



UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

T/C.2/SR.319
12 March 1956

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND NINETEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 3 February 1956, at 2.50 p.m.

CONTENTS

Examination of petitions concerning the Trust Territory of the
Cameroons under French Administration (T/C.2/L.197)(continued)

PRESENT:

Chairman:

Mr. JAIPAL

India

Members:

Mr. HAMILTON

Australia

Mr. SCHEYVEN

Belgium

Mr. de CAMARET

France

Mr. SERAPHIN

Haiti

Mr. BENDRYSHEV

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics

Also present:

Mr. LEFEVRE

Special Representative of the
Administering Authority for
the Trust Territory of the
Cameroons under French
Administration

Secretariat:

Mr. BERENDSEN

Secretary of the Committee

EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS CONCERNING THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE CAMEROONS UNDER
FRENCH ADMINISTRATION (T/C.2/L.197) (continued)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Lefèvre, Special Representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under French Administration, took a place at the Committee table.

Petitions relating to certain incidents that occurred in the Cameroons under French Administration in April-May 1955 and the action taken by the local authority with regard to them (T/C.2/L.197) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN invited observations on document T/C.2/L.197, with a view to the preparation of suitable recommendations for the Trusteeship Council.

Since no one was prepared to speak at that point, he said that if there were no objections he would make certain observations, as representative of India.

Firstly, the Secretariat was to be commended for the useful working paper (T/C.2/L.197) it had prepared. The Committee should draw the Trusteeship Council's particular attention to that document and to the Administering Authority's observations (T/OBS.5/71), for the Council would no doubt wish to consider those two documents in connexion with its examination of the general situation in the Territory.

Next he would like to congratulate the Special Representative, whose intimate knowledge of the situation, background of experience and readiness to answer all questions as fully as possible had been most helpful. Mr. Lefèvre's patience must have been tried by the endless repetition of questions; on behalf of the Committee, he apologized for that but pointed out that it was to some extent unavoidable, owing to the difficulty of examining petitions in the petitioners' absence. There had been no intention to cast aspersions on the Administering Authority.

In May 1955 there had been some serious incidents in certain parts of the Cameroons under French Administration which had led the French Government to dissolve three local political organizations, the UPC, the JDC (Jeunesse démocratique camerounaise) and the UDEFEC (Union démocratique des femmes camerounaises). Since the outbreak of the disorders, the United Nations had been

(The Chairman)

deluged with petitions from the dissolved organizations and their political opponents.

The petitions from the dissolved organizations contained complaints concerning the repression of their organizations by the Administration, police searches of UPC offices, prohibition of UPC gatherings and the breaking up of UPC meetings by the police, judicial proceedings against UPC members on such charges as slander and libel, exclusion of the UPC from the commissions appointed to revise the electoral lists, reinstatement of the indigénat system, interference with UPC mail, inadequate official protection of the UPC when attacked, mass arrests, expulsion of UPC members and their families from the Territory, imprisonment, beatings and police excesses resulting in 5,000 fatalities, the departure of 20,000 inhabitants from their homes as refugees, and the destruction of thousands of huts. The UPC had further accused the Administration of bringing in troops from outside the Trust Territory and of bombing the Territory from the air.

In their petitions, the political and other organizations which were in opposition to the UPC, as also certain traditional chiefs and elders, had asked for the punishment of the UPC, which in their opinion bore sole responsibility for the incidents. They had further requested that French trusteeship should be continued until independence could be secured with friendly relations with France, that farms, railways, bridges and other public utilities should be protected, that peace and normal conditions should be speedily restored, that more schools and colleges should be established and that increased facilities should be provided for training Africans for responsible positions.

He would like to say at the outset that the complaints and statements both of the UPC and of its opponents had contained a great deal of exaggeration.

