

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

FOURTEENTH SESSION  
*Official Records*



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 995th  
MEETING**

Wednesday, 9 December 1959,  
at 1.15 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	Page
Agenda item 41: <i>The future of the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration (continued):</i>	
(b) <i>Report of the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner on the plebiscite in the northern part of the Territory and report of the Trusteeship Council (continued) . . .</i>	673

**Chairman:** Mr. L. N. PALAR (Indonesia).

**AGENDA ITEM 41**

The future of the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration (A/C.4/412) (continued):

(b) *Report of the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner on the plebiscite in the northern part of the Territory and report of the Trusteeship Council (A/4313, A/4314 and Add.1, A/C.4/440 and Add.1, A/C.4/L.636 and Rev.1) (continued)*

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Djalal Abdoh, United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner for the Cameroons under United Kingdom Administration, took a place at the Committee table.

1. Mr. MACQUARRIE (Canada), introducing the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.636) sponsored by Canada, Denmark, New Zealand and Sweden, said that the first four preambular paragraphs were not, he believed, controversial. The fifth referred to the very important fact that the Administering Authority was taking prompt action because the plebiscite had indicated that the people of the Northern Cameroons, whatever might be their views as to their future, were not satisfied with the particular form of their present relationship with the Northern Region of Nigeria. The sixth paragraph followed the generally accepted form of resolutions of the Committee based upon discussions in which petitioners had been heard.

2. In the operative part, paragraph 1 embodied the Committee's unanimous view in expressing appreciation to Mr. Abdoh the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner, and his staff. Paragraph 2 established the basic provisions for a new plebiscite. The dates selected would make it possible to co-ordinate the arrangements for the plebiscite with the separate plebiscite to be held in the Southern Cameroons. Paragraph 3 clearly established the alternatives to be put to the voters: they had a choice of achieving their independence by joining either the independent Republic of the Cameroons or the independent Federation of Nigeria. Paragraph 4 was very important. The recommendation that the plebiscite should be conducted on the basis of universal adult suffrage recognized what had appeared to the sponsors to be the clearly expressed desire of

the Committee. The provision might create certain difficulties for the Administering Authority and the Federation of Nigeria, but the sponsors were convinced that they would view the recommendation in a most cooperative spirit. Paragraph 5 provided for the preparation and submission of a report by the Plebiscite Commissioner in accordance with the normal procedure. Paragraph 6 recommended that the necessary work of local reform should be undertaken without delay, as the Administering Authority had already pledged itself to do. Paragraph 7 made an extremely important related recommendation, which delegations would also consider essential in view of the results of the first plebiscite, namely, that the Administering Authority should begin without delay to arrange for the administrative separation of the Northern Cameroons from Nigeria, and that the process should be completed by 1 October 1960. The final paragraph requested the Administering Authority to report on the process of separation to the Trusteeship Council so that the Council might in turn submit a report on the matter to the General Assembly at its fifteenth session.

3. The sponsors hoped that their draft substantially met the wishes of the Committee. They believed that on a subject of such great importance, unanimity or near unanimity was desirable. Although the draft resolution was sponsored by only four delegations, it was the product of the widest consultation. The sponsors had taken careful account of precedents and of the numerous suggestions made by other delegations. Were it not for a difficulty on one point, the draft resolution might have been sponsored by a large number of delegations. The sponsors were grateful for the useful suggestions made in the form of amendments for correcting whatever deficiencies the draft resolution might have.

4. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) said that he did not believe that lengthy discussion would be required to reach agreement on the need for a second, costly plebiscite in the northern part of the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration in order to correct the mistake made at the thirteenth session of the General Assembly.

5. At the thirteenth session many delegations had refused to accept the conclusion of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, 1958, that a popular consultation was unnecessary in the Northern Cameroons (T/1426 and Add.1, para. 181); they had rejected the argument that the northern part of the Cameroons constituted a unit linked to the Northern Region of Nigeria and had insisted on a secret ballot which would enable not only the ruling tribes—the Fulani, the Hausa and the Kanuri—but the various so-called pagan tribes, which represented the majority of the population and had long had claims to put forward, to express their views. Those delegations—and they included the delegation of Mexico—would be justified in recalling in detail the deliberations at the thirteenth session in order to show where the responsibility lay. The Assembly had seldom had so clear a

warning, and it was to be hoped that in future visiting missions and the Administering Authorities would act with greater circumspection than they had done in the present case. Such serious mistakes could only be avoided by common action which took account of all the views expressed. For that reason, and because it was necessary for the Committee to take corrective action within the short time remaining before the end of the session, the Mexican delegation had agreed to take part in the informal conversations held recently on the initiative of the United Kingdom for the purpose of drafting a resolution on the only logical basis possible in the circumstances, the organization of a second plebiscite.

6. The United Kingdom representative had stated that the results of the first plebiscite should not be interpreted as a protest against the union of the Northern Cameroons and Nigeria, but rather as a demonstration of the people's dissatisfaction with the local authorities. An opinion on that point was included in paragraph 242 of the Plebiscite Commissioner's report (A/4314 and Add.1). The discussion in that connexion had arisen from the unusual character of the plebiscite of 7 November 1959 and more particularly from the wording of the second question. He believed that further discussion on the point was unnecessary as the Committee was determined to correct the mistake made at the thirteenth session and its members now realized that the people of the northern part of the Territory should be allowed to choose between its two great neighbours, the Federation of Nigeria and the Republic of the Cameroons, as the Mexican delegation had advocated at the thirteenth session. It was clear that the Northern Cameroons could not, because of its small size and for other reasons, constitute an independent entity. Both the Federation of Nigeria and the Republic of the Cameroons had declared their readiness to incorporate it. In the circumstances it was the duty of the United Nations to allow the population of the Territory to choose freely between the two alternatives open to it, and it was desirable that the Federation of Nigeria and the Republic of the Cameroons should know what the position was as soon as possible. At the thirteenth session, there had been a somewhat surprising opposition to that logical course and one of the disturbing factors in the debate had been that not only the United Kingdom, but France, had voted against the amendment proposing, as the second alternative, union with the Republic of the Cameroons (A/C.4/L.589). He recalled that a question put by the Mexican delegation on the matter had remained unanswered.

