

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FOURTEENTH SESSION
Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 961st
MEETING**

Friday, 20 November 1959,
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda items 13 and 39:</i>	
<i>Report of the Trusteeship Council (continued)</i>	
<i>Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Trust Territories: report of the Trusteeship Council (continued)</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolutions (continued)</i>	455
<i>Requests for hearings (continued)</i>	
<i>Requests concerning agenda item 41 (The future of the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under United Kingdom administration) (continued)</i>	460
<i>Requests concerning agenda item 13 (Report of the Trusteeship Council) (continued) . . .</i>	460

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

AGENDA ITEMS 13 AND 39

Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/4100, A/4262; A/C.4/L.610, 611/Rev.1, 613, 614; T/PET.3/95, 96 and Add.1, 97, 98) (continued)

Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Trust Territories: report of the Trusteeship Council (A/4100, part I, chap. VII, sect. D) (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.510, 611/REV.1, 613, 614) (continued)

Draft resolution on the future of the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under French administration (A/C.4/L.610) (concluded)

1. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) explained that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.610 because it felt that the United Nations had responsibilities with regard to the Cameroons under French administration and should rescue it from the dangers of civil war, in order to guide it toward national unity and cohesion; peace was indivisible, and the United Nations could not remain inactive in face of the progressive worsening of the situation in the Territory. He recalled having said during the general debate that the situation in the Cameroons under French administration was far from normal, but that the defenders of the Cameroonian people would see that everything was done to restore forthwith normal relations, on the one hand between the people and the Administration, and on the other between the different political parties, which all had common aims. He recalled also that at the thirteenth session he had expressed the hope that the Cameroonian people and their leaders would discover a supreme national ideal, above all politics and all

ideology, and would unite their efforts to free and to unify their country. Neither in the preamble nor in the operative part of draft resolution A/C.4/L.610 was any idea expressed which was contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In fact, that draft resolution constituted the least that the Committee should do; it represented a last effort to restore peace and to promote national reconciliation in a Territory which, under the Trusteeship Agreement and the provisions of Chapter XII of the Charter, should be regarded until 31 December 1959 as a Trust Territory and should consequently receive the watchful supervision of the United Nations. He therefore regretted that, by voting against the draft resolution, the majority of the Committee had done a disservice to the Cameroonian people, which wanted, above all, national unity and reconciliation before attaining independence. By refusing to help in making that wish come true, the United Nations would be failing in its duty, but history would in the long run decide on which side the truth lay.

2. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) said that his delegation, true to its traditional feeling of friendship for the African peoples, had made contact with the delegations which had been preparing a draft resolution concerning the Cameroons under French administration, in the hope that a text could be submitted to the General Assembly which would be adopted by a large majority. However, draft resolution A/C.4/L.610 had been a great surprise to his delegation, which had advised the sponsors not to be too hasty in submitting such a text but to consult in advance the greatest possible number of delegations, as was the custom when important questions were at issue.

3. On 19 November, in view of the imminence of the vote on that draft resolution, the result of which could be foreseen, the delegations of Cuba, Venezuela and Mexico had submitted to the sponsors of the draft various amendments which they had decided not to submit to the Committee unless they were approved by all the draft resolution's sponsors. Those amendments had been designed to balance the text of the draft resolution by incorporating in it several elements which had unfortunately been omitted. For example, the amended draft resolution would have taken note of the statements that the amnesty would be extended until 1 December and that a round-table conference of political parties and representatives would be convened; it would also have taken note of the announcement of the date of the general elections. Additional paragraphs would have expressed the concern of the General Assembly at the disorders which had arisen in the Territory and would have reaffirmed its direct responsibility in regard to the Territory's population until the termination of the trusteeship. In particular, one of the proposed amendments would have called for reconciliation among all Cameroonianians, in dignified terms which none could have

criticized. The amendments had not proposed the deletion of any paragraph of the draft resolution and they had been worded with great care, with a view to ensuring that at least part of the draft would be approved by a large majority, so that the General Assembly might have before it a constructive text, inviting all Cameroonians to unite in peace.