(The Chairman)

The Administering Authority, in its turn, had attributed to the UPC and its affiliated organs the entire responsibility for the incidents. According to it, the UPC had been established in 1947 as a branch of the RDA (Rassemblement démocratique africain) but had broken away from the parent body in 1950, because of internal differences. Its main political objectives had been unification of the two Cameroons and independence. It had functioned like any other political organization until early in 1955, when it had begun to agitate for immediate independence. According to the Special Representative, its membership had been about 8,000, while the party itself had claimed about 30,000 members. Its influence had been confined to about 5 per cent of the total area of the Territory, in which about 8 per cent of the population lived. To be more specific, it had been active at Douala and Yaoundé and in the Mungo and the Sanaga-Maritime Regions. Its membership had been said to include a sprinkling of intellectuals, subordinate officials, members of the liberal professions, persons from private business, sections of labour and other detribalized elements; from the ethnic point of view, the Bassa tribe had provided a substantial number of its members. While the party itself had not professed any particular ideology, it had carefully exploited, in the town, the prevailing discontent among labour, the civil service and commercial employment, while in the rural areas it had criticized the high rate of market dues and other taxation, the low prices of coffee and cocoa and the conduct of land cases. There had been no UPC representatives in the French National Assembly or the Territorial Assembly, but there had been several UPC men in the municipal assemblies. Opposition to the party had come largely from the traditional elements, the northern tribes and certain political organizations such as the Front National, ESO CAM and INDECAM.

According to the Administering Authority, the UPC had had a carefully worked out plan to seize power by force. It had had all the necessary paraphernalia, such as a leadership training school, secret cells, publications and bulletins for propaganda purposes, radio sets, precision cameras, a special system of mail relaying, shock troops and an assortment of weapons from nail-studded clubs to

(The Chairman)

shotguns. The campaign had been waged in two stages. From March to the middle of April, the UPC had been engaged in preparing the people psychologically by propaganda against the Government, by fomenting racial hatred, by reviving traditional practices and opposing missionary activities and lastly by claiming United Nations support for the party's cause - using the United Nations flag and disseminating propaganda about the United Nations favourable to the party. The second stage, from mid-April to the end of May, had opened with the organization of demonstrations and strikes and the party had dispatched active members to other areas to hold meetings and recruit members. In the course of those activities it had met with strong opposition from anti-UPC and traditional elements and many clashes had ensued, police intervention having sometimes been necessary to protect UPC members. Nevertheless the UPC had continued to cause trouble by defying the law, organizing illegal meetings and demonstrations on public highways and attacking anti-UPC meetings. It was interesting to recall that in April, before the final phase, the UPC had met with failure at Mbanga and Bafoussam, where it had been attacked by hostile elements. According to the Administering Authority, that had been regarded as a set-back by the UPC, since two of its leaders - Um Nyobé and Abel Kingué - had been involved, and it had consequently felt obliged to organize reprisals.

It was necessary to bear those circumstances in mind, for they established an historical connexion and perhaps also provided a clue to the origin of the provocation. 22 May had marked the beginning of a series of incidents in various places, starting at Mbanga, Douala and Yaoundé. Meetings had been organized on public highways, followed by police attempts to disperse them. That in turn had led to resistance by UPC followers, who had attacked the police with a motley collection of weapons. Vehicles had been set on fire and there had been casualties on both sides. At Douala there had been demonstrations against anti-UPC organizations, particularly the Front National, and that had led to clashes between the parties. The UPC had apparently regarded the incidents of 22 May as a modest

(The Chairman)

victory, for on the following day there had been similar incidents characterized by inflammatory speeches and armed attacks on the police. Members of the UPC had marched about in the streets in military formations, carrying such weapons as knives and cudgels. On 24 May, there had been attacks on certain prisons, administrative buildings and police stations in the Mungo Region. On 25 May the Loum prison and administrative station had been attacked by UPC members; at Douala, the prison, the administrative buildings and the radio station had been attacked, twenty vehicles had been set on fire and Europeans and non-UPC Africans had been attacked. The police had been obliged to open fire and there had been some casualties. Similar incidents had taken place at Yaoundé on 26 May and the police had again had to use firearms. In the Sanaga-Maritime Region, some bridges had been destroyed, some roads had been barricaded and the administrative buildings had been besieged.