7. Since the mistake had to be corrected, his delegation would not dwell upon the waste of time and money in which it had resulted. Whatever might be the view of the members of the Committee regarding the outcome of the second plebiscite, it was necessary to show the most complete impartiality. The Mexican delegation, for its part, respected both the Federation of Nigeria and the Republic of the Cameroons and extended its best wishes to them on the eve of their independence. What remained to be done was to organize the second plebiscite wisely and efficiently and to isolate the Territory as much as possible from its neighbours, however difficult that might be, so that it might make its choice in full freedom.

8. The Mexican delegation had expressed its views on the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.636) during the private conversations in which it had taken part. In principle, it was prepared to vote for it, but would be glad to hear the views of the other members of the Committee. It

was also inclined to favour the amendments in documents A/C.4/L.637 and A/C.4/L.638 because they were motivated by the desire, which Mexico shared, to isolate the Territory from its two neighbours so far as possible during the period prior to the plebiscite.

9. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) said that his delegation viewed the draft resolution introduced by the Canadian representative with great sympathy. There was one point, however, on which the Haitian delegation did not agree with the sponsors and on which it had considered it necessary to submit an amendment (A/C.4/L.638). Operative paragraph 7 of the draft did not go far enough: the first step to be taken in effecting a genuine administrative separation between the Northern Cameroons and Nigeria was to ensure that the people of the Territory did not take part in the Nigerian federal elections. If they did so, it was hard to see how the presence of representatives of the Territory in the Federal House of Representatives could be justified after 1 October 1960. It would be possible to organize partial by-elections in the Territory after the plebiscite if the people chose union with Nigeria. Nothing should be done which might prejudice the future or jeopardize the Cameroonian people's freedom of choice.

10. The Haitian delegation had always considered that the policy followed by the Administering Authority in the Trust Territory was not in accordance with the Trusteeship Agreement, which regarded the Territory as a single territorial and political entity. Administrative unions should not hinder the development of Trust Territories towards self-government and independence. It was extremely important to preserve the identity of each Territory and to ensure that administrative unions did not become political unions. That was the position which his delegation had consistently taken in the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions, in the Trusteeship Council, and in the Fourth Committee. It went without saying that his delegation's present position was based solely on those considerations and did not imply any criticism of, or lack of confidence in, the Federation of Nigeria.

11. His delegation had been very disappointed at the Administering Authority's lack of wisdom in failing to prevent the Northern Cameroons from taking part in the federal elections when the results of the plebiscite had become known. It was still not too late, however, whatever had been said, and the prestige of the United Nations might suffer a further blow if it did not make every effort to show the greatest impartiality. It was of course claimed that no one in the Territory was opposed to the elections, but the example of the forecast prior to the plebiscite should make the Committee wary of such statements. The Committee had received a communication from the Northern Kamerun Democratic Party (NKDP) calling for the cancellation of the federal elections (T/PET.4/L.74). His delegation did not go so far as that, but believed that the elections should at least be postponed in the Northern Cameroons. That course would save the Territory's representatives in the federal legislature from possible embarrassment after 1 October 1960 and so seemed the soundest solution until such time as the will of people could be ascertained.

12. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand) said that although a small number of delegations had put their names to the draft resolution, it had in fact been prepared by a fairly large number as it took account of suggestions

from different groups. His delegation had been happy for its part to join in the efforts to find a solution to the complex problem before the Committee.

13. It was worth noting that the results of the last plebiscite at least proved that administrative unions, even of long standing, did not necessarily predetermine the people's decision. His delegation was inclined to agree that the vote in the Northern Cameroons should not be interpreted as being a vote against Nigeria, or as a request that existing links with Nigeria should be abruptly cut, but as an expression of its people's desire to maintain the status quo for a period before taking a final decision regarding their future. The United Nations observers had noted the influence of local questions on the outcome of the plebiscite. It should be noted that out of 70,500 people who had voted in favour of the status quo only the members of one fairly small political party, the NKDP had openly opposed integration with Nigeria, while the other two opposition parties were associated with Nigerian political parties and were actively campaigning in preparation for the federal elections. There was nothing to show that the people of the Northern Cameroons in general wished to have the federal elections cancelled. If that were the case, the inhabitants could refuse to take part in the elections or cast a protest vote in favour of the NKDP. Moreover, in view of the fact that reforms were to be made to local organizations and institutions in the Northern Cameroons, there were good arguments in favour of permitting the people to elect by secret ballot representatives who could represent their views adequately.

14. The sponsors of the draft resolution understood the reasons why certain delegations had submitted amendments. His delegation for its part would have no difficulty in accepting the three-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.637), but would be unable to accept the Haitian amendment (A/C.4/L.638). Although he fully understood the principle underlying the proposal, the cancellation of the elections at so late a stage was in his view unnecessary, unjustified, and a practical impossibility. A resolution to that effect would be difficult to explain to the people of the Northern Cameroons, and to adopt an impossible recommendation might impair the prestige and influence of the United Nations.

15. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) said that he would not recall the circumstances which had induced the United Nations to supervise the plebiscite held in the Northern Cameroons on 7 November. The results of the plebiscite had been transmitted to the Committee by the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner and the United Kingdom delegation had given the Committee its interpretation of the results.

