

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**

THIRTEENTH SESSION
 Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE 859th
 MEETING**

Monday, 2 March 1959,
 at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 13: The future of the Trust Territories of the Cameroons under French administration and the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration: special re- port of the Trusteeship Council (continued)	
Hearing of petitioners (continued)	621

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

AGENDA ITEM 13

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

HEARING OF PETITIONERS (continued)

At the invitation of the Chairman, the petitioners took
 places at the Committee table.

1. Mr. Théodore MAYI MATIP (Anciens maquisards, détenus politiques et réfugiés) said that the section of the people and the youth of the Cameroons whom he represented before the Committee were still suffering from the events of 1955 and from all the violence which had marked political life in the Cameroons since that date. As a youth leader and former member of the resistance, he was well informed about events in the Cameroons in general and in the Sanaga-Maritime in particular. Since 1955 he had spent two years in various prisons in the Territory and the rest of the time in the maquis with the nationalist leader, Ruben Um Nyobé. He also represented the Union nationale des mères camerounaises (UNAMEC), which was the most representative women's movement legally operating in the Cameroons.

2. The prisoners, the homeless and the unemployed, victims of repression, had sent him to New York to describe their sufferings, to express their faith in the United Nations and to voice their ardent desire to live after 1 January 1960 in a free and democratic Cameroons, truly independent and fully sovereign.

3. Those whom he represented would wish the Cameroonian Government, the Administering Authorities and all the petitioners, whatever their views, to endeavour to make the present session of the General Assembly a milestone on the road to reconciliation and national unity. They might have denounced the Administering Authorities and those Cameroonians who seemed to have treason in their hearts and nationalism on their lips, but the time had come to use every means

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

to create an atmosphere of general security. He would therefore confine himself to making concrete proposals and suggestions to the Fourth Committee regarding steps to be taken before 1 January 1960 for the realization of national independence and sovereignty.

4. The aim of those whom he represented was and had always been to unite the Cameroonians with a view to the more rapid development of the people and the raising of their standard of living. Ruben Um Nyobé had said that the chief requisite for success was unity. To that end he had appealed to all Cameroonians, both men and women, regardless of class, religion or political persuasion, to accept the nationalist anti-colonialist programme. Mr. Mayi Matip and those he represented acknowledge, as Ruben Um Nyobé had done, the interdependence of the peoples of the world in accordance with the United Nations Charter, and he had warned his people of the dangers of interracial hatred.

5. Those whom he represented, whether former members of the resistance, prisoners, former prisoners or political refugees, were all nationalists. They intended to continue their activity in favour of the reunification and independence of the Cameroons, to denounce everything which was contrary to the interest of the peoples of the Cameroons and to help the masses to organize for the defence of their rights.

6. At the present time there were three obstacles to be overcome: colonialism; the opportunism of the Right, marked by lack of understanding, bad faith and self-interest; and the opportunism of the Left, a would-be super-nationalism which ignored reality and political facts. Those obstacles, however, were not insurmountable. Unity and national reconciliation could be achieved if all Cameroonians were allowed to return to their country and if the objectives to which they aspired were authorized by the re-establishment of the Union des populations du Cameroun (UPC), the Union démocratique des femmes camerounaises (UDEFEC) and the Jeunesse démocratique du Cameroun (JDC). That was an essential prerequisite to the realization of national independence and sovereignty.

7. Upon their return from the maquis and from prison, he and those he represented had had one single aim: to work for the re-establishment of the UPC and the other national movements by eradicating anything which might be used as a pretext for describing the UPC as a para-military organization. Such action was a fitting response to the appeals and promises made by the Prime Minister, Mr. Ahidjo. From statements he had made on various occasions, the Prime Minister had seemed to be trying to represent the former members of the maquis as uncompromising fanatics pursuing a policy of "all or nothing" and struggling, not for the reunification and independence of the Cameroons, but for power for themselves. His attempt had failed, however, for the members of the resistance had proved

their good faith by leaving the maquis. That had not been a surrender but an act of political realism and a first step towards national reconciliation. They would do everything they could to achieve reconciliation and national unity, but it was not in their power to open the prison gates and to release the Cameroonians who had been incarcerated for months and years because they had striven for that independence which today was desired by all.

8. It might be asserted that those patriots had been kept in prison because of the violent methods used by the UPC. Such an argument was tantamount to declaring against reconciliation and national unity and acknowledging that, ten months before the attainment of national independence, the French and Cameroonian authorities were still determined to pursue a policy of oppression and hostility to the UPC, the JDC and the UDEFEC. That policy would lead neither to reconciliation nor to national unity and seemed therefore to be, as it were, a denial of the independence which all were awaiting on 1 January 1960.

9. He would not dwell on the conditions in which the prisoners had been kept or the manner in which they had been arrested, interrogated, tried and detained. The time had come to think of the future and to tackle the task that lay ahead, the achievement of independence. For that purpose he hoped to help to create an atmosphere free of passion in which the past could be forgotten and all could strive for the realization of national sovereignty. He hoped that immediately after the current session the Cameroonian Government and the Administering Authority would make every effort to abandon the persecution of the national movement, whose only crime was to have organized the Cameroonian people in the struggle for independence and reunification. He could not believe that the Administering Authority and the Cameroonian Government would fail to ensure that the UPC, the JDC and the UDEFEC should be present with their fellow Cameroonians on 1 January 1960.

10. Those whom he represented endorsed the arguments which had been put forward in favour of the dissolution of the present Legislative Assembly, and the enactment of a full, total and unconditional amnesty before the holding of a general election. They welcomed the amnesty law which had just been passed by the Legislative Assembly,^{1/} for though not entirely satisfactory it represented a great step forward.

11. The removal of the ban on the UPC was essential; an amnesty in the Cameroons was meaningless unless it included the abrogation of the decree dissolving the UPC, the UDEFEC and the JDC. If such an amnesty were enacted, the members of the UPC would abjure any sort of revenge and would undertake to co-operate with the authorities in the maintenance of public order.

12. With regard to the desirability of a general election before the proclamation of independence, he maintained that by-elections in certain regions would not be a satisfactory solution. There was great and genuine anxiety in the Cameroons on that subject.

13. The French Minister of State had informed the Committee at its 849th meeting that on 1 January 1960 the State of the Cameroons would possess the full attributes of a sovereign State and that France would sponsor its application for admission to the United

^{1/} See A/C.4/395.

Nations. According to Le Monde of 27 February 1959, Mr. Ahidjo, the Prime Minister, had stated that when the Cameroons became independent, it would not ask to be integrated into the French Community. Those statements might contribute to the achievement of reunification before 1 January 1960, which was so much to be desired.