The High Commissioner had ordered a curfew in the disturbed localities and had called on the army for assistance. The Committee had been informed that the army had never been in action, although it had been available for any emergencies. About 450 police had been utilized in the entire operation and 120 soldiers had been obtained from French Equatorial Africa. In all, 565 persons had been arrested, of whom 346 were still under detention pending trial. Twenty-six persons had been killed, including twenty-one UPC demonstrators, four civilians and one policeman. The wounded had included 114 UPC demonstrators, thirteen civilians and sixty-two members of the police force. Two Europeans had been killed and eleven wounded. Calm had been restored towards the end of May and on 13 July 1955 the French Government had announced the dissolution of the UPC and the other two bodies.

The Committee had heard the bare story as told by the UPC, its opponents and the Administering Authority. It was not easy to know what to make of that composite picture. There had clearly been a great deal of exaggeration on the part of the petitioners. Many of their allegations had been adequately answered by the observations of the Administering Authority and the Special Representative. For

(The Chairman)

example, there seemed little truth in the allegation that the UPC had been excluded from the commissions appointed to revise the electoral lists, or that the indigénat system had been reintroduced. There was also no truth in the allegation that 5,000 people had died and that thousands of huts had been destroyed, or that members of the UPC had been expelled from the Territory. Quite obviously, no aircraft had been used by the Government to drop bombs and no United Nations submarine had been lying in wait to help the UPC.

Apart from those patently false allegations, there were certain others which were true, as for example those regarding judicial proceedings against UPC members, censorship of UPC mail, police searches of UPC offices and Police action at UPC meetings. It must be realized, however, that those allegations referred to certain actions by the Government which in its opinion were justified; upon those he had no comments to offer. He must however deplore in the strongest terms the misuse of the United Nations and its symbols by the UPC for its own partisan ends: that tendency had to be checked in the interests of the entire Trusteeship System. The dissemination of information regarding the United Nations and its proper role in a Trust Territory was obviously the function of the Administering Authority and he found it extraordinary that the UPC had been allowed so much latitude in misrepresenting the United Nations and its symbols for the party's own ends. He hoped the Visiting Mission would examine that aspect of the situation and make recommendations with a view to preventing the recurrence of such an unfortunate situation.

So far as the incidents themselves were concerned, certain facts emerged from a study of the documents. There had been clashes between the UPC and other political parties, leading in many instances to violence. It was difficult to see who had been responsible for the clashes: provocation had sometimes been provided by the UPC but it was quite likely that the anti-UPC elements might have contributed their share. It was unfortunate that political parties had behaved in that degenerate fashion. It being, of course, the responsibility of the Administering Authority to promote the political development of the inhabitants,

greater vigilance and guidance were clearly necessary to ensure that political organizations developed along the right democratic lines with due regard for freedom of speech and assembly.

Another fact that emerged quite clearly was that the UPC had actually organized meetings on the public highway, in defiance of the law. Organizers of such meetings had been brought to trial and suitably punished. The Administering Authority appeared also to have evidence to show that members of the UPC, numbering two or three hundred, had marched in military formation carrying clubs, knives and other dangerous weapons; there had been two instances in which such armed bands, under the leadership of Moumié and Kingué, had attacked bridges, destroyed vehicles and laid siege to administrative buildings. During the first three days of the incidents which had begun on 22 May, the Administering Authority had shown commendable restraint in withholding fire, even though, unfortunately, there had been some casualties. He felt, however, that the Administration and police had been inadequately prepared for the incidents. It was conceivable that greater vigilance, negotiations and preventive measures taken at an early stage might have averted the subsequent incidents, or at any rate lessened their gravity. There had obviously been poor co-ordination and bad intelligence. It was commendable that the casualties had been kept so low and it was fortunate that the extent of damage caused to property appeared to be small, though no accurate assessment had yet been made. He noticed, however, that in November 1955 there had still been some 346 people under detention, awaiting trial, though a number of them might perhaps have been tried since then. It would obviously be advisable to reduce the period of detention to the minimum. It was quite likely that in the majority of the cases those arrested had not been guilty of any serious misdemeanour but had been misled by misguided leaders. It was unfortunate that some of the leaders responsible for the incidents had escaped and could not as yet be brought to trial. From the legal point of view, it was not clear whether there was sufficient evidence upon which to bring them to trial, even had it been