16. His delegation believed that there were still five questions on which the General Assembly must take a decision: firstly, the organization of a second plebiscite and the date on which it should be held; secondly, the choice to be put before the people; thirdly, the qualifications for voting; fourthly, the interim measures to be taken by the Administering Authority in the period following Nigeria's accession to independence; fifthly, the participation of the inhabitants of the Northern Cameroons in the Nigerian federal elections. Draft resolution A/C.4/L.636 provided a satisfactory solution to the majority of those questions. It provided for a second plebiscite and properly stipulated that the plebiscite should take place at the same time as the

plebiscite in the Southern Cameroons and should ask the same questions; lastly, the draft resolution recommended universal adult suffrage. He recalled in that connexion that the question of women's participation in the plebiscite had led to some lively discussion at the thirteenth session, and he expressed pleasure at the fact that the right of women to participate was now fully recognized. He wished to suggest, however, that operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution should include a statement to the effect that the right to vote was reserved exclusively to residents of the Territory. Paragraph 5 provided for the submission of a report to the Trusteeship Council and paragraphs 6 and 7 dealt with interim measures to be taken by the Administering Authority before Nigeria's accession to independence. All those provisions were excellent and his delegation would vote in their favour at the proper time.

17. As to the amendments which had been submitted, his delegation had considered them jointly. If the only amendment had been the Haitian amendment (A/C.4/L.638), his reaction might have been somewhat different. In fact, he fully agreed with the views just expressed by the Haitian representative and, like him, regretted that the inhabitants of the Northern Cameroons, the majority of whom had preferred to postpone any decision on the Territory's future until a later date, were now to be compelled to take part in federal elections. His delegation, like the Haitian delegation, regretted that the Administering Authority had not decided to cancel the federal elections in the Northern Cameroons as soon as the results of the plebiscite of 7 November had become known, as that would have avoided the complicated situation which had now arisen.

18. Facts must, however, be faced. The federal elections were to be held on Saturday, 12 December, and Northern Cameroons time was six hours ahead of New York time. In view of United Nations procedure, the General Assembly would probably be unable to reach a final decision before Friday, 11 December, at the earliest, which would be at approximately the same time when voting would begin in the Territory. The Committee could not, without harming the prestige and authority of the United Nations, make recommendations which could not be put into effect. In addition, neither the Administering Authority nor the Nigerian Government could be expected to cancel elections at the last minute. Even if such a decision was possible, it might have an unfortunate psychological effect and shake the people's confidence in democratic institutions. His delegation therefore had serious doubts concerning the desirability of that solution.

19. The three-Power amendment (A/C.4/L.637, para. 2), on the other hand, did not have those disadvantages and it did take account of the basic objections of principle raised by the Haitian representative. If it was adopted it would state clearly that participation in the federal elections could not in any way be considered as prejudging the issue of the future of the Trust Territory and that was the desired aim. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of it.

20. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) proposed that the word "further" in operative paragraph 6 should be replaced by the word "effective". The new wording would be more logical in view of the fact that the explanation given for the results of the plebiscite was that the population had been dissatisfied with the local authorities. His amendment was substantive, and he hoped that



the United Kingdom representative and the sponsors of the draft resolution would accept it.

21. He fully endorsed the principle underlying the Haitian amendment (A/C.4/L.638). However, as the Ceylonese representative had pointed out, the problem had to be considered in practical terms and it was too late to cancel the Nigerian federal elections to be held in the Northern Cameroons on 12 December. His delegation was prepared to accept the three-Power amendment (A/C.4/L.637, para. 2) as it took the circumstances into account without repudiating the principle that was at stake. His delegation would be grateful to the Administering Authority if it would state how it intended to put operative paragraph 7 into effect; he was anxious that any steps taken in that connexion should not be such as to be construed as a gesture of mistrust towards Nigeria.

22. Mr. KIANG (China) said that, while there were many things to be learned from the results of the plebiscite, it could not be said that in deciding to postpone the decision on their future the people of the Northern Cameroons had in fact spoken against joining Nigeria. Another plebiscite would therefore have to be held and the Committee must decide when that should be; in setting the date it would have to take into consideration the view expressed by the Plebiscite Commissioner at the end of his report. For practical reasons, it would be advisable for the date of the plebiscite in the Northern Cameroons to be the same as that of the plebiscite to be held in the Southern Cameroons in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1352 (XIV). Although the votes should be counted separately, in order to allow for the possibility of a different choice by the peoples of the two areas, the questions asked should be the same. Furthermore, the draft resolution was in keeping with the conclusion which the United Nations Commissioner had expressed in paragraph 242 of his report and which the United Kingdom representative himself had confirmed; that conclusion also agreed with those of the 1958 Visiting Mission and of the Trusteeship Council, which had recommended the establishment of local administrative organs which would be representative of the people, stable and effective. If the Cameroonian people had wished to protest against the system of local administration, it could not be concluded that they had actually declared themselves opposed to joining Nigeria.

23. On the question of participation in the Nigerian federal elections, he realized that it was impossible to cancel the elections to the eight seats allocated to the Northern Cameroons. If, however, those elections were not cancelled or deferred, how would the administrative separation of Nigeria and the Northern Cameroons be effected and what would be the position of the representatives elected from that Territory when Nigeria became independent? His delegation thought that the best solution would be to defer the elections in the eight Northern Cameroonian constituencies, which would ensure that there could be no complaints about the influence exerted on the Cameroonian population by Nigeria at the next plebiscite. Difficulties of a practical nature might admittedly arise during the interim period, but from the constitutional point of view and, what was even more important, from the standpoint of the principles of the International Trusteeship System, that solution would be the best.

24. His delegation was giving the draft resolution and the amendments submitted to it careful study and would vote on them in accordance with the views it had just expressed.