14. Mr. Jacques NGOM (Union générale des travailleurs kamerunais) said that on 7 and 8 February 1959 a conference organized by the two largest trade unions in the Cameroons, the Confédération générale camerounaise du Travail (CGKT) and the Union des syndicats autonomes du Cameroun (USAC), and attended by representatives of all the trade unions in the Territory, with the exception of the CASL/Force Ouvrière, had been held at Douala. At the conclusion of the conference the organization which he represented (UGTK) had been formed, consisting of the following trade unions: the CGKT, the USAC, the Fédération nationale des syndicats des enseignants du Cameroun, the Fédération nationale des fonctionnaires et travailleurs publics du Cameroun, and the Union camerounaise des travailleurs croyants. The Confédération camerounaise des syndicats croyants had not joined the organization but had adopted its national programme and expressed itself in favour of the unity of action which it advocated. As the CGKT had requested a hearing (A/C.4/394, sec.4) before the UGTK had been formed, it had authorized the latter to speak for it. In doing so, the UGTK was speaking for the great majority of workers and peasants in the Cameroons. It was entirely independent of the Government and of any political party.

15. He would confine his remarks to the national problem in the Cameroons as the UGTK saw it, since another representative was to speak on economic and social questions. The trade unions forming the UGTK had always considered that the struggle to improve conditions for the workers and peasants in the Cameroons was inextricably linked with the struggle for national independence and reunification. The resolution adopted by the conference at which the UGTK had been formed called for an amnesty, reunification, independence and the termination of the Trusteeship Agreements.

16. The trade unions had been in the forefront of the groups which had been pressing for a complete amnesty and the UGTK was happy to see that a favourable start in that direction had recently been made. Unfortunately, the amnesty adopted by the Legislative Assembly on 14 February 1959 was only a partial one. The people of the Bassa Region, which had been the principal scene of the tragic events of the past few years, had held a meeting of the Congrès du relèvement du peuple bassa at Eséka on 13 December 1958, in which representatives of all political and trade-union groups and of both those in the maquis and the groups opposing them had solemnly proclaimed a general reconciliation. The Cameroonian Government should follow that example by proclaiming a complete and unconditional amnesty to all Cameroonians charged with political offences. That should include repeal of the decree outlawing the UPC and its affiliates.

17. The UGTK saw no reason for holding a referendum on the question of reunification. As the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, 1958, had observed in its report on the Cameroons

under French administration (T/1427 and T/1434²), the entire population of that Territory wanted reunification, and the general election which had just taken place in the Southern Cameroons under British administration had brought victory to the party favouring the same objective. Cameroonian public opinion overwhelmingly desired that the United Nations should adopt a resolution unconditionally proclaiming the reunification of the two parts of the Cameroons. The UGTK would also protest vigorously against any attempt to detach the Northern Cameroons under British administration and incorporate it into Nigeria, for to do so would be to create a source of conflict between the new States of the Cameroons and Nigeria. The United Nations, one of whose objects was to preserve peace throughout the world, could not be a party to such a development without violating its own Charter. To facilitate the solution of the problem of the Cameroons as a whole, reunification should be proclaimed before the date on which any part of the Cameroons acceded to independence.

18. All the political, traditional and trade-union organizations of the Territory, as well as the Legislative Assembly and the Cameroonian Government, had now expressed their desire for independence, the goal which, together with reunification, had been advocated by Mr. Um Nyobé when he had appeared before the Fourth Committee in 1952, during the seventh session of the General Assembly. If his words had been heeded at that time the country would have been spared the regrettable incidents of the past five years. With regard to the procedure by which the Cameroons should attain independence, the UGTK considered that as reunification should precede independence it was logical that the proclamation of independence should occur simultaneously in both parts of the country. The date chosen might well be 13 December 1959, the anniversary of the signature of the Trusteeship Agreements and as such a historic date for the Cameroons. The attainment of independence should not be subject to any commitment to join a particular community of nations.

19. The future constitution of an independent Cameroons should be drawn up after reunification. The legislatures of both Territories should be dissolved and an election should be held, prior to the attainment of independence, for a constituent assembly of the reunified Cameroons. The present Legislative Assembly of the Cameroons under French administration should not be transformed into a constituent assembly. To begin with such a procedure would prejudice the reunification of the two Territories. Furthermore, there were certain juridical considerations which disqualified it from adopting the constitution of an independent sovereign State. First, it had been elected as a Territorial Assembly without political competence; having been automatically transformed into a Legislative Assembly so that it could adopt the first Statute of partial self-government granted by France, it should then have been dissolved and replaced by a Legislative Assembly expressly elected as such under the provisions of the Statute itself. Secondly, article 6 of the new Statute which had gone into effect on 1 January 1959 (T/1427, annex II) stipulated that legislative powers were to be vested in an Assembly elected by universal direct and secret suffrage. Thirdly, the

present Legislative Assembly included among its members eight French citizens. The constitution of a sovereign country could not be drawn up and voted on by citizens of another country. Fourthly, seven seats in the present Legislative Assembly were vacant. It was probably only because the Visiting Mission had not had sufficient time to examine all aspects of the question of new elections that it had concluded they were not necessary. The trusteeship should not be terminated until the constituent assembly had been elected.

20. The UGTK's position on the matter of elections did not reflect any hostility towards the present Prime Minister but was simply a matter of logic and of respect for democratic procedure. Similarly, it was not taking a stand in favour of any particular party or person but was guided by what it understood to be the interests of the working masses and of the Cameroonians as a whole. The experience gained by the Cameroons during the years in which it had been under trusteeship would be wasted if at the very time when it attained independence democratic principles were not observed.

21. Mr. Joseph BINET (Union générale des travailleurs kamerunais) said that he would address himself to the economic and social problems confronting the Cameroons at the present crucial period. Independence would be meaningless for the Cameroonian workers if it were not accompanied by an appreciable improvement in their conditions of work and level of living: improved social legislation, increased purchasing power, revised family allowances, the elimination of racial discrimination in employment and wages, solution of the unemployment problem, the establishment of a social security system and so forth. The Cameroons had valuable natural resources but, like all colonial countries, its wealth was mainly agricultural. Its agricultural output had increased enormously in the past ten years. Industrial activity, however, was very limited although industries could be developed successfully if the requisite funds were available, as the experience of the Société d'aluminium du Cameroun (ALUCAM) showed. It was estimated that the production of beer, tobacco, aluminium articles, timber other than that exported, cocoa butter, clothing, soap and so forth would amount to a total value of 5,500 million francs, a figure 40 per cent higher than that for 1957.

22. Nevertheless, the Cameroonian workers were still among the most underpaid in that part of Africa. The minimum wage was 26.75 francs CFA per hour. The trade unions had been seeking for more than two years to have it raised to the modest level of 35.80 but the Government and the employers had refused to comply with that request. Only after a long struggle on the part of the trade unions had the family allowances been raised from 350 to 500 francs CFA per month for each child. The peasants continued to receive very low prices for their products and were often obliged to carry their produce on their heads for considerable distances for lack of cheap means of transport. The reasons why the living conditions of workers and peasants continued to be so unfavourable despite the great economic activity in the Cameroons were not hard to define: the refusal of the employers to meet trade-union demands; the squandering of public funds on huge salaries for deputies and ministers, and the effects on the Cameroons of monetary instability in France. A French Government decree in 1957, for example, had

²/ Transmitted to Members of the General Assembly by a note of the Secretary-General (A/4092).

automatically raised by 20 per cent the prices of imported products and the recent devaluation of the French franc had caused grave concern to the Cameroonian Chamber of Commerce and Industry. The budget for development of the Territory was decreasing from year to year. In 1958, for example, it had totaled 487,363,000 francs as compared with 722 million in 1957 and the budget for the current year provided for the investment of only 316,738,000 francs. One quarter of the labour force of the Cameroons was at present unemployed. Yet the Government would be obliged in the following year to bear the cost of the services transferred to it in the current year by the Administering Authority, which would amount to 250 million francs, as also the cost of diplomatic representation, military expenditure and so forth. The UGTK felt that the situation could be remedied only by a vast programme of industrialization, economic and social development, the elimination of waste in the handling of public finances, the investment of foreign capital with no political conditions attached, and technical and financial assistance from the United Nations.