(The Chairman)

possible to apprehend them. However that might be, the people had obviously been misled and the demonstrators who had been arrested were entitled to an early trial. It was to be hoped that the Administering Authority would review the entire situation with a view to speeding up the trial of those still under detention. He noted with interest that the Administering Authority was now pursuing a policy of tranquillization and he hoped that policy would lead to the rapid stabilization of the situation in the Cameroons under French administration.

With reference to the Government's decision to dissolve the three political parties concerned, it was necessary to bear in mind certain important facts. Firstly, the UPC had not had any clear-cut plan of revolt to take over the Government of the Territory. According to the Special Representative himself, no precise plan of action had been discovered, but the documents seized had indicated that orders had been issued for attacks on vehicles, political opponents and police. On the other hand, UPC leaders had made inflammatory statements and had organized their members in units resembling military formations, armed with an assortment of locally available weapons. That action of the UPC might bring it within the purview of the Act of 1936, under which political parties that organized military formations were to be dissolved.

Whatever legal justification there might be for the dissolution of the UPC, it was necessary to remember that though the situation had been very grave it had quickly been brought under control. A state of emergency had never been proclaimed, though the curfew had been imposed on certain days. The casualties had been relatively small, as had been the number of persons arrested. The extent of damage caused to property could not be said to be very large.

He was somewhat troubled by the fact that no proper inquiry had been instituted into the incidents immediately after they had occurred: a commission of inquiry, headed by a judge, might have been expected and it might have been more satisfactory to dissolve the party on the basis of recommendations by such a commission. It was surprising too, that the Territorial Assembly had not discussed the incidents;

(The Chairman)

perhaps it was not empowered to do so. Those omissions somehow detracted from the gravity of the incidents. It was also difficult to see why the UDEFEC had been dissolved, for there had been no evidence to suggest that that women's organization had had armed groups.

So far as he had been able to ascertain, the particular Act of 1936 which provided for the dissolution of political parties had seldom, if ever, been invoked in French Overseas Territories. It had been enacted for meeting the threat of fascist groups in another era; in a historical sense it was obsolete and it clearly required revision, particularly for the purposes of application in a Territory under the International Trusteeship System. The Administering Authority had itself admitted that the dissolution of the party was an extreme step. Whatever the merits of the case might be, the UPC had been a large party and its disappearance from the political scene had doubtless created a major vacuum in the political life of the Territory. It was unfortunate that it had been necessary to dissolve a political party in the early years of the growth of political organizations in the Trust Territory, where until 1946 political organizations of any kind had been altogether banned. The dissolution of the party was indicative of a deep-seated political malaise that had to be overcome, not only by rapidly normalizing the political situation but also by the introduction of reforms which must be imaginative in scope and must pay due attention to the political advances made in the neighbouring countries. He did not consider the present reforms adequate to the situation; if another extreme manifestation of political unrest was to be avoided, the Administering Authority must show greater political initiative.

Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that document T/C.2/L.197 dealt with more than 200 petitions containing complaints against the Administering Authority in connexion with the events that had occurred in the Territory in May and June and the following months of 1955. The petitioners complained that in April and May of that year, certain organizations of the indigenous

(Mr. Bendryshev, USSR)

inhabitants had experienced difficulties in holding meetings and assemblies. Meetings had been broken up on one pretext or another, sometimes by force; there had been interference by members of other organizations and the police and local authorities were alleged to have arrived too late to prevent those occurrences. In preparing recommendations, the Secretariat should draft a paragraph expressing regret that the right to hold meetings was not secured for all political parties and organizations in the Cameroons under French administration, one result being that meetings called by organizations and parties of the indigenous inhabitants were dispersed and broken up. That was especially necessary, since in its resolution 1055 (XIV) on a petition from the same Territory the Trusteeship Council had emphasized the need to ensure the freedom of political parties to hold meetings.