25. Mr. Taieb SLIM (Tunisia) thought that it would be better not to take a hasty decision on the question of the future of the Northern Cameroons and consequently to consider the question as a whole at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly, so that the population could have time to settle down. His delegation thought it essential, however, that the administrative separation of the Northern Cameroons from Nigeria should be accelerated.

26. The participation of the Northern Cameroons in the Nigerian federal elections raised an important question of principle, for such participation might subsequently be regarded as having influenced the choice which the people would make in the second plebiscite. His delegation endorsed the spirit in which the Haitian amendment had been presented and it had been for practical reasons only that it had been induced to submit, together with Iran and Liberia, amendments A/C.4/L.637. It was convinced that, even if the Northern Cameroons took part in the federal elections, such participation would not affect the outcome of the forthcoming plebiscite, which would be held in the requisite conditions of impartiality. His delegation would vote in favour of the Haitian amendment if it was put to the vote; if that amendment was not accepted it would vote in favour of its own amendment and of the draft resolution.

27. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) recalled that at the thirteenth session his delegation had submitted the very same proposals as the sponsors of the draft resolution were now endorsing: it had asked that the plebiscite should be held simultaneously in the Southern and Northern Cameroons and that the alternative offered to the population should be strictly between the independent Nigeria and the independent Republic of the Cameroons. He was happy that those proposals, which had been rejected at that time, now seemed to be acceptable to the majority of the Committee.

28. Certain provisions of the draft resolution were of major importance. Operative paragraph 4, for instance, recommended that the plebiscite should be conducted on the basis of universal adult suffrage. It would be desirable, however, for the new electoral registers and voting requirements to be drawn up by the Administering Authority in consultation with the Plebiscite Commissioner.

29. With respect to the democratization of the system of local government, referred to in operative paragraph 6, the United Kingdom representative had given his assurance that vigorous measures would be taken to remedy the present situation. It was, indeed, important that the factors that had played such a significant part in the outcome of the plebiscite of 7 November should be eliminated, for it would be dangerous if local issues were to intrude once again when the question of the Territory's future was being decided.

30. The Administrative separation of the Northern Cameroons from Nigeria, recommended in operative paragraph 7, raised problems which might play a decisive role in the 1960-1961 plebiscite. It was therefore important that on that date the Northern Cameroons should have a body capable of negotiating, on behalf of the population, the conditions for the union of the Territory with the Federation of Nigeria or with the Republic of the Cameroons, and that body should be established before Nigeria became independent. He would like to know, in that connexion, whether the Administering Authority was contemplating setting up in



the two parts of the Territory, after the municipal elections of April 1960, a joint administration which would be competent to negotiate freely once the results of the plebiscite were known. He did not agree with the New Zealand representative that the representatives of the Northern Cameroons who would be elected to the Nigerian House of Representatives on 12 December 1959 could fill that role.

31. His delegation would have voted in favour of the Haitian amendment had it not entailed major difficulties of implementation. Since the three-Power amendment defended the principle which the Haitian representative had in mind, while at the same time taking into consideration the requirements of the situation, his delegation would vote in favour of that amendment.

32. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) said that he was glad that the sponsors of the draft resolution had taken into consideration some of the suggestions and reservations that he had made. The amendments of which his delegation was a sponsor (A/C.4/L.637) were designed to correct an important omission. He appreciated the arguments presented by the Haitian representative, but he feared that in his concern to defend a principle he had overlooked the practical side of the question. If the Haitian amendment was put to the vote, his delegation would abstain. In order to emphasize, however, that it was only practical considerations which prevented the General Assembly from supporting the principle enunciated by the Haitian representative, he proposed that the following new paragraph should be added to the preamble: "Considering that the extremely close date of the elections to the Legislative Assembly of the Federation of Nigeria makes it impossible for the General Assembly to take any decision with regard to the participation or the non-participation of the peoples of the Northern Cameroons in these elections".

33. He would also like the following words to be added at the end of operative paragraph 4: "all those over the age of twenty-one and ordinarily resident in the Northern Cameroons being qualified to vote".

34. If those two oral amendments and the amendments submitted in document A/C.4/L.637 were incorporated in the draft resolution, his delegation would be happy to become one of its sponsors.

35. Mr. MACQUARRIE (Canada) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution accepted the amendment which the Venezuelan representative had proposed to operative paragraph 6 and the amendment which the representatives of Ceylon and Iran had proposed to operative paragraph 4. As the New Zealand representative had already stated, the sponsors also accepted the amendments in document A/C.4/L.637. The incorporation of the second of those amendments in the draft resolution took into account the question of principle raised by the Haitian representative, so that there was no longer any need for the Haitian amendment (A/C.4/L.638). His delegation would therefore be compelled to vote against that amendment if it were put to the vote.

36. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that the legal problem which had arisen at the beginning of the session concerning the date for the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement in the two parts of the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration no longer existed, since, as a result of the plebiscite which had just taken place, plebiscites would be held simultaneously in the Northern and Southern Cameroons. He considered that the decision taken by the

Committee at the thirteenth session on the choice to be offered to the people of the Northern Cameroons was sound, because it had allowed that people the possibility of making their decision at a later date. The Cameroons people would now be able to make that decision in the best conditions, since important progress had been made, in particular on the question of universal adult suffrage and the qualifications for voting in the plebiscite. The question of the separation of the Northern Cameroons and Nigeria was a very important one and the sponsors of the draft resolution had been wise to take it into account.