23. Turning to social conditions, he said that the UGTK advocated the acceleration of the process of filling the higher posts in both the public and private sectors with Cameroonians, as a prerequisite for the attainment of independence. A progressive labour code adapted to the conditions prevailing in the Cameroons and guaranteeing democratic freedoms and the workers' right to join trade unions should be drawn up. The UGTK was ready to support the authorities to the fullest extent in the development of technical training, the eradication of illiteracy, the production of low-cost housing and the establishment of a comprehensive social security system. It would likewise appeal to the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) to intensify its activities in the Cameroons and to allow the trade unions to participate in its administration. It hoped that the States Members of the United Nations would increase the number of scholarships offered to Cameroonian students in technical and social subjects.

24. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that France would complete its good work in the Cameroons by heeding the wishes of the Cameroonian people and that the Cameroonian Government and Legislative Assembly would realize that the confidence of the people was their only guarantee of stability.

25. Mr. Albert MUKONG (National Union of Kamerun Students) said that he would confine himself to the recommendations made by the Visiting Mission, which unfortunately did not reflect the true state of affairs in the Cameroons. This was due to the limited time at the Mission's disposal and to the fact that, owing to threats of victimization, it had not been possible for all those who wished to address the Mission to do so.

26. With regard to the Cameroons under French administration, he considered that, in proposing that the Trusteeship Agreement should be terminated on the ground that the Territory would attain independence on 1 January 1960, the Visiting Mission had gone beyond its terms of reference. It had been asked to set forth its views on the procedure for organizing a consultation of the people, not to determine what those wishes were. What it was proposing was tantamount to asking the Committee to sign a blank cheque in favour of France, for he feared that the present Cameroonian Government would join the French Community once independ-

ence had been granted. The Trusteeship Agreement should not be terminated until the task of the United Nations was complete. The fact that the people of the Southern Cameroons under British administration had placed Mr. Foncha in power at the recent elections showed that they wished to be reunited with the Cameroons under French administration. His organization viewed the willingness of France to grant independence with some suspicion, which events in Guinea had done nothing to dispel.

27. He had no particular objection to a referendum in the Southern Cameroons, but he would remind the Committee that the original proposal had been that the elections might in certain circumstances be taken as decisive. At those elections, 75,000 persons had voted in favour of unification against 51,000 who had voted for integration; that was surely a decisive result and failure to consider it as such gave grounds for suspicion.

28. The Visiting Mission's recommendation, in paragraph 181 of its report on the Cameroons under British administration (T/1426 and Add.1^{3/}, that the Northern Cameroons should be integrated with the Federation of Nigeria was wholly untenable. To the knowledge of his organization, the majority of the people in the Northern Cameroons wished to be reunited with the Southern Cameroons and with the Cameroons under French administration. If more had not been heard of the views of such people, it was because the Northern Nigerian Government did not tolerate any talk of secession by the Northern Cameroons. The views expressed to the Committee by Milam Abdullahi were those of the Northern Nigerian Government, not those of the people; Malam Abdullahi had not fought his election on that issue and the very method by which he had been elected was open to question. It was certain that, in an election conducted under democratic principles, the majority of the people of the Northern Cameroons would vote for reunification. He urged the Committee to decide in favour of holding a plebiscite in that area; votes could be counted separately in the Northern and Southern Cameroons under British administration, and the decision left to the United Nations. It was illogical to accept the views of a few persons in the Northern Cameroons who had something at stake or who had been intimidated, yet not to accept the result of the election in the Southern Cameroons.

29. A referendum should be held throughout the Cameroons under British administration. In that connexion, freedom of speech, assembly and movement should be granted to all persons of Cameroonian origin regardless of the Trust Territory from which they came; the ban on certain parties and movements should be lifted; all Cameroonians in exile should be allowed to return and express their views; complete and unconditional amnesty should be granted to all political offenders in the French-administered Cameroons; and agreement should be reached immediately on the question to be put at the referendum and on the symbols to be used. In his view, the question should be "Do you want unification or not"; anyone voting "No" would be held to have voted in favour of integration with Nigeria. The decision on unification should not be left in the hands of the two Prime Ministers, and it would be dangerous to create a State of the Southern Cameroons. The referen-

^{3/} Transmitted to Members of the General Assembly by a note of the Secretary-General (A/4093/Rev.1).

dum should be on the basis of universal adult suffrage, and the women of the Northern Cameroons should not be excluded. All Cameroonians over eighteen years of age from either Territory should be allowed to vote. They should vote at their place of residence, subject to their having resided there continuously for six months. Arrangements should be made for Cameroonians who resided abroad to vote and their votes should be included with those cast at their place of origin or permanent residence. The referendum should be supervised by a large and fully representative United Nations commission, which should arrive in time for the registration of voters. The referendum should take place at a date which would enable reunification and independence to be achieved by January 1960. No Trusteeship Agreement covering any part of the Cameroons should be terminated before the commission had completed its work.

30. If the decision were in favour of reunification, the referendum commission should be reconstituted as a peace commission presided over by a United Nations commissioner for the Cameroons, who would maintain law and order in co-operation with the Administering Authorities. At the same time, all frontiers between the various Territories of the Cameroons would be abolished and a general election would be held throughout the Cameroons, under the supervision of the United Nations commission. Before the election, all parties would be given a period of not less than two months in which to make public statements about their programmes for a unified State of the Cameroons. The parties successful in the elections would then be invited to draw up a constitution for the whole country, with advice from the United Kingdom and France. Once that constitution had been passed by the central legislature, the leader of the majority party would form a Government and announce the independence of the country. Thereupon the United Nations commissioner, France and the United Kingdom would withdraw and the Trusteeship Agreements would be terminated.

31. In its earliest days, colonialism had been marked by a desire for raw materials rather than for domination. Subsequently, there had been a stage of oppression and subjection, but of late the colonial Powers had seen the need of granting to each Territory the right of self-determination—a development which had undoubtedly been brought about by pressure of opinion in the United Nations. Both the United Kingdom and France had now seen reason and he felt sure that the unified State of the Cameroons would wish to remain on the most cordial terms with both those countries, economic ties with which would be reviewed in the best interests of all parties concerned.

32. He would ask the members of the Committee to divest themselves of any preconceived opinions and to consider the problem of the reunification of the Cameroons in the light of the facts which had now been presented to them.

