have one volume but it was prepared to agree to two, if the Secretariat thought that advisable.

115. Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) reserved his delegation's position on the Australian representative's suggestion. His immediate reaction, however, was to wonder whether the decision to divide the report into two or three volumes might not have unfortunate repercussions on the substance of the report as well as the form. Furthermore, a report in several volumes would not be so readily comprehensible, particularly to those members of the Fourth Committee who were not members of the Council. The Under-Secretary had explained that one object of the Secretariat's sug-

gestion was to cut by half the length of the document which the Secretariat would have to process during its peak period of activity. He asked whether the same result could not be achieved by proceeding with the translation and preparation for printing of all the material ready for immediate processing, deferring the actual printing until the whole report was complete. It could then appear in a single volume, which his delegation, like that of India, would prefer.

116. Mr. WIESCHHOFF (Secretary of the Council) said that the Guatemalan representative's suggestion had been carefully considered by the Secretariat but that inquiries had shown that it would not sufficiently expedite distribution of the report. Most of the translation had already been done; the real difficulty lay in the printing, which might be done abroad, in which event problems such as shipping were involved.

117. At the tenth session of the General Assembly, the Council's documents had not been available in the various languages until the middle of November and the order of the Fourth Committee's agenda had been dictated by the availability of documents rather than by

substantive considerations. It was to prevent a repetition of that situation that the Secretariat had proposed that the report should appear in two instalments.

118. While the Australian representative's suggestion would maintain the unity of the report, it would have the disadvantage of giving readers first an isolated volume — volume two — dealing merely with conditions in certain Trust Territories and totally unrelated to the history of the events recounted in part I of document T/L.683. The suggestion had another minor drawback: the proposed administrative volume one would amount to only forty-five pages or so, which from a technical point of view would not make a full volume. For those reasons the Secretariat would prefer the procedure it had suggested, although the final decision would, of course, lie with the Council.

119. In conclusion he urged the Council to reach an early decision. Otherwise, the whole point of the new procedure would be lost and the Council might as well revert to the original idea of a report in one volume.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.