37. His delegation had been very sympathetic to the arguments put forward by the Haitian representative on the non-participation of the Northern Cameroons in the federal elections of 12 December 1959. As, however, it was impossible in practice to carry out the measures proposed in that respect in the Haitian amendment, it would be compelled to vote against the amendment. Besides, the deputies elected by the Northern Cameroons could adopt a definite position on the matter, for example by not taking their seats. His delegation did not think that participation in the federal elections could have any influence on the results of the forthcoming plebiscite. Moreover, as the sponsors of the draft resolution had accepted the second amendment in document A/C.4/L.637, which incorporated in a milder form the idea contained in the Haitian amendment, his delegation saw no reason for not supporting the draft resolution. It would therefore vote in favour of it.

38. If the sponsors of the draft resolution had not accepted the first amendment in document A/C.4/L.637, his delegation would have voted against that amendment, because it considered that the question of the application of the Trusteeship Agreement was the concern both of the United Nations and of the Administering Authority.

39. Mr. JHA (India) said that the result of the plebiscite which had just taken place in the Northern Cameroons confirmed that the decision to hold the plebiscite, in spite of the conclusions of the 1958 Visiting Mission, had been a sound one. His delegation agreed that the new plebiscite to be held in the Northern Cameroons should take place at the same time as the plebiscite in the Southern Cameroons, that the questions asked in those two plebiscites should be the same and that the plebiscite in the Northern Cameroons should be conducted on the basis of universal adult suffrage. It was pleased to note that all those conditions appeared in draft resolution A/C.4/L.636 and it was in favour of the amendment to paragraph 4 submitted by the Ceylonese and Iranian representatives.

40. In view of the result of the plebiscite, his delegation thought that it would have been preferable to postpone the federal elections to be held on 12 December, but as it was now too late for the Committee to decide that the Northern Cameroons should not participate in those elections, his delegation thought that the Committee should do its best to preserve the aim of the Haitian amendment. To that end he suggested that the words "and legislation" should be inserted after "separation of the administration" in operative paragraph 7. During the period before the forthcoming plebiscite, the Administering Authority should proceed with the decentralization of the administration of the Northern Cameroons and a legislative body might even be established there, as had been suggested by the Iraqi representative. His delegation therefore suggested the in-

sersion, in operative paragraph 6, of the words "the further decentralization of governmental functions and" after "without delay for" and it would be prepared to submit that amendment formally when it had heard the opinion of other delegations, and in particular the Haitian delegation, on the matter. Another method of ensuring the separation of the administration and legislation of the Northern Cameroons from those of Nigeria would be for the representatives of the Northern Cameroons in the Nigerian legislature to refrain as much as possible from taking part in parliamentary matters which did not concern the Northern Cameroons, and for the Nigerian legislature, in its turn, to refrain as far as possible from adopting legislative measures concerning the Northern Cameroons. The adoption of those suggestions would do a great deal to allay the misgivings aroused by the participation of the Northern Cameroons in the federal elections.

41. His delegation would vote in favour of the amendments proposed orally by Iran and those which appeared in document A/C.4/L.637. Before taking a definite position on the Haitian amendment, it would like to know the views of the Haitian representative on his delegation's suggestions.

42. Mr. SHAHA (Nepal) drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that, at the thirteenth session, his delegation had expressed the view that the plebiscites in the Northern and Southern Cameroons should be conducted simultaneously. The result of the plebiscite which had just been held had confirmed the soundness of that view. His delegation was therefore pleased to note that the draft resolution provided for the organization of simultaneous plebiscites in the two parts of the Territory. It supported operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution and the amendment which the representatives of Ceylon and Iran had proposed to that paragraph. With regard to operative paragraph 7, his delegation agreed with the Iraqi representative that when Nigeria became independent there should exist in the Northern Cameroons an authority competent to negotiate the conditions of a possible association of that part of the Territory with one or other of its neighbours. The draft resolution was improved by the amendments proposed orally by the Iranian representative, in particular the new preambular paragraph concerning the General Assembly's inability to prevent the Northern Cameroons from taking part in the federal elections. His delegation would, however, like to know the opinion of the Haitian representative on that matter before taking a definite position. In principle, the Northern Cameroons should not take part in the federal elections so long as it had not decided to unite with Nigeria. In order to respect that principle, his delegation would be obliged to vote in favour of the Haitian amendment if it were put to the vote. If that amendment was withdrawn, it would vote in favour of the three-Power amendment, which considerably improved the draft resolution.

43. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) noted that the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner had referred in his report (A/4314 and Add.1) to the expedience of the consultation conducted in the Northern Cameroons under United Nations supervision. It was well to bring that point to the attention of the delegations of countries which had deprived the Trust Territories they administered of that privilege. Moreover, the Plebiscite Commissioner had suggested that the advantages of consultations under United Nations supervision should be extended to other parts of the world. His delegation

hoped that that suggestion would be heeded by the Powers which still administered Non-Self-Governing Territories.

44. In spite of the very special interest which the African, Asian and Latin-American countries took in the future of the African Trust Territories, none of those countries was among the sponsors of the draft resolution, nor had any of them taken part so far in the discussion on it. The reason was that the informal discussions in which the draft resolution had been drawn up had aroused a strong feeling of uneasiness in the delegations of those countries. It had been claimed that there was no reason to draw the logical conclusions from the result of the plebiscite organized in the Northern Cameroons. Those conclusions were the ones which appeared in paragraph 242 of the report of the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner. In view of those unambiguous conclusions, the Committee might have expected the Administering Authority to submit a plan for the establishment of self-governing institutions in the Northern Cameroons. Unfortunately, that expectation had not been realized. The opposition of the African, Asian and Latin-American delegations to the draft resolution was in no way directed against Nigeria but was due to the absence in the draft resolution of any reference to the question of the participation of the Northern Cameroons in the federal elections. By not taking a stand on that question they would be betraying the people's will, which had been clearly expressed in the recent plebiscite. In spite of all the improvements that had been made in the original draft resolution, the Haitian amendment remained the best way of settling that question in a manner which accorded with the wishes of the people. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of that amendment. If the Haitian amendment was withdrawn, it would vote in favour of the three-Power amendment. If the latter amendment was not adopted, his delegation would not be able to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

45. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) fully supported the principle maintained in the Haitian representative's amendment. If there had been the least possibility of ensuring the non-participation of the Northern Cameroons in the federal elections, his delegation would have been ready to vote for the amendment. Such an action would in no sense be directed against Nigeria. It was the duty of the General Assembly to see to it that the plebiscite by which the population of the Northern Cameroons would decide its future was organized in a completely impartial manner. In view of the convincing arguments that the step called for in the Haitian amendment was not feasible, his delegation expressed the hope that the Committee would accept the amendment to the preamble proposed by the Iranian representative, which maintained the basic principles of the Haitian amendment, and that the Haitian representative would agree to withdraw his amendment.

46. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for having taken some of the views she had expressed into consideration, particularly in the second, third and fourth preambular paragraphs and in operative paragraphs 2, 4 and 6. She was especially gratified at the provisions of operative paragraph 4, which recommended that women should have the right to vote; the Liberian delegation was particularly proud of that victory.

47. The amendments in document A/C.4/L.637 represented the minimum that her delegation could

accept. Her delegation entirely approved of the Haitian amendment (A/C.4/L.638) and would vote for it if it was put to the vote.

48. Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) was pleased that the representative of Guinea had stressed the lack of enthusiasm among the African, Asian and Latin-American delegations for the draft resolution under discussion and had expressed the viewpoint of the African countries, which were the countries most directly concerned.

49. His delegation approved of the principle which was the basis of the Haitian representative's amendment. The only possible objection to that amendment was that, in view of the lateness of its submission, it was likely to remain inoperative. Moreover, the sponsors of the draft resolution had agreed to incorporate in their text the three-Power amendment, which brought the draft resolution into conformity with the view expressed by the Haitian representative. Accordingly, his delegation seconded the Mexican representative's request that the Haitian delegation should withdraw its proposal. On the other hand, he hoped that the amendment to the preamble proposed orally by the Iranian representative would be accepted.

50. The draft resolution, thus amended, would satisfy those who wanted to see the attainment of a just settlement in the Northern Cameroons. As it had done in the case of the Southern Cameroons, his delegation supported the viewpoint of the indigenous inhabitants, who must be given every means of expressing their opinions freely in one sense or the other. That was the principle which should guide the General Assembly.

51. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) recalled that, in introducing amendment A/C.4/L.638, he had clearly explained the reasons which had led him to present it. He noted with great satisfaction that all the speakers, including the sponsors of the draft resolution, had agreed entirely with the Haitian delegation on the principles involved. It had been maintained that the anticipated popular consultation could not be cancelled at a date so close to the elections; his delegation did not consider that argument very convincing. His delegation was ready to yield, not because of that argument, but because it wanted to prove that there was no basis for certain interpretations which had been put on its attitude.

52. Although he was not entirely satisfied with the text of the draft resolution as orally revised by the sponsors, he agreed to withdraw his amendment. He was grateful to the Iranian representative for his initiative in proposing an amendment to the preamble that took account of the views expressed by Haiti, and he accepted that compromise.

53. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) expressed the warm appreciation of his delegation and of his colleagues from Nigeria and the Northern Cameroons for the attention which the Committee had given to the problem of the Northern Cameroons; he was particularly appreciative of the understanding shown by the various speakers and of the decision just announced by the Haitian representative. He was convinced that, as several speakers had affirmed, there had been no intention whatsoever to take any action embarrassing to Nigeria or the Administering Authority. For his part, he assured the Committee that the closeness of the dates of the federal elections and the plebiscite was entirely fortuitous. He expressed his appreciation to the Haitian delegation and to all those who had helped

to draft the resolution under discussion, which he hoped would be adopted unanimously.

54. In reply to a question asked by the Iranian representative regarding operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, he explained that the rules on "ordinary residence" in the Northern Cameroons were to be found in the Nigeria (Electoral Provisions) Order in Council, 1958, First Schedule, amended in 1958 and 1959, as follows:

"1. The place of ordinary residence of a person is that place where he usually lives, or which has always or generally been his home, or which is the place to which he intends to return when away therefrom.

"2. Where a person usually sleeps in one place and has his meals or is employed in another place, his place or ordinary residence will be where he sleeps.

"3. For the purpose of these rules it will be assumed that a person can have only one place of ordinary residence and that it cannot be lost until it is replaced by another.

"4. Temporary absence does not cause a loss, and an absence of less than six months, or which is anticipated to be less than six months, will be regarded as temporary if the intention is to resume actual residence within that period."

55. The Iraqi representative's suggestion for establishing a central agency in the Northern Cameroons to study problems relating to the Territory and its future was an attractive one. A consultative committee, with terms of reference which could be amended to include such a function, was already in existence; the matter would be given careful consideration.

56. Regarding the provision in operative paragraph 4 to which the Liberian representative had referred, he emphasized that the Administering Authority could not commit itself before it had consulted the Government of Nigeria, which was very closely concerned. Nevertheless, he assured the Committee that the proposed resolution would be carefully considered by the Administering Authority and by all those concerned in Nigeria and the Cameroons.