33. Mrs. SKOTTSBERG-AHMAN (Sweden) noted that both Mr. Moumié and Mr. Ngom were in favour of reunification before the attainment of independence yet both thought that independence should be granted within less than a year. Inasmuch as the question of reunification was not one which the Cameroons under French administration alone could decide and Mr. Foncha had said that his Government wanted to have time to consult Mr. Ahidjo's Government on the mat-

ter, she asked how the petitioners thought it would be possible to bring it about before the end of 1959. She also observed that Mr. Ngom's argument to the effect that there was no need for a plebiscite in the Cameroons under British administration on the question of reunification seemed to her to be tantamount to depriving the inhabitants of that Territory of their right of self-determination, for both Mr. Foncha and Mr. Endeley felt that in view of the sharp division of opinion among the population a plebiscite would be required.

34. Mr. MOUMIE (Union des populations du Cameroun) said that although Mr. Foncha had spoken of the need for a period of reflection he had not said how long it should be. Presumably the reason he requested it was that his people wanted time in which to ensure that a united Cameroons would not be integrated into the French Community. There was nothing in his statement to show that a plebiscite could not be held before the date on which the Cameroons under French administration was to attain its independence. Elections had been held in both parts of the Cameroons during the rainy season in the past.

35. Mr. NGOM (Union générale des travailleurs kamerunais) said that while he had not been present when Mr. Foncha had made his statement before the Committee he had heard a delegate of the latter's party to the trade-union conference held at Douala on 20 February 1959 say on behalf of the party that the people of the Cameroons under British administration desired reunification. The UGTK's position was that, as the League of Nations had confirmed the arbitrary division of the Cameroons without consulting its people, the United Nations, as its successor, should remedy that injustice. The most expeditious way to do so would be to adopt a resolution re-establishing the frontiers of the Cameroons as they had existed at the end of the First World War. Surely Mr. Foncha, whose electoral campaign slogan had been reunification, should not object if the United Nations simplified his task by adopting such a resolution. Furthermore, the newly elected House of Assembly of the Southern Cameroons had adopted a resolution in favour of secession from Nigeria. As for the argument that the inhabitants of the Northern Cameroons under British administration wanted integration with Nigeria, the Committee had just heard a petitioner from the British-administered part of the Cameroons state that the people of the Northern Cameroons wanted reunification with the rest of the Cameroons. In view of all those circumstances he saw no conflict between the UGTK's position and that of Mr. Foncha.

36. Mr. SPACIL (Czechoslovakia) asked Mr. Mayi Matip what was the strength of the women's organization on whose behalf he had spoken.

37. Mr. MAYI MATIP (Anciens maquisards, détenus politiques et réfugiés) said that the Union nationale des mères camerounaises, which was the largest women's organization in the Cameroons under French administration, had several thousand members and was particularly well organized in Sanaga-Maritime and the areas of Yaoundé and Douala. A recently formed organization, it had the same programme as the outlawed UDEFEC. Its mimeographed newspaper *La Maman* was the first women's publication in the Cameroons.

38. Mr. SPACIL (Czechoslovakia) asked if he was correct in thinking that the UDEFEC had been the first women's organization in the Territory.

39. Mr. MAYI MATIP (Anciens maquisards, détenus politiques et réfugiés) replied in the affirmative.

40. Mr. SPACIL (Czechoslovakia) asked Mr. Ngom what percentage of the workers and peasants of the Cameroons were represented by the UGTK.

41. Mr. NGOM (Union générale des travailleurs kamerunais) replied that although it was difficult to ascertain the membership of a newly established organization such as the UGTK it was possible on the basis of the size of the trade unions which belonged to it to estimate that it had over 50,000 members.

42. Mr. UDOVICHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he understood the French representative to have stated in reply to a question by the Lebanese representative at the previous meeting that French troops would remain in the Territory for an indefinite period, whereas during the twenty-third session of the Trusteeship Council (954th meeting) he had said that such troops had already been withdrawn. He asked if the French representative could explain that apparent contradiction.

43. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) replied that his statement in the Trusteeship Council had referred to the troops temporarily brought into Sanaga-Maritime and subsequently withdrawn. The 1,200 French troops remaining in the Cameroons were there under the provision of the Trusteeship Agreement which made it incumbent upon French to ensure the external security of the Cameroons; they would be withdrawn when that Agreement was terminated.

44. In reply to a further question by the Ukrainian representative, he said that the additional French troops brought into the Territory to help restore order after the incidents of May 1955 had likewise been withdrawn.

45. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) asked Mr. Bebey-Eyidi what in his opinion was the present strength of the UPC and how much influence it still had.

46. Mr. BEBEY-EYIDI (Comité pour le regroupement des forces nationalistes) said that when the Visiting Mission had been in the Territory the Chairman had asked him if he thought the UPC leaders in exile had lost touch with the real situation in the Cameroons, to which he had replied that in his opinion that was to some extent true although Mr. Moumié still enjoyed some popularity. It might be said that the influence of the UPC was reflected in the fact that the Government was applying the UPC programme despite its insistence that the organization itself no longer existed.

47. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) asked Mr. Mayi Matip why he had gone into the maquis.

48. Mr. MAYI MATIP (Anciens maquisards, détenus politiques et réfugiés) said that he and those like him had gone into the maquis not because they had wanted to commit acts of violence but simply because they had wanted to continue to work for the freedom of the Cameroons within the three outlawed parties.

49. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) asked if Mr. Mayi Matip himself had participated in acts of violence and whether there had been any organization specifically committed to violence.

50. Mr. MAYI MATIP (Anciens maquisards, détenus politiques et réfugiés) said that violence had never been

a part of the UPC's programme and that any acts of violence committed by UPC members had simply been in retaliation for acts of violence committed by their opponents. He himself had never participated in acts of violence as such.

51. In reply to a further question by the French representative, he said that he had not been in charge of the Comité national d'organisations, but that he was President of the JDC and he had always worked for political education and organization, on the basis of the principles he had explained to the Committee.

52. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) asked if Mr. Mayi Matip could explain why he had urged his comrades to surrender to the authorities.

53. Mr. MAYI MATIP (Anciens maquisards, détenus politiques et réfugiés) wished to make it clear that the refugees had come out of the maquis, not to gratify their personal ambitions, but to defend the cause of the Cameroonian people by acting in the light of reality and the political facts. Their reasons for leaving the maquis had been briefly explained in the document he had submitted to the Visiting Mission; he had also mentioned some of them in his statement to the Committee. In brief, since the date for independence had been fixed, he and his comrades had accepted the Prime Minister's invitation to resume their lives as free citizens on the understanding that they would be at liberty to express their opinions. They had eschewed violence in favour of political activity as a means of attaining their objectives and they did not agree with the opportunists of the Left who thought that now was the time to pursue the struggle by force of arms.

54. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) read out a resolution signed by 800 former members of the maquis authorizing Mr. Mayi Matip to undertake to guide the defectors in the path of reconciliation. In it the signatories rejected violence; welcomed the Administering Authority's consent to the imminent accession of the Cameroons to independence; urged their comrades in the maquis to return to legality; noted with satisfaction that the Prime Minister and the Legislative Assembly had officially notified the United Nations through the Administering Authority of their desire for the reunification of the Cameroons; called on both sides to do their utmost to bring about a reconciliation; and urged a full and unconditional amnesty for all political offences committed since 1954. He asked if the petitioner supported that appeal.