4. His delegation was not playing politics in the Fourth Committee; it was merely defending the principles of the United Nations. The Cameroonian question had in substance been settled at the thirteenth session. The principles involved should not be repudiated because of diplomatic considerations. His delegation had an unconcealed admiration for Mr. Ahidjo, the Prime Minister of the Cameroons, and hoped for the success of his Government; but it felt that, since the Territory was still under trusteeship and the situation there was disturbed, the General Assembly's concern should be expressed in a resolution which would also take note of the Cameroonian Government's assurances.

5. It was in such a spirit of moderation and conciliation that the three Latin-American delegations had submitted their amendments to the sponsors of the draft resolution; but as the latter had been unable to accept those amendments unanimously, the delegations of Cuba, Venezuela and Mexico had decided not to put them before the Committee, but to vote in accordance with the positions of their individual Governments.

6. It was untrue to say that the anti-colonialist delegations were always ready to vote in favour of a draft resolution which would run counter to the interests of a colonial Power. His delegation would never hesitate to vote against an ill-advised, provocative, badly drafted or meaningless text. He regretted that the delegations which had submitted the draft resolution had insisted on the Committee's members voting on so unsatisfactory a text. No act committed by a colonial Power had been more prejudicial to the anti-colonialist cause than the disastrous movement, led by anti-colonialist delegations, which had resulted in the vote at the previous meeting.

7. The non-administering Powers had often won great victories in the Committee, but the secret of their victories had lain in their moral strength, the logic of their arguments and the affirmation of their principles, as well as in the patience and courtesy displayed by their delegations in the course of consultations. The results of the vote at the previous meeting were a harsh lesson for the Committee. The anti-colonialist movement was triumphing throughout the world, and it was important that the Committee should do its utmost to maintain in the future the great qualities which had accounted for its prestige.

8. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) said that in submitting draft resolution A/C.4/L.610 its sponsors had known that they would have difficulty in winning their point, in view of the outcome of the debate on the Cameroons at the thirteenth session, and that delegations would not readily change their attitude. The essential feature of the proposals contained in the draft had been the dispatch of a good offices commission to the Cameroons; obviously, if that proposal were to be rejected, the resolution would become meaningless. He appreciated the efforts made by the Mexican delegation to persuade the Committee to act before it was too late. The amendments submitted to the draft resolution's

sponsors might admittedly have given the Committee ground for moral satisfaction, but the real key to the problem remained the dispatch of a commission to the Cameroons. The young, weak nations had difficulty in making themselves understood, but they knew what they wanted and stated it firmly. Since the delegations of Cuba, Venezuela and Mexico had found it impossible to express themselves on the cardinal point of sending a United Nations commission to the Cameroons, the sponsors of the draft resolution had been unable to support the amendments proposed.

9. As the voting had proceeded, he had tried to obtain the bare minimum for the Cameroonian people—even a resolution which would merely have expressed the wishes of certain delegations by reaffirming General Assembly resolution 1349 (XIII) and by stressing its decisive nature. His delegation would have been prepared even to place confidence in the Government of Mr. Ahidjo, in order that at least a resolution might be adopted and the Cameroonian people might know that they had been defended.

10. He was grateful to the Mexican delegation; but it had been the sponsors' duty to interpret the wishes of the African Heads of States and the Foreign Ministers of the independent African countries who, meeting at Monrovia, had firmly stated their position on the question. In any case, the Cameroonian population was master of the situation and would take it in hand. He recalled that the President of the Republic of Guinea, Mr. Sékou Touré, had said before the General Assembly that the question was no longer one of Africa's becoming free or otherwise, but one of combating the efforts of those few who still believed that they could turn the freedom of the African people to their own advantage.