57. Mr. MATSUDAIRA (Japan) said that, in view of the fact that the sponsors had accepted all the amendments before the Committee, his delegation wished to be added to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

58. Mr. Itaat HUSAIN (Pakistan) stressed the importance of the problem before the Committee, which concerned the future of an entire people. In his delegation's opinion, the Northern Cameroons should be separated completely from Nigeria and a plebiscite conducted as rapidly as possible. In the second plebiscite the solutions proposed to the people should be the same as those to be put before the Southern Cameroons, namely, union with Nigeria or union with the Republic of the Cameroons. His delegation also felt that the timing of the plebiscite should be the same in both parts of the Territory, and it noted with satisfaction that the draft resolution included provisions relating to those points. It was difficult, on the basis of the results of the plebiscite conducted under United Nations auspices, to predict the outcome of the federal elections which were to take place on 12 December. In any case, it was too late to do anything whatever about the matter, and the new operative paragraph 9 was intended to provide for any eventuality in that connexion.



59. In his opinion, the revised draft resolution represented the most satisfactory solution that could be hoped for in the circumstances and he would vote for it.

60. Mr. DZIRASA (Ghana) said that his delegation appreciated the statements made by the United Kingdom representative with regard to the reforms which were to be undertaken immediately in the Territory.

61. He wished it to be recorded that the position taken by his delegation at the thirteenth session had been clearly justified. His delegation had felt that it was absolutely necessary for the people of the Northern Cameroons to be able to express their desires as soon as possible, before Nigeria acceded to independence, whereas the 1958 Visiting Mission and the United Kingdom Government had held the view that such an approach was unnecessary, since the Northern Cameroons, in their opinion, had long been integrated into the political, economic and social life of the Northern Region of Nigeria.

62. With regard to the report of the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner, he wished to state, first, that in his delegation's opinion the fact that 70,546 persons had favoured the second alternative meant that the same number had voted against the first alternative, namely, integration with Nigeria. By putting off the decision regarding their future until a later date, the people of the Cameroons had in effect been saying that they would be in a position to decide whether they should be associated with an independent Nigeria or an independent Republic of the Cameroons only after those two Territories had in fact achieved their independence.

63. In the light of those considerations, his delegation did not support the view that the people of the Northern Cameroons should participate in the forthcoming federal elections in Nigeria. The result of the plebiscite marked a turning point in the political life of the Cameroons. It was time to evolve a new political and administrative system, conceived in relation to the entire Territory, and no longer to the Northern Region of Nigeria alone. Such a system, under which administrative and political powers would gradually devolve on the people of the Cameroons, would set them on the road to independence.

64. The United Kingdom delegation had argued that the Cameroons should take part in the federal elections because, since the results of the vote had become known, certain political parties had declared that they had no desire to be separated from Nigeria. The validity of that argument was disputed by two documents: document T/PET.4/L.71, in which Mr. Ibrahim Abba, President of the Northern Kamerun Democratic Party, called upon the United Nations to postpone the elections until the Territory's future had been decided; and document T/PET.4/L.72, in which Mr. Foncha, President-General of the Kamerun National Democratic Party, denounced the elections as a move to prevent unification.

65. The proposal that the people of the Northern Cameroons should participate in the federal elections had been based on the assumption that in the plebiscite they would decide in favour of integration with Nigeria. That assumption had not materialized and there was no longer any reason to maintain the proposal.

66. His delegation was in general agreement with the proposal to hold a second plebiscite in the Northern Cameroons before the termination of the trusteeship. However, unlike the United Kingdom, it felt that the

Northern and Southern votes should not be counted separately. All of the Cameroons was under a single Trusteeship Agreement, which could be terminated only as the result of a single integrated plebiscite. The United Kingdom proposal, if accepted, would tend to set up two separate sections in the Territory; but the future of the Cameroons as a sovereign and independent State lay in the unification of North and South.

67. His delegation also held the view that the principle of universal suffrage should be applied during the forthcoming plebiscite and that both men and women should be given the opportunity to vote. While not opposing the Administering Authority's proposal that the same Plebiscite Commissioner should supervise the second plebiscite, his delegation felt that the General Assembly should be left free to decide the matter for itself.

68. His delegation did not fully agree with the Plebiscite Commissioner's views on the results of the plebiscite. According to the Commissioner, the plebiscite had offered the people an opportunity to register what was, in effect, a protest against the system of local government, and that was why the majority had voted for the second alternative. The delegation of Ghana was of the opinion that while the plebiscite had offered the people of the Cameroons an opportunity to register their protest against the existing local administration, it had also offered them the opportunity to vote in the direction of their own sovereignty. Assuming, as did the Plebiscite Commissioner, that, although the people had not known what they were voting for, they had at least known what they wanted to vote against, there was no doubt that they had voted against integration with the Northern Region of Nigeria. His delegation had asked the Plebiscite Commissioner whether he thought, considering his views on the reasons why the people had voted for the second alternative, that the results of the plebiscite would have been different if there had been effective democratization of the system of local government. The Commissioner had not yet replied to that question.

69. His delegation wished to express its appreciation of the effectiveness with which the people of the Northern Cameroons, the majority of whom were described as illiterates by the Administering Authority, had accepted their responsibilities and carried out their duty during the plebiscite.

70. In the opinion of his delegation, Mr. Ntumazah, the petitioner, although a Southern Cameroonian, had a far better grasp of the problems of the Cameroons as a whole than the United Kingdom representative maintained.

71. He wished to assure his friends from Nigeria that Ghana, in taking its stand on the question, had no feeling of hostility towards Nigeria. Relations between the two countries, within the concept of the declarations of the Conference of Independent African States held at Accra in April 1958, and in the international field, would always be carried out on a basis of friendship. His delegation's protests were based on questions of principle. First, it felt that colonial Powers which had created artificial barriers between peoples of the same ethnic group to satisfy their imperialistic desires should allow the countries under their administration to be free to choose the type of political system and administration they wished to have, either as independent States or as dependent territories moving towards sovereignty. Secondly, his delegation wished

to state that no foreign Power had the right to decide that one African State should be brought into association with another African State or with any other State in the world. It was because of its deep conviction that all African countries had the right to self-determination that it had taken its position on the Northern Cameroons question.