55. Mr. MAYI MATIP (Anciens maquisards, détenus politiques et réfugiés) said that the number of signatories to the text mentioned by the French representative amounted to several thousand. He saw no contradiction between that text and the statement he had just made.

56. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) thanked the petitioner for that confirmation. He asked him if he could tell the Committee exactly how many people were still in prison.

57. Mr. MAYI MATIP (Anciens maquisards, détenus politiques et réfugiés) said that it was difficult to give the figures because in addition to the official prisons there were various types of gaols, such as those under the village chiefs and other authorities, or those called "pounds", from which people had sometimes been taken to unknown destinations. In violation of the provisions of the French Penal Code it had been possible also to

hold people for indefinite periods of time at police stations. However, in Sanaga-Maritime, for example, all but the official prisons had ceased to exist and with the application of the new amnesty law there would be no more than 100 political prisoners left.

58. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that he could appreciate that it was difficult for the petitioner to give the exact figures. As the figures had been much exaggerated by some speakers, he thought it was important for the Committee to have them and, in the absence of Mr. Ahidjo, he would read them out. On 1 January 1959, there had been 400 people in prison for acts of violence, of whom 350 would now be unconditionally amnestied. The sentences of the remaining fifty, who had been condemned to twenty years' or more hard labour, would be reduce.

59. Mr. MAYI MATIP (Anciens maquisards, détenus politiques et réfugiés) said that he welcomed those assurances and hoped that the amnesty would, as soon as possible, become a reality for all, for the existence of political prisoners was not conducive to reconciliation.

60. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) asked the petitioner if the authorities had taken any steps against him because of his present activities.

61. Mr. MAYI MATIP (Anciens maquisards, détenus politiques et réfugiés) said that he had not been greatly troubled by the authorities since he had left the maquis. That was perhaps attributable to a number of circumstances, one of which was the fact that in Sanaga-Maritime and Eséka he was regarded as a guarantor of his comrades who left the maquis. His case was therefore not typical.

62. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that she would like to know whether Mr. Ahidjo had any objection to the granting of an unconditional amnesty and, if so, what the objection was.

63. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that he would convey that question to the Prime Minister.

64. Mr. MALILE (Albania) asked Mr. Tchoumba Ngouankeu, who had said he had been a prisoner, what had been the accusations against him and what conditions were like in the gaols where political prisoners were housed.

65. Mr. TCHOUMBA NGOUANKEU (Bureau national kamerunais de la Conférence des peuples africains) replied that there had been thirteen charges against him, including offences against the security of the State, reconstitution of an illegal organization and the sale of arms. He had spent sixteen months in solitary confinement before being released by the Court of Appeals at Dakar in January 1959. Another appeal was pending in Paris at the present time.

66. He could say from his own experience that political prisoners were badly fed and were not allowed to communicate with their wives or relatives. Some prisoners had been mutilated or tortured with electric needles. When the authorities wanted to put someone in prison they found people who were willing to make false statements about that person to the police, on the strength of which they then arrested him. One of the petitioners who had come to the present session had spent six months in prison on the charge of having taken part in the assassination of Deputy Samuel Wanko. Many

prisoners had been drowned in a lake in the Bamiléké Region.

67. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) asked if the petitioner had given that information to the Visiting Mission and requested it to make an inquiry.

68. Mr. TCHOUMBA NGOUANKEU (Bureau national kamerunais de la Conférence des peuples africains) said that he had been in prison when the Visiting Mission had been in the Territory but that he had sent it a memorandum, a copy of which would be circulated to the Committee, requesting an inquiry.

69. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) asked if the petitioner had not had friends who could have gone to the Visiting Mission direct with that information.

70. Mr. TCHOUMBA NGOUANKEU (Bureau national kamerunais de la Conférence des peuples africains) said that the Visiting Mission had in many cases not known what was happening because the police had allowed only those approved by the Administering Authority to talk to it. Wherever it had gone in the Territory, a car full of police had gone ahead of it to prevent the people from approaching it and another had brought up the rear.

71. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that he found it hard to believe that the members of the Visiting Mission would not have realized that their movements were thus being controlled.

72. In reply to a question by Mr. MALILE (Albania), Mr. GERIG (United States of America) said that the petitioner's statement did not tally with the freedom in which the Visiting Mission had been able to perform its task.

73. Mr. CHAPMAN (Ghana) asked Mr. Tchoumba Ngouankeu in what respect he considered the Visiting Mission's report to be hostile to the legitimate aspirations of the people of the Cameroons. He would also like to hear the comments of Mr. Ntumazah, Mr. Moumié and Mr. Bebey-Eyidi on the subject.

74. Mr. TCHOUMBA NGOUANKEU (Bureau national Kamerunais de la Conférence des peuples africains) said that he made that assertion because the Mission had expressed the view that the northern Cameroons under British administration wished to be integrated with Nigeria. He considered that such a solution would be inconsistent with the Charter; according to Article 76 the people should be consulted, but that did not mean that any part of a Trust Territory should be integrated into a neighbouring country.

75. Mr. NTUMAZAH (One Kamerun) said that owing to lack of time the Mission had been unable to hear the views of all sections of opinion in the Territory. Moreover, at the time of the Mission's visit certain political organizations had been proscribed and had therefore been unable to express their views to the Mission. Others had been imprisoned in order to prevent their approaching the Mission.

76. As the Committee had already been informed, the Mission had done most of its travelling in the Territory by air and had seen only the districts near the airports, whereas the majority of the people lived in the country districts. Moreover, in the Northern Cameroons under British administration there were no political parties which could speak in the name of the people. The Cam-

eronian members of the Northern House of Assembly had been elected on Nigerian political platforms.

77. Mr. MOUMIE (Union des populations du Cameroun) observed that a few days previously the Chairman of the Visiting Mission had implicitly admitted that the Mission had not had sufficient time to collect all the information it needed. Furthermore, as the Committee had already been informed, any person who wished to have an interview with the Mission had been obliged to submit his name in advance in writing, together with his reason for asking for a hearing. That had naturally frightened off people who wished to complain about the Administration. Neither had the Mission been given the opportunity to interview prisoners in the gaols. He considered that the Mission had had insufficient time at its disposal and that too large a proportion of its time had been spent at Yaoundé.

78. He did not regard the Mission's report as hostile to the aspirations of the Cameroonians but would point out that it had been instructed by the Trusteeship Council to set forth its views on the procedure for organizing the consultations which would enable the people of the Cameroons under French administration to express their wishes concerning their future. It therefore appeared to be in excess of the Mission's terms of reference to conclude that no popular consultation was necessary.

79. Mr. BEBEY-EYIDI (Comité pour le regroupement des forces nationalistes) recalled that he had said in his statement that the lack of time and the circumstances of the Mission's visit might be at the root of some divergences between the Mission's report and certain Cameroonian aspirations. Three weeks was a very short time in which to visit so large a Territory. Moreover, the Visiting Mission, not being a supervisory commission, had been obliged out of mere courtesy to the Administration to fall in with the arrangements that had been made. It naturally could not know about things which had been hidden from it. The people would have liked the Mission's offices to be situated in an indigenous quarter of Douala, but they had been in the European quarter and near a military camp, so that the ordinary Cameroonians had been afraid to approach them.