Consideration of the petitions revealed that the Administering Authority had imposed a series of restrictions on the sending of mail by the indigenous inhabitants, including telegrams to the United Nations: that was an infringement of the indigenous inhabitants' right to send petitions to the United Nations. The recommendations to the Council should include an expression of regret that the right of petition had been violated by the imposition of restrictions on the sending of telegrams by the indigenous inhabitants to the United Nations. The Administering Authority had also imposed restrictions on the delivery of mail to a series of social organizations, including the trade union organization, the CGT: that too was a violation of the indigenous inhabitants' rights which should be mentioned in the recommendations with an expression of regret.

It was evident from the petitions and from the Administering Authority's observations that the indigenous inhabitants had been fired on, with the result that many persons had been killed and wounded. That fact could not be passed over without comment and the recommendations should include an appropriate expression of regret.

As the representative of India had pointed out and as was apparent from the petitions, most of those who had been arrested in May and June 1955 were still in prison awaiting trial. The recommendations should include an appropriate expression of regret.

In July 1955, the Administering Authority had dissolved a number of organizations of the indigenous inhabitants which had as their aim the achievement of

the independence and unification of the Cameroons. The Administering Authority had admitted in its reports that they had been among the leading organizations in the Territory. The recommendations should express regret at the dissolution of such organizations of the indigenous inhabitants.

It should be pointed out in the recommendations that such measures were not in accordance with the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement and violated the fundamental rights of the indigenous inhabitants. Article 5 of the Trusteeship Agreement provided that the Administering Authority was bound to arrange appropriate measures to enable the inhabitants freely to express their opinions and ensure the attainment of the objectives prescribed in Article 76 of the Charter, objectives which included in particular the development of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories towards self-government or independence. Hence it was necessary to recommend that the Administering Authority should take all necessary measures to restore to the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territory, in accordance with the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement, the free exercise of their right of freedom of assembly, freedom to establish organizations and the real and free exercise of all democratic liberties.

The petitions included a number of individual complaints. On those, the Secretariat should prepare separate resolutions containing recommendations for appropriate action in accordance with the suggestions made by the members of the Committee.

The meeting was suspended at 3.40 p.m. and resumed at 4.15 p.m.

Mr. SERAPHIN (Haiti) associated himself with the Chairman's well-deserved tribute to the Special Representative.

The impression that emerged from a study of the working paper was that a very uneasy atmosphere prevailed in the Territory. The Committee had not sufficient information to assess the causes of the disquiet that had culminated in the May incidents. The Administering Authority claimed that the events had taken place in accordance with a plan of campaign prepared by the UPC leaders and that the way in which they had been synchronized testified to the existence of an efficient organization. The petitioners, on the other hand, placed the whole blame on the Administration, the High Commissioner's policy and the hostile and provocative attitude of the French colonists in the Territory. It was a pity that the recent

(Mr. Seraphin, Haiti)

Visiting Mission had not been in a position to make a thorough investigation of the incidents on the spot, by granting hearings to all the parties concerned and examining the incriminating evidence collected by the Administration. The Committee might then have had an idea of the true situation. He stressed that his delegation did not doubt the truth of the Administering Authority's statements but it was only just that the Committee should heed the petitioners' complaints also. While the petitioners had undoubtedly exaggerated, their allegations could not be entirely dismissed as false.