72. His delegation would examine the draft resolution in the light of the considerations he had put forward.

73. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Cameroons had greatly suffered in the course of its history. Formerly occupied by Germany, it had been divided, after Germany's defeat, between France and the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom, which had divided its sector into two parts, Southern and Northern, had then subdivided the latter into even smaller segments—a process calculated to destroy the Cameroons as a political entity. The Administering Authority itself acknowledged it, but when the question of the Territory's future arose, it took care that the Cameroonian people were given no freedom of choice. Thus, the 1958 Visiting Mission, persuaded by the Administering Authority of the existence of a quasi-unanimous wish on the part of the population to unite with Nigeria, had recommended that no plebiscite should be held in the Northern Cameroons. Similarly, the Administering Authority had influenced the decision taken by the General Assembly at the thirteenth session to organize plebiscites in the Northern and Southern Cameroons at different dates, and had caused the issue of Cameroonian reunification to be omitted from the plebiscite in the Northern Cameroons. It had been the Administering Authority, too, which had deprived the women of the Northern Cameroons of the right to vote.

74. Those manoeuvres had not prevented the Cameroonian population from choosing its future and frustrating the Administering Authority's plans. The results of the plebiscite showed that 62 per cent of the inhabitants of the Northern Cameroons had cast a vote of no confidence in the Administering Authority. From that it could be concluded that the popular political consciousness had been awakened to a considerable degree, that the Cameroonian people had understood that they were responsible for their future, that they were dissatisfied with the colonial system imposed upon them—since, as recognized by both the Plebiscite Commissioner in his report and by the representative of the Administering Authority, the plebiscite had been a vote of protest against the system of local administration in which the population had too little share—and lastly that the population rejected the *status quo* and the trusteeship.

75. At the thirteenth session his delegation had urged that the plebiscite should be organized in the two parts of the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration simultaneously, before the accession to independence of the Republic of the Cameroons and the Federation of Nigeria; and that it should offer the same choices in order that the population of the Territory as a whole might decide its future. Unfortunately, the General Assembly, under pressure from the United Kingdom, had decided otherwise. The Committee had now belatedly realized its error, and was now trying to remedy it. The revised draft resolution envisaged the organization of a plebiscite in the Northern Cameroons to be held between 30 September 1960 and March 1961 simultaneously with the plebiscite in the Southern

Cameroons. Thus, if the results warranted it, the General Assembly would be able to terminate the trusteeship in the whole of the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration at the same time. The administration of the Northern Cameroons should be separated from that of Nigeria before the latter obtained independence, and the Cameroonian population should not participate in the Nigerian federal elections. For those reasons, his delegation would have been prepared to vote for the Haitian amendment if it had not been withdrawn. It wished to stress that it had looked upon that amendment not as an expression of suspicion with regard to Nigeria, but as a logical consequence of the results of the plebiscite.

76. His delegation deemed it essential that independence should be granted to the whole Territory and that it should be given the option of choosing between independence by union with Nigeria and independence by union with the Republic of the Cameroons. Since the revised draft resolution satisfied all those conditions and was substantially in accordance with the resolution on the Southern Cameroons which had already been adopted during the session (resolution 1352 (XIV)), his delegation would vote for it.

77. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) recalled that he had suggested an amendment to operative paragraph 7 which had been designed to dispel the concern expressed by the Haitian representative. In view of the fact that the Haitian representative had now withdrawn his amendment, the Indian delegation wished to withdraw its suggestion. Since, however, it considered that true democratization was not possible without decentralization, it would formally propose another suggestion which it had made earlier, namely, that the words "the further decentralization of governmental functions and" should be inserted in operative paragraph 6 after the words "without delay for".

78. Mr. MACQUARRIE (Canada), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, said that he would be pleased to have Japan and Iran included as co-sponsors of the draft resolution. He thanked the Haitian representative for having withdrawn his amendment and accepted the amendment which had just been proposed orally by the Indian representative.

79. Mr. Majmuddine RIFAI (United Arab Republic) thought that the Committee should concern itself more closely with the question of administrative unions.

80. His delegation was generally in favour of the draft resolution as modified by the various amendments which had been incorporated into it. The revised draft was acceptable to his delegation primarily because it recognized that the voting should be on the basis of universal adult suffrage—a principle on which his country had always insisted and which it was pleased to see retained. His delegation was also gratified that the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner had stressed the need for introducing reforms in the Northern Cameroons and that those reforms had been mentioned in the draft resolution. It would be extremely useful if the report to be transmitted to the Trusteeship Council on the progress made in the implementation of those reforms were prepared in consultation with the Commission.

81. With regard to the federal elections which were to take place on 12 December in Nigeria and in the Northern Cameroons, his delegation would have been better pleased if the Northern Cameroons was not to

participate. As soon as it had known the results of the plebiscite, the Administering Authority should have taken measures to prevent the elections being held in the Northern Cameroons. Most of the representatives who had spoken, however, had been of the opinion that there had been no reason for preventing the holding of those elections. His delegation therefore bowed before their arguments, without, on the other hand, regarding them as convincing. Since the draft resolution stipulated that the participation of the Northern Cameroons in the federal elections of Nigeria should in no way interfere with or influence the free choice of the

Northern Cameroons in deciding its future in the forthcoming plebiscite, he would vote in favour of it.

82. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the text of the draft resolution as revised by the sponsors to incorporate the amendments which they had accepted (A/C.4/L.636/Rev.1).

*The revised draft resolution (A/C.4/L.636/Rev.1) was adopted unanimously.*

The meeting rose at 7.40 p.m.