80. As he had said in his statement, his only criticism of the Visiting Mission's report was on the question of the dissolution of the Legislative Assembly and the holding of fresh elections. He thought if the Mission had remained longer in the Territory it would have changed its views on that subject.

81. Mr. CHAPMAN (Ghana) observed that according to Mr. Tchoumba Ngouankeu the elections of 23 December 1956 had been held in an atmosphere of fear and intimidation. He would like to hear Mr. Yaya's comments on that statement.

82. Mr. YAYA (Mouvement de l'Union camerounaise) entirely disagreed with that statement. The elections had been held in conditions of absolute freedom.

83. Mr. CHAPMAN (Ghana) said that according to Mr. Tchoumba Ngouankeu none of the candidates at those elections had presented a precise programme to the electors. He asked Mr. Mbida whether that was in fact the case.

84. Mr. MBIDA (Parti des Démocrates camerounais) replied that it was true, as Mr. Tchoumba Ngouankeu

had stated, that no list of candidates had taken its stand on a political platform in the proper sense of the term. The candidates on his own list had had to decide a few days before the opening of the electoral campaign what name to choose and they had at first called themselves Démocrates chrétiens. Groups had been formed in the Legislative Assembly and it had been only in June 1957 that his group had drawn up its programme and decided on the name of Démocrates camerounais.

85. Most of the lists of candidates had had a clearly defined economic, cultural and social programme; in the political sphere they all had been in favour of the principle of independence. There had been differences of opinion with regard to the details and in fact the majority of the members had been in favour of independence by stages. Mr. Soppo Priso's group had therefore gone into opposition.

86. Mr. CHAPMAN (Ghana) observed that apparently all the petitioners wanted independence and unification of the Cameroons. He asked Mr. Ntumazah what other issues there were which divided the people of the Cameroons so sharply as to make an election necessary. He would also like to hear Mr. Yaya's comments on the subject.

87. Mr. NTUMAZAH (One Kamerun) confirmed that most Cameroonians agreed in desiring independence on 1 January 1960. The present Cameroonian Government intended to associate the Cameroons with France, as could be seen from the resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly on 24 October 1958, quoted in paragraph 82 of the Visiting Mission's report on the Cameroons under French administration. One Kamerun was opposed to that association and if there were to be an election it would be fought on that question.

88. Mr. YAYA (Mouvement de l'Union camerounaise) said there was general agreement that elections should be held; the only question was when. His party was in favour of elections after the attainment of independence and that was the opinion of the majority of the people of the Cameroons. The poll in 1956 had been very large and the present Legislative Assembly was truly representative. The holding of elections as a preliminary to the attainment of independence might lead to delay; there was much to be done in the country before 1 January 1960 to prepare for independence without the additional work and disturbance caused by an election. The Visiting Mission itself did not recommend the holding of elections before the attainment of independence. There was no need to fear that the present Government and the Legislative Assembly would bring about the integration of the Cameroons in the French Community: as an independent State the Cameroons would be able to co-operate with any Government it wished but that did not mean to say that it would be integrated into the French Community. There was no question of elections not being held after the attainment of independence.

89. Mr. CHAPMAN (Ghana) said it had been argued that the atmosphere of a general election would not be conducive to the hoped-for reconciliation in the Cameroons and that elections should therefore be postponed until after independence. He would like to hear the comments of Mr. Bebey-Eyidi, Mr. Ntumazah and Mr. Moumié.

90. Mr. BEBEY-EYIDI (Comité pour le regroupement des forces nationalistes) said that if internal order was

assured in the country his party would not press for elections before the attainment of independence, but it felt serious misgivings about the manner in which an election would be conducted under the auspices of the present Government or any other Government chosen by the present Legislative Assembly. His party was therefore anxious that the elections should be held under United Nations supervision before the attainment of independence. Mr. Yaya maintained that the majority of Cameroonians desired the continuation of the present Legislative Assembly, but he himself was convinced that a very large number of Cameroonians wished for its dissolution and fresh elections. The holding of elections in a new country which had just achieved independence might well lead to trouble and perhaps even to civil war. He earnestly appealed to the United Nations not to abandon the Cameroonians.

91. Mr. NTUMAZAH (One Kamerun) expressed the hope that before the United Nations terminated the Trusteeship Agreement it would make sure that the Territory was in good hands. If the elections were carried out under United Nations supervision people would know they had been fairly and freely conducted. If, on the other hand, the elections were held after the attainment of independence they might be carried out in an atmosphere similar to that of 1956. Moreover, since the present Government had announced its desire to associate itself with France, there was no knowing when or in what conditions the elections would be held.

92. Mr. MOUMIE (Union des populations du Cameroun) said that he had been surprised to hear Mr. Yaya say that the people had been able to express their opinions freely in the 1956 elections.

93. The French representative had said at the previous meeting that it would be for the Cameroonian Government to decide whether the troops now in the Cameroons should remain there. That was a very important statement and revealed a most dangerous possibility, since no one could predict what the Cameroonian Government would decide.

94. With regard to the Conventions annexed to the Statute, the French representative had stated that they would continue in force until they were denounced. The present Conventions might therefore remain in force indefinitely if the Cameroonian Government so desired.

95. Another point which caused his party uneasiness was article 25 of the Statute, under which a state of exception (*état d'exception*) could be proclaimed in the event of "imminent danger" of armed disturbances. Such a provision might obviously open the way to serious abuses.

96. Once the Cameroons had become independent it might be claimed that in accordance with Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter anything that occurred in the country was within the domestic jurisdiction of the State and outside the competence of the United Nations. Since up to, but not after, 1 January 1960 the United Nations could intervene on behalf of the Cameroonian people, they wanted elections to be held before that date.

97. Mr. CHAPMAN (Ghana) asked Mr. Moumié in what circumstances he thought that the Cameroons might be thrown into a state of anarchy and why so many of the violent actions of UPC members been directed against other Africans.

98. Mr. MOUMIE (Union des populations du Cameroun) said that a reply to the first question would be found in a statement made by Mr. Bebey-Eyidi a few minutes earlier.

99. In reply to the second question, he maintained that violence had not been inaugurated by the UPC but had been used in self-defence against African troops sent against its members by the Administration.

100. Mr. CHAPMAN (Ghana) asked whether Mr. Bebey-Eyidi would comment on Mr. Ahidjo's statement at the 849th meeting in support of his decision not to hold elections before the attainment of independence.

101. Mr. BEBEY-EYIDI (Comité pour le regroupement des forces nationalistes) maintained that it was in the interests of a country that elections should be held as often as appeared desirable. The argument that frequent elections were undesirable was not convincing, more particularly since an Assembly elected before the attainment of independence under United Nations supervision would be unassailable and could therefore be transformed into a constituent assembly if necessary.

102. With reference to the Prime Minister's statement that the problem of elections was a domestic problem, he would say that that would be so after 1 January 1960 but that until then every Cameroonian problem was a matter of concern to the United Nations.

103. Thirdly, Mr. Ahidjo had argued that it was not usual in any country in the world to dissolve a parliament whenever it was confronted with a new problem. That was quite true, but there were good grounds for dissolving parliament and holding new elections when grave problems arose and there was a serious division of public opinion in the country.