Certain facts were reported by the Administering Authority and the petitioners alike. Firstly, there was the dissolution of the UPC and its two affiliates. While reserving its position on the dissolution of the UPC, which was blamed for the violence that had occurred, his delegation could not understand why the Jeunesse démocratique camerounaise (JDC) and the Union des Femmes camerounaises (UDEFEC), which had taken no active or direct part in any of the acts of violence, had been banned. The Administering Authority was responsible for ensuring the free development of political and civil liberties and it should have limited itself to taking legal action against the authors of the disturbances and refrained from dissolving the JDC and UDEFEC. Secondly, the police had opened fire on several occasions with resulting loss of life. They had, however, been under orders not to shoot except in self-defence. Thirdly, as the Special Representative agreed, there was some delay in bringing to trial the persons arrested as a result of the disorders; many people were still in prison pending trial. Fourthly, the Administration had imposed measures of censorship which were, to say the least, unusual. House searches had been conducted, often in the absence of the owners and without warrants having been issued. Fifthly, preferential treatment had been accorded to the members of anti-UPC groups. When clashes had occurred between members of the UPC and anti-UPC elements, only the members of the UPC had been arrested and tried, the members of other groups going unmolested. It was difficult to understand the Administration's attitude in that respect; it would have been more natural for the Administration, as the guardian of life and property in the Territory and the authority responsible for maintaining law and order, to punish the

(Mr. Seraphin, Haiti)

members of the UPC and the anti-UPC elements alike. Lastly, bloodshed had undoubtedly occurred in April and May 1955. His delegation lacked sufficient information to pass an objective judgement on the incidents as a whole, but, no matter who was responsible, it strongly condemned all action conducive to violence as being against the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement.

In conclusion, he assured the French representative that the facts he had enumerated should not be considered in the nature of an indictment against French policy in the Trust Territory. On the contrary he had mentioned them only because he was convinced that the Administering Authority would take steps to remedy them and to promote the advancement of the Trust Territory in accordance with the great French traditions of liberty, equality and fraternity.

Mr. HAMILTON (Australia) joined previous speakers in paying a warm tribute to the Special Representative. He endorsed the Chairman's commendation of the working paper prepared by the Secretariat.

He had prepared a number of proposals, taking into account the views expressed in the Committee, and he hoped that they would provide a basis for agreement. The proposals represented an attempt to reconcile the many opinions expressed in the Committee rather than a precise reflection of his own delegation's views. They were intended for incorporation in a single draft resolution designed to cover the bulk of the petitions in document T/C.2/L.197. As the Chairman had said, many of the petitioners' complaints were adequately covered by the Administering Authority's observations. The Special Representative's statements in the Committee had shed further light on the situation. He therefore proposed that the draft resolution should transmit to the petitioners the observations of the Administering Authority and an extensive summary of the Special Representative's remarks.

The draft resolution should note the following facts:

1. The incidents had occurred within a limited period of time between 22 and 28 May 1955 in a strictly limited area and the participants had represented numerically only a very small proportion of the population of the localities concerned.

(Mr. Hamilton, Australia)

2. According to the Special Representative, it had been within the limits of that area alone that the UPC had been able to enlist significant popular support.
3. In most instances the incidents had been initiated by armed attacks on the part of UPC supporters upon the persons or property of members of Cameroonian political organizations to which the UPC was opposed and had been characterized by attacks upon officers or property of the Administration.
4. In no instance had military units used firearms and, wherever military units had been used, they had operated strictly under the control of the civil authorities.
5. Orders for the police to open fire upon rioters had been given in all cases by senior civil officials.
6. In no circumstances had firearms been used by the police except to prevent physical assault upon the Administration's officials themselves, nor had firearms been used on any occasion by the authorities until at least the minimum statutory warnings had been given.
7. Notwithstanding the fact that the disorders had been instigated by groups of armed men and that one law enforcement officer had been killed and sixty-two wounded by the rioters, the casualties known to have been suffered by the groups instigating the disorders had numbered no more than twenty-one killed and 114 wounded.
8. No state of siege had been declared in the Territory at any stage during or after the disorders and curfews had been imposed in two places only, for periods not exceeding five days.
9. In the course, and as a consequence, of the disorders, 545 persons had been arrested by the Administering Authority by 30 November 1955; of them 346 still remained to be brought to trial. If the Special Representative had any later information, those figures could be amended accordingly.
10. The Administering Authority was contemplating early measures of indulgence.

The draft resolution should express the hope that investigations into the cases of persons under arrest would be accelerated and that persons awaiting trial would be brought to trial as soon as possible. It should note that in no instance had persons been tried or sentenced in connexion with the disorders except in accordance with the established civil procedure of French law.