11. Mr. THAPA (Nepal) explained that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it had reaffirmed General Assembly resolution 1349 (XIII), a course to which there could be no objection. It had voted for all the operative paragraphs except paragraph 6.

12. The Nepalese delegation had voted for paragraph 5 because it had considered it appropriate to remind the Cameroonian Government that the fundamental rights set forth in the Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should be respected. It had been unable, however, to accept the Iraqi representative's view that a vote by parts would indicate which nations respected those principles and which did not; that would have been misleading and would have created bitter feelings, which should be avoided. His delegation had accordingly abstained in the vote on the Iraqi proposal.

13. It had also been obliged to abstain on paragraph 6, because it was opposed to all forms of condescension; no commission of the type contemplated by the sponsors had ever been sent to a country which was on the eve of independence. Such a course would, in the present circumstances, have indicated a lack of confidence in the Cameroonians and have encouraged the advocates of violence. The normal processes of democracy supposed the existence of opposing political parties and the organization of free elections. Since the United Nations had never refused to recognize a Government, even one imposed by violence, why should it apply a different standard in the case of the Cameroons? Instead of sending a commission to the Cameroons, it would be better if all Member

States and the Secretary-General of the United Nations sent a delegation to congratulate the Cameroons on its attainment of independence and to tell the people and the Government of that country how satisfactory it was that they should take their place in the United Nations. It was for that reason that the Nepalese delegation had abstained in the vote on paragraph 6 of the draft resolution.

14. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand) said that his delegation had opposed the draft resolution because it had considered that any resolution on the question was probably unnecessary and that a draft resolution running counter to the spirit and intention of General Assembly resolution 1349 (XIII) was quite unacceptable. Furthermore, the text of draft resolution A/C.4/L.610 had been poorly balanced, and its general approach unsound.

15. Having been a sponsor of General Assembly resolution 1349 (XIII), his delegation was happy that the unanimous vote on the first words of operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.610 endorsed the essential soundness of that resolution. His delegation had voted against the same words when moved as an amendment to operative paragraph 4 because it had felt the submission of amendments on a point of order during the voting to be contrary to rule 129 of the rules of procedure, and because the addition proposed was, in the new context, misleading. He considered that the Chairman and the Committee must be careful not to permit breaches of the basic rules of procedure which could give rise to serious abuses and create regrettable and embarrassing precedents.

16. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) felt it necessary to explain his delegation's vote, for the benefit particularly of the Administering Authority and the Cameroonian Government, on the one hand, and of the representatives of Cameroonian organizations whom the Committee had heard as petitioners, on the other.

17. His delegation had felt bound to vote for operative paragraphs 1 to 4 because they had reflected a *de facto* situation. It wished to point out, however, that it had definitely not interpreted those paragraphs as a criticism of the Administering Authority or of the Cameroonian Government, or as an implication that the Prime Minister of the Cameroons had done nothing to fulfil the assurances which he had given to the General Assembly at the thirteenth session.

18. On paragraph 6, the Ceylonese delegation had abstained for purely practical reasons. While conditions in the Territory on the eve of independence were far from satisfactory, the dispatch of a United Nations commission would not, in existing circumstances, serve any useful purpose. It would have been better if the draft resolution had expressed the hope that the representatives of all the political groups and, if necessary, of the Administering Authority would meet in a round-table discussion before the date of independence; such a course would certainly have contributed to the restoration of peace and harmony in the Territory.

19. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) said that his delegation had always stood with the delegations of the African and Asian countries in their fight against colonialism. It had however been compelled to differ with them on the subject of draft resolution A/C.4/L.610, because that text, despite its noble intentions, had been open to three major objections: firstly, as the Ceylonese

representative had pointed out, it had not taken practical realities into account; secondly, it had not been completely in line with the decisions taken by the General Assembly at its previous session; and thirdly, it would have complicated the task of a Government which was already faced with many problems and which, it should be remembered, would the following year be called upon to take its place among the Members of the United Nations. Despite those reservations, and for reasons of fellowship with the members of the African-Asian group, his delegation had not wished to oppose the draft resolution and had preferred, by abstaining, to leave the matter to the collective wisdom of the Committee.