104. He would not reopen the question whether the present Assembly represented all shades of opinion in the country, since the Committee was well aware that it had been elected before the enactment of the amnesty law, and hence without the participation of the UPC, and that certain other parties had also abstained from taking part.

105. Mr. CHAPMAN (Ghana) recalled that Mr. Moumié had stated that he was prepared to meet Mr. Ahidjo outside the conference room in an attempt to reach a settlement of their differences. He asked whether any progress had been made.

106. Mr. MOUMIE (Union des populations du Cameroun) said his attempt to open negotiations had met with a categorical refusal from Mr. Ahidjo.

107. Miss BROOKS (Liberia), referring to the Allegations that had been made that prisoners had been tortured and killed, asked whether any of them were women.

108. Mr. TCHOUMBA NGOUANKEU (Bureau national kamerunais de la Conférence des peuples africains) replied in the affirmative.

109. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that he understood that Mr. Yaya was a member of the majority party. Mr. Yaya could perhaps tell him what role he considered the Legislative Assembly should play in drawing up the future constitution of the independent Cameroons and in the formulation of the Territory's future relations with France.

110. Mr. YAYA (Mouvement de l'Union camerounaise) confirmed that he represented the party which had a majority in the Legislative Assembly. With regard to the future relationship of the Cameroons with France and other States, his party had confidence in the present Government and the Legislative Assembly. It considered the Legislative Assembly to be representative because, as he had stated before, it had been freely and democratically elected.

111. He thought that question concerning the work of the Legislative Assembly would be better put to the Head of the Government, who was present as a member of the French delegation.

112. Mr. MOUMIE (Union des populations du Cameroun) said that the existing Legislative Assembly was not competent to deal with such questions as the drafting of a new constitution and future relations with France. It had been elected to discuss a Statute which would lapse on 1 January 1960. A new Legislative Assembly should be elected before that date to consider those matters.

113. Mr. NTUMAZAH (One Kamerun) said that the Mouvement de l'Union camerounaise had not placed a programme before the people at the time of the 1956 elections and it was therefore impossible for that party to claim that its programme had been accepted by them. The only solution was a fresh election, before independence, which would show whether in fact that party enjoyed the confidence of the electorate.

114. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that, at a meeting that afternoon of members of the Committee belonging to the Afro-Asian group, Mr. Ahidjo had been asked what the function of the Legislative Assembly would be in connexion with the drafting of a constitution. Mr. Ahidjo had replied that, whatever that function might be, the result would be subject to confirmation by a new Legislative Assembly to be elected once the Territory had achieved independence. It therefore seemed that the existing Legislative Assembly had a part, however tentative, to play in formulating the constitution. He asked Mr. Yaya whether that would not also be the case in connexion with the question of future relations with France.

115. Mr. YAYA (Mouvement de l'Union camerounaise) said that his statement must necessarily correspond to that made by Mr. Ahidjo, who was Chairman of the party. He could only repeat that there would be elections after independence had been achieved.

116. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that it seemed clear that the two issues to which he had referred had not been envisaged at the time of the 1956 elections. Did not Mr. Yaya feel that there was something to be said for the suggestion that new elections should be held before independence?

117. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) observed that references were being made to a statement which appeared to have been made by the Prime Minister of the Cameroons at a private meeting and there were already two different versions of what Mr. Ahidjo was supposed to have said. In his opinion, the question should more properly be addressed to the Prime Minister himself.

118. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the case of many assemblies and similar bodies in the world, reference to proceedings outside the House were considered to be

out of order. He wondered whether the representative of the Philippines would not prefer to put his question direct to the Prime Minister of the Cameroons.

119. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) replied that, at the private meeting, it had been agreed that he could put that particular question at the meeting of the Committee. Mr. Yaya was a member of the party in power in the Cameroons and should be aware of its programme and of the functions of the Legislative Assembly.

120. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that, Mr. Ahidjo being absent, he would make every reservation on his behalf. Mr. Yaya was not a member of the Legislative Assembly and it was surely more appropriate that the question should be put to the Prime Minister.

121. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that in that case he would merely ask Mr. Yaya for his personal views on the two questions to which he had referred earlier.

122. Mr. YAYA (Mouvement de l'Union camerounaise) said that, once independence had been achieved, the Cameroons would be free to make agreements with any nation it chose. With regard to the other question, he would suggest that the representative of the Philippines should apply to the President of the Legislative Assembly, who was present. His own party was in the majority but it had no intention of imposing its own views.

123. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that the petitioner was apparently not in a position to enlighten the Committee on the views of the majority party on those two questions.

124. The representative of France had said that the Conventions annexed to the Statute would remain in force unless abrogated by the independent State of the Cameroons. He asked Mr. Yaya whether his party held that the Statute and the Conventions should remain in force after 1 January 1960.

125. Mr. YAYA (Mouvement de l'Union camerounaise) said that the Statute and the Conventions constituted a stage on the way to independence. They would be non-existent after 1 January 1960.

126. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) observed that that appeared to contradict the French representative's statement that those instruments could remain in force unless abrogated.

127. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) pointed out that, in his previous statement on the subject, he had said that it would be possible for the Conventions to remain in force provided that they were not denounced. Mr. Ahidjo, however, had said that they would lapse on 1 January 1960. Accordingly, France too would consider that they had lapsed on that date.

128. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) asked what sentence had been passed on Mr. Moumié and for what offences. Assuming that Mr. Moumié's existing sentences were covered by the amnesty, did the authorities intend to prosecute him for other offences for which he had not yet been sentenced?

129. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) replied that, as he had already stated, Mr. Moumié had been sentenced in 1955 to various terms of imprisonment. His case had already been covered by the first amnesty and he had nothing to fear; there was no intention of

prosecuting him for any other offence which he might have committed.

130. Mr. GOEDHART (Netherlands) said that he would be glad to hear Mr. Kingue-Jong's views on the election question.

131. Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Mouvement d'Action nationale du Cameroun) said that the Committee would have observed from the petitioners' statements that Cameroonian opinion was divided only on the question of holding elections in 1959. Those who favoured elections in 1959 said that they did so because they would be held under the protection of the United Nations. The same petitioners had criticized the Visiting Mission for the short time it had stayed in the Territory. Yet the number of observers the United Nations would be able to make available for supervising the election would certainly be small in relation to an electorate of over a million. The fact was that what such persons really wanted was a seat in the Legislative Assembly; their fears about the withdrawal of United Nations protection were a mere pretext.

132. His party opposed elections prior to independence for several reasons. The existing Legislative Assembly had been elected on a basis of universal suffrage and the percentage of voters had been remarkably high. It had been elected for a five-year period, until 1961. The election campaign had been entirely based on the question of independence and unification, however much the Committee might have heard to the contrary. What was being suggested was that a constituent assembly should be elected, followed by a referendum on the constitution and by a general election. The Cameroons had not the money to waste on such a series of consultations.