(Mr. Hamilton, Australia)

The draft resolution should also note the Special Representative's statement that, with regard to ex-members and ex-supporters of the former UPC and affiliated organizations, it was the Administering Authority's policy that from the juridical point of view action should be taken against persons only in respect of offences against the law committed in the course of the disorders and that in no circumstances would action be taken or be allowed to be taken against any person on grounds of former membership in or support for the political organizations which had been dissolved. As a matter of general policy the Administering Authority regarded the majority of those who had participated in the disorders as having been misled by their leaders, upon whom the responsibility for the disorders was recognized as resting. Such persons who were at present in fear of arbitrary reprisals from any quarter in the Territory on account of their former support of the UPC or affiliated organizations were assured of the Administering Authority's full protection against illegal acts which might be directed against them from any quarter.

The draft resolution should express regret that certain political organizations in the Territory, which the Administering Authority had subsequently found it necessary to dissolve, had attempted to pursue political ends by the use of armed force. It was to be hoped that in future all political organizations in the Territory would pursue their aims by exclusively peaceful means, in a spirit of mutual toleration and with full respect for the rights of freedom of speech and assembly. It was regrettable that certain political groups in the Territory had falsely claimed the support of the United Nations exclusively for themselves and for their partisan policies and activities.

The draft resolution should then note with satisfaction the assurance of the Administering Authority that in no circumstances in the course of the disorders had its officials departed from either the spirit or the letter of the Charter or the Trusteeship Agreement.

It should note that, since the dissolution of the UPC and directly affiliated organizations, formerly inactive as well as active sectors of the population had, with the Administering Authority's encouragement, manifested an increasing interest and participation in the Territory's political development. It should express

(Mr. Hamilton, Australia)

confidence that the Administering Authority's policy of tranquillization, together with the vigorous pursuit of programmes of reform and general political development, would bring to an end the tensions which had characterized the Territory's political life in recent years.

Lastly, the draft resolution should suggest to the petitioners who had submitted complaints in connexion with the disturbances that, if they had not already done so and if they wished to pursue the matter further, they should bring their complaints to the direct attention of the Administering Authority. The petitioners should be invited to identify themselves and to submit additional information regarding their complaints.

Mr. SCHEYVEN (Belgium) associated himself with previous speakers in paying a tribute to the Special Representative.

He endorsed the Australian representative's proposals.

With regard to the Haitian representative's regret that the Visiting Mission had not investigated the May incidents, he pointed out that the Mission had not been asked for a specific report on the incidents. Nevertheless, he could assure the Committee that there had been no conspiracy of silence with regard to the incidents and that the Mission had been able to make any inquiries it wished. As a member of the Mission he had taken numerous notes about the disturbances during interviews with French officials and representatives of the various political parties. He had also examined photographs of the weapons seized by the Administration and had therefore felt that there was no need to examine the weapons themselves.

Mr. SERAPHIN (Haiti) said that some misunderstanding had arisen. He had not intended to cast aspersions on the Visiting Mission's competence but felt that it was regrettable that its terms of reference had not called for a special inquiry into the May incidents.

Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he did not wish to discuss the terms of reference and activities of the Visiting Mission which had been to the Cameroons under French administration, and of which Mr. Scheyven, the Belgian representative, had been a member, because the Visiting Mission's report would be considered by the Trusteeship Council at its forthcoming session. It was to be hoped that all such questions would be clarified during the discussion of the report now being prepared by the members of the Visiting Mission and, in particular, that, in their report, the members of the Mission would be able to dispel the confusion which had arisen in connexion with recent petitions from the Cameroons under French administration which contained assertions that members of the Visiting Mission had refused to accept petitions from certain public organizations, groups and individual indigenous inhabitants and that many indigenous inhabitants, on attempting to pass their petitions to the Visiting Mission, had in some manner been handed over to the local authorities and placed under arrest.

The Committee discussed the form of its report and resolution or resolutions on the petitions dealt with in document T/C.2/I.197. It decided to postpone any final decision thereon until it had before it the draft report prepared by the Secretariat.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.