20. The Iranian delegation, which had not viewed the vote at the previous meeting as a defeat for the ideas underlying the draft resolution, hoped that all the parties concerned would work together for national reconciliation, that the Cameroonian Government and the opposition parties would take into account the opinions expressed by the members of the Committee—especially those expressed by the representatives of the African and Asian countries—and that the 1960 elections would take place in circumstances in which all the necessary safeguards for political freedoms were present.

21. It also hoped, particularly in the light of the statements just made by the representatives of Mexico and Guinea, that the General Assembly would have before it a constructive and realistic proposal which would assist the Cameroonian Government and people to achieve independence in an atmosphere of peace and harmony.

22. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that his country, which had experienced nearly four centuries of foreign rule, had always been in the vanguard of the struggle against all forms of colonialism. Nevertheless, it was prepared to admit that colonialism had certain practical aspects and it had to some extent enabled the dependent peoples to move towards modern civilization. Accordingly the Philippines, while resolutely opposed to all the evil manifestations of colonialism, had always striven to remain as objective as possible. That was the spirit in which the Philippine delegation had studied the draft resolution on the future of the Cameroons under French administration.

23. It had been able to support the preambular paragraphs without reservation; it had also supported operative paragraphs 1 to 5, inclusive, although they might lend themselves to an unfavourable interpretation. It had not, however, been able to vote in favour of operative paragraph 6. The French representative had stated that the Administering Authority and the Cameroonian Government were opposed to the dispatch of a United Nations commission to the Territory; in accordance with established United Nations usage in applying Article 87 c of the Charter, the United Nations never sent a mission to a Trust Territory without the agreement of the Administering Authority concerned. Paragraph 6 of the draft resolution ignored that relevant provision of the Charter. Furthermore, in view of the limited time that remained before the date set for the independence of the Cameroons, the paragraph could have had no practical effect. In the circumstances the Philippine delegation had had no choice but to abstain.

24. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that although his delegation fully understood that the Chairman had been obliged to accept amendments while the voting had been in progress at the previous meeting, in order to find a way out of what appeared to be an impossible situation, he hoped that there would be no further violations of rule 129 of the rules of procedure. He had therefore welcomed the Chairman's statement that he would not allow any further such departure from the rule.

25. The United Kingdom delegation had voted against the draft resolution even after the operative part had been reduced to a single paragraph reaffirming General Assembly resolution 1349 (XIII) and recalling the statements of the Prime Minister of the Cameroons at the thirteenth session, because it did not consider that any resolution was necessary at the present stage. The Republic of the Cameroons was about to attain independence and the General Assembly, in resolution 1349 (XIII), had expressed its confidence in the Cameroonian Government. The United Kingdom still had confidence in it and eagerly awaited the day when the independent Cameroons would itself take part in the deliberations of the United Nations.

26. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) said that although his delegation had refrained from taking part in the heated discussions at the previous meeting, it could not allow the impression to be created that it was only the countries that were not Administering Authorities that were responsible for the procedural problems in which the Committee so often became involved and which made the Chairman's work so difficult. The responsibility for that state of affairs rested equally with all the members of the Committee.

27. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that at the previous meeting his delegation had refrained from taking part in the vote on two occasions because it had felt that the procedure followed was out of order. He had bowed to the Chairman's decisions in order not to complicate the latter's task, but he fully agreed with the view expressed by the New Zealand representative and he welcomed the Chairman's decision to apply the rules of procedure with all strictness in the future.

28. The French delegation had voted against the draft resolution as a whole because it considered that it would be unworthy of the Committee to submit to the General Assembly the remnants of a resolution that no longer represented the essence of its sponsor's views. Furthermore, as it had had occasion to inform the Committee, the French delegation did not consider that any resolution was necessary at the present stage, because reconciliation in the Cameroons was more likely to be achieved through the generous offers made by the Prime Minister of the Cameroons than through intervention on the part of the United Nations.