133. The Trusteeship Council had been informed that Mr. Ahidjo's Government was a Government of national unity. The Committee should not doubt the good faith of those who did not believe in a premature election, any more than the Cameroonians had doubted the good faith of the United Nations when it had proposed that a decision on the future of the Cameroons should be postponed until the Visiting Mission had made its report. That report had stated that the Legislative Assembly was representative in character and he felt that there was no good reason for dissolving it. No one had denied the right of the Legislative Assembly to ask for independence and he failed to see why it should not also be accorded the right to draft a constitution, which in any case would be submitted to the voters for their approval, once the new electoral law had been passed. Under that law, French citizens would be debarred from sitting in the Legislative Assembly. His country wanted to be entirely free and it put all its faith in the United Nations.

Mr. Michalowski (Poland), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

134. Mr. TELLI DIALLO (Guinea) said that his delegation, like that of Liberia—but independently of it—had felt it should make some attempt at reconciling the parties. It had made its first attempt when some of the petitioners had passed through Conakry, but without success. His delegation felt that every possible effort should be made to bring about such a reconciliation. In his opinion the French delegation was the one best qualified to attempt the task.

135. Mr. Yaya had said that elections would take place after independence, on the ground that the existing Government and the Legislative Assembly were representative in character. That, surely, was a good reason why they should agree to face the electorate in order to obtain a fresh mandate from them. It had been suggested that the holding of elections in 1959 would cause inconvenience, but it might equally be said that elections after independence would cause even greater inconvenience.

136. He would be glad to hear the comments of the French representative and of Mr. Yaya on those observations and would like Mr. Yaya to say whether he was in fact a member of the Legislative Assembly.

137. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) replied that, since elections were the concern of the Cameroonian Government, Mr. Ahidjo would answer that question in due course.

138. Mr. YAYA (Mouvement de l'Union Camerounaise) said that he was not a member of the Legislative Assembly. His party did not fear an election but felt that the country would be better employed in preparing for independence than in holding elections. His party hoped that after independence many parties would be represented in the legislature and that they would express their views freely. As for supervision by the United Nations, the Cameroons had succeeded in holding perfectly respectable elections, without such supervision.

Mr. Boland (Ireland) resumed the Chair.

139. Mr. TELLI DIALLO (Guinea) said that the Visiting Mission had reached the conclusion that the UPC had ceased to exist as an organized political party. He would ask Mr. Mayi Matip to comment on that observation, with particular reference to the situation in Bamiléké and Sanaga-Maritime.

140. Mr. MAYI MATIP (Anciens maquisards, détenus politiques et réfugiés) said that it was impossible for a body like the Visiting Mission to feel the presence of the UPC. It was quite wrong to say that the UPC no longer existed; indeed it was even more alive than it had been in 1955. A French High Commissioner had said that there were three Powers to be reckoned with in the Cameroons; the UPC, the Catholic missions and tribalism. Those for whom he spoke asked that the UPC should once more be allowed to operate as a legal organization.

141. Mr. TELLI DIALLO (Guinea) said that it was generally recognized that the amnesty law was a great step forward. There were some, like himself, who regretted that it was not complete and unconditional. He would ask Mr. Mbida, Mr. Kingue-Jong, Mr. Moumié and Mr. Bebey-Eyidi what they would feel about the holding of elections, either before or after independence, without the ban on the UPC being withdrawn.

142. Mr. MBIDA (Parti des Démocrates camerounais) said that the fact that there was a division of opinion between the petitioners was the fault of France. The UPC existed and many people in different walks of life belonged to it. Its influence endured and the fact that its activities were forbidden was a source of bitterness. If new elections were held without the UPC there would be no peace in the Cameroons. That party had been

banned by France, without the opinion of the Cameroonians having been sought. France had given internal self-government to the Territory in January 1959 and the ban against the UPC should have been removed at that time. He felt that France had some hidden reason for opposing elections before independence.

143. Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Mouvement d'Action nationale du Cameroun) said that, in the first place, it was wrong to say that the election of 23 December 1956 had been fought without any precise political programme. As soon as the Legislative Assembly had met after the election, his party had submitted its programme for independence; that was a matter of common knowledge in the Cameroons.

144. The decree of 1955 under which the UPC had been banned was a French decree. The Cameroonian Government should take steps to have it annulled by the Conseil d'Etat; some said, indeed, that the Cameroonian Government itself could have it repealed. Knowledge of the origins of the UPC would put the matter in a better perspective. In his opinion, there would not be a major upheaval if the Cameroonian Government felt unable to remove the ban on the UPC's activities. It was a matter, however, on which he would prefer to consult Mr. Ahidjo.

145. Mr. MOUMIE (Union des populations du Cameroun) recalled that in 1956 Mr. Assalé and Mr. Soppo Priso had said before the Committee that it was regrettable that the UPC had not taken part in the elections. Again, on 14 February 1959, Mr. Soppo Priso had said in the Legislative Assembly that the amnesty did not go far enough and that what he had hoped for had been the removal of the ban on the UPC. On one occasion Mr. Kingue-Jong himself had said that the dissolution of the UPC had been badly received by the Cameroonian people; now he had said that the matter could be referred to the Conseil d'Etat. Mr. Betayenné, however, had said during the twenty-third session of the Trusteeship Council (954th meeting) that the Cameroonian Government had the right to review the decree dissolving the UPC but that it had no intention of doing so.

146. Mr. BEBEY-EYIDI (Comité pour le regroupement des forces nationalistes) said that the whole debate was about internal problems which the Cameroonians should have settled themselves. Some of the

petitioners had expressed views different from those which they had expressed the previous year. He was not blaming them, but he would point out that his own views on the necessity of removing the ban on the UPC had not changed since 1955. The disturbances which had taken place had all been due to the ban. The grant of independence and the holding of elections without the UPC, even if the amnesty covered its members, would be yet another mistake which might well lead to disturbances in the future. Now that the amnesty law had been passed, the UPC should be allowed to re-establish itself as a legal political party.

147. Miss TENZER (Belgium) said that Mr. Kingue-Jong had referred to the origins of the UPC and she would be glad if he would give further details.

148. Mr. KINGUE-JONG (Mouvement d'Action nationale du Cameroun) said that, according to some, the UPC had evolved from the Rassemblement camerounais. The fact was, however, that the UPC had been created to counter that organization. Most parties in the Cameroons had been set up in Douala and the UPC had been a movement directed against the Douala parties. It had later become a nationalist party. When Mr. Um Nyobé had told him that he had been asked to be General Secretary of the UPC, he had advised him against accepting the office on the grounds that it appeared to be a Communist organization, but Mr. Um Nyobé had not taken that advice.

149. He was no enemy of the UPC, but political activities should be conducted within the law and without violence. He was among those who held that there were unquestionably dissensions within the present UPC. Mr. Moumié was the leader of the UPC, but it was well known that he had been cut off from the members of the party in the Cameroons which had been under Mr. Um Nyobé's control. Indeed, at the time of the All-African People's conference, held at Accra in December 1958, Mr. Moumié had not even known whether Mr. Um Nyobé was alive or dead.

150. In short, the UPC did not exist as a political movement and it would be possible to hold free elections in its absence without giving rise to disturbances.

151. The CHAIRMAN stated that all the petitioners who had arrived in New York had now been heard.

The meeting rose at 9.30 p.m.