29. As the French delegation had not wished to bring pressure to bear when the voting was about to take place, he had refrained from reading out an appeal by the Prime Minister of the Cameroons, the text of which he had just received. He felt, however, that he should now read out the following statement by Mr. Ahidjo:

"We are close to independence; the establishment of a democratic system of government had been fully guaranteed; general elections are to take place

in the first quarter of 1960 and a total amnesty has been formally promised. In these circumstances I see no reason why Cameroonians of good faith, whatever their views, cannot reach agreement so that the new State may take its place among the family of nations with due dignity."

Moreover, he was now able to state that preparations were being made for a round-table conference in the Cameroons and that any Cameroonian who wished to take part in it had only to send a telegram to Dr. Benoît Essougou, Boite postale 144, Yaoundé, stating his intention of renouncing all forms of violence.

30. He thanked all the delegations which had supported the French delegation and all those which, while not sharing its views, had paid a tribute to the achievements of the Cameroonian Government and of France, the Administering Authority. In the interests of international conciliation, a necessary condition for national reconciliation, he had not wished to bring up the question of the active foreign support that had been given to acts of violence and he hoped that the independent Cameroons would never have occasion to do so.

31. In conclusion he expressed the hope that the Members of the United Nations would be unanimous in welcoming the independent Cameroons as a Member of the Organization the following year.

*Draft resolution on assistance to Territories emerging from a trust status and newly independent States (A/C.4/L.611/Rev.1) (continued)**

32. Mr. ZABLOCKI (United States of America) said that at the 955th meeting when he had submitted his original version (A/C.4/L.611) of the draft resolution now before the Committee (A/C.4/L.611/Rev.1), he had stressed his delegation's wish to encourage the countries concerned to make use of all the existing facilities in the United Nations in the field of technical assistance. In that connexion the United States delegation attached particular importance to the part that could be played by high-level technical experts in the transfer of administrative responsibility to the people of newly independent States. The General Assembly would not have before it the study proposed in the draft resolution adopted at the 957th meeting (A/C.4/L.606/Rev.1, as amended) until its fifteenth session and there was accordingly no conflict between that draft resolution and the United States proposal, which could be put into effect in 1960, during which year three Trust Territories were to attain independence.

33. The revised text of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.611/Rev.1) embodied some amendments proposed by the Afghan representative, designed to make it clear that the assistance to be given to the former Trust Territories should not prejudice in any way the assistance at present being given to other States Members of the United Nations. The United States delegation wished to thank the Afghan representative, as well as the delegations of Ceylon and Guinea, for their co-operation.

34. Mr. ZIKRIA (Afghanistan) said that his delegation warmly welcomed the approaching independence of three Trust Territories and was convinced that those Territories would make great progress. There

*Resumed from the 955th meeting.

was no denying that they would have various difficulties to surmount, especially in economic and social matters, and it was that fact that had prompted the Afghan delegation to express the view in the general debate that the United Nations should take special steps to help those Territories. His delegation had therefore been happy to find that idea embodied in a more specific form in the United States draft resolution. That text, which, as the United States representative had explained, had been amended in accordance with suggestions made by the Afghan delegation, now met the two objections that could have been made: namely, that assistance to the newly independent States might prejudice assistance that was already being received by other Members of the United Nations; and that there might be discrimination, with respect to technical assistance, between the former Trust Territories and other Members of the United Nations.

35. The Afghan delegation would like to be regarded as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution with the United States of America and hoped that it would receive the unanimous support of the Committee.

36. Mr. ZABLOCKI (United States of America) said that his delegation was glad to accept Afghanistan as a co-sponsor of the United States draft resolution.

37. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) said that he would vote in favour of the draft resolution. He would be all the more happy to do so because he recalled that the United States representative had stated at the 955th meeting that the draft resolution did not conflict with the proposal made by the Haitian representative at the 940th meeting and was not intended as a substitute for draft resolution A/C.4/L.606 or as an amendment to it. The Afghan representative had just stated, however, that the amendments that he had proposed to the original version of the United States draft resolution removed some elements which, in draft resolution A/C.4/L.606, might lead to differentiation between States. He wished to emphasize that the sponsors of the latter draft resolution had never intended to establish such a differentiation.

38. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) supported the United States draft resolution for the same reasons that had led his delegation to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.606. He was especially glad to note that in its revised form (A/C.4/L.611/Rev.1) the United States draft resolution referred to newly independent States. He felt, however, that those States should be mentioned in the preamble as well as in the operative part. He therefore suggested that a new paragraph referring to newly independent States should be added at the end of the preamble. He hoped that the draft would be adopted unanimously.

39. Mr. ZABLOCKI (United States of America) thought there was much force in the Iranian representative's observation. He therefore agreed to add the words "and newly independent States" in the third and fourth paragraphs of the preamble after the words "emerging Trust Territories".

40. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) whole-heartedly supported the draft resolution presented by the United States and co-sponsored by Afghanistan. He proposed, however, that, with the agreement of those two delegations, the words "and the specialized agencies" should be inserted after the words "United Nations" in the fourth paragraph of the preamble, and the

words "and the executive heads of the specialized agencies concerned" should be inserted in the operative paragraph, after the words "Invites the Secretary-General".

41. His delegation would be happy to co-sponsor the draft resolution.

42. Mr. ZABLOCKI (United States of America) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution accepted the Ceylonese amendments and welcomed Ceylon as a co-sponsor.

43. Mr. BUSNIAK (Czechoslovakia) whole-heartedly endorsed the draft resolution. So long as a Territory was under trusteeship it was the Administering Authority's responsibility to take effective steps to provide training for the indigenous inhabitants and to prepare the Territory for independence in the economic, cultural and public health fields. When a Territory attained independence, as in the case of any newly independent State, the United Nations was in a particularly good position to provide it with assistance, especially in the technical sphere. The draft resolution rightly stressed the importance of that assistance. His delegation considered, however, that, as had been done in the draft resolution on assistance to Togoland (A/C.4/L.608), reference should be made in the operative part not only to the Secretary-General and the specialized agencies but also to the Special Fund and the Technical Assistance Board.

44. His delegation would be happy to co-sponsor the draft resolution.

45. Mr. ZABLOCKI (United States of America) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution would welcome the Czechoslovak delegation as a co-sponsor but hoped that it would not press for the inclusion of a reference to the Special Fund and the Technical Assistance Board in the operative part, which, for maximum effectiveness, should be as general as possible on that point.

46. Mr. ALWAN (Iraq) said that his delegation was wholly in favour of granting assistance to former Trust Territories to enable them to surmount their economic difficulties. It also thought it was the duty of the United Nations to assist newly independent States. It therefore whole-heartedly endorsed the draft resolution.

47. Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) recalled that he had stated at the 946th meeting that his delegation would give favourable consideration to any proposal which would invite the Secretary-General and the specialized agencies to provide technical and economic assistance to former Trust Territories. It would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution, which had been improved by the Ceylonese amendments.

48. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that he had understood from the statement by the United States representative that the draft resolution referred to all newly independent States including former Non-Self-Governing Territories. Only two categories of States were, however, mentioned in the text: former Trust Territories and newly independent States. The latter category was comprehensive enough to include former Non-Self-Governing Territories but it would be preferable to mention them explicitly.

49. Mr. ZABLOCKI (United States of America) pointed out that the Committee was at present con-

sidering the report of the Trusteeship Council; he therefore thought that the distinction between Trust Territories and Non-Self-Governing Territories which had always been recognized in the United Nations should be maintained in the present instance. The Philippine delegation would have ample opportunity to present a draft resolution on assistance to former Non-Self-Governing Territories when the Committee considered those Territories. His delegation might even associate itself with the Philippine delegation in presenting such a draft resolution.

50. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) said he would vote in favour of the draft resolution. Over and above the needs common to all under-developed countries, States which had just attained independence had special needs, particularly in technical matters. The draft resolution met those needs because it provided for the granting of all forms of technical aid which those States might require owing to the special circumstances in which they had acceded to independence. He therefore hoped that the draft resolution would be approved unanimously.

51. Mr. Itaat HUSAIN (Pakistan) said that his delegation whole-heartedly supported the draft resolution, which would be welcomed with satisfaction by two thirds of the people of the world. At the present day those two thirds of the world's people disposed of only 15 per cent of the world's income, were living on an average annual income of \$80 and were subsisting on a diet which was 20 per cent below the minimum nutritional level. Those two thirds of the world's population amounted to about one thousand million people, living chiefly in Asia and Africa, who could neither read nor write. While so much was said on the subject of the fundamental freedoms, the man in the street was clamouring for bread. The delegation of Pakistan congratulated the United States representative, who had originated the draft resolution, and the delegations which had joined in sponsoring it.

52. Mr. RAO (India) said he would be glad to vote in favour of the draft resolution, which laid timely stress on the need for technical assistance to Territories emerging from a trust status and newly independent States. He hoped that it would be approved unanimously.

53. The CHAIRMAN noted that Afghanistan, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia and Pakistan had joined in the sponsorship^{1/} of the draft resolution A/C.4/L.611/Rev.1.

54. He then put the draft resolution to the vote, with the oral amendments accepted by the sponsors, namely, the addition of the words "and newly independent States" after the words "emerging Trust Territories" in the third and fourth paragraphs of the preamble; of the words "and the specialized agencies" after the words "United Nations" in the fourth paragraph of the preamble; and of the words "and the executive heads of the specialized agencies concerned" after the words "Invites the Secretary-General" in the operative paragraph.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.611/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1, as thus revised, was approved unanimously.

^{1/} See A/C.4/L.611/Rev.1/Add.1.

Requests for hearings (A/C.4/408/Add.2) (continued)

REQUESTS CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 41 (THE FUTURE OF THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE CAMEROONS UNDER UNITED KINGDOM ADMINISTRATION) (A/C.4/408/ADD.2) (continued)

55. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to take a decision on the request for a hearing presented by the Northern People's Congress, Dikwa Division (A/C.4/408/Add.2).

56. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that he had no objection to the request but wished to state that the allegations against United Kingdom officials made in the letter circulated as document A/C.4/408/Add.2 were wholly unjustified.

57. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia) asked if it would be possible, in order to speed up the Committee's work, for the text of the petitioners' statements to be circulated before the hearing.

58. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would note the request.

The Committee decided to grant the request for a hearing (A/C.4/408/Add.2).

REQUESTS CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 13 (REPORT OF THE 'TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL') (continued)

59. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received the following letter:

"Mr. Michel Rwagasana, General Secretary of l'Union nationale rwandaise presents his compliments to the Chairman and has the honour to request permission to make a statement to the Committee concerning the situation in Ruanda-Urundi."

He asked the Committee to take a decision on the request immediately, in view of the limited time remaining for the completion of its work.

60. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) said that he had only just been informed of the request and had not had time to obtain instructions from his Government. In view, however, of the limited time available to the Committee, his delegation would not raise any objection to the request. At the same time, it should be clearly understood that his delegation would not countenance the opening of a debate of substance regarding the situation in Ruanda-Urundi. The petitioner would merely be stating his personal views or those of the organization to which he belonged. There were many inhabitants of Ruanda-Urundi who could come to the United Nations and state contradictory views. It was not through the statement of opposing views but through the action of representative institutions based on universal suffrage that the people of Ruanda-Urundi would be able to decide on their future.

The Committee decided to grant the request for a hearing.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.