



C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Requests for hearings (<i>continued</i>).....	7

Chairman: Mr. Rafik ASHA (Syria).

**REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS (A/C.4/262, A/C.4/264)
 (continued)**

1. The CHAIRMAN called for a discussion on the requests for hearings submitted by the Mouvement de la jeunesse togolaise (Juvento), the Union des populations du Cameroun (UPC), the Evolution sociale camerounaise (ESOCAM) and the Coordination des indépendants camerounais (INDECAM), contained in document A/C.4/262 and by the Honorary Chairman of the INDECAM (A/C.4/264).

2. Mr. PIGNON (France) said he would consider all the requests for hearings together. He did not question the principle of the right of petitioners to be heard on specific questions, but he reminded the Committee that the Charter laid no obligation on the United Nations to hear all petitioners without distinction. He quoted Article 87 of the Charter, which was relevant to the subject under discussion, and pointed out that the word used to define the functions of the General Assembly and the Trusteeship Council was "may", which meant that the Trusteeship Council had the power to examine petitions if it so desired but was not under any obligation to do so. He felt that the authors of the Charter in their wisdom had envisaged no such obligation. The Trusteeship Council had correctly interpreted Article 87 and observed suitable rules in keeping with that Article, but the Fourth Committee had consistently refused to adopt any rules of procedure in connexion with requests for hearings and had unfortunately fallen into the practice of automatically granting them without considering each petition on its merits. It was hardly in the interests of the General Assembly to hear statements by representatives of political parties concerning problems to which there was no immediate solution. Furthermore, by granting such hearings the General Assembly was to a certain extent usurping the functions of the Trusteeship Council, which inevitably led to some confusion.

3. He did not think that an examination of the petition from the National Chairman of the Juvento would serve any useful purpose, but he would not oppose a hearing of the representative and would abstain from voting on that request, as it referred to an item on the Committee's agenda. In connexion with the two petitions from the UPC, he pointed out that that organization was well known as a subversive body. The Committee, by granting a hearing to its representatives,

would in fact be supporting subversion in the Trust Territory. He thought that the representative of the UPC who had been given a hearing at the previous session of the General Assembly had exploited that opportunity on his own behalf. With regard to the allegation that Mr. Abessolo N'Koudou, Secretary of the UPC Central Committee of Mbalmayo, had been arrested at the very moment when he was preparing to leave the Territory, Mr. Pignon pointed out that that arrest had taken place in accordance with a sentence passed by a competent court, on 12 December 1953, and that an effort had been made to defer execution of sentence until the close of the General Assembly session in order to enable Mr. Abessolo N'Koudou to go to New York if necessary.

4. The petitions from the Juvento, the INDECAM and the ESOCAM all dealt with general problems with which the Trusteeship Council was concerned already, and the two last-named groups had submitted substantially similar petitions. The reactions aroused in the Cameroons by the behaviour of Mr. Um Nyobé after he had been granted a hearing by the Fourth Committee had merely proved that certain elements of the population were using the United Nations General Assembly as a forum for their private disputes. He urged the Committee to reject the requests for hearings other than that of the Juvento.

5. Mr. CARDIN (Canada) said that in principle his delegation favoured granting hearings since the right to be heard was laid down in the Charter. In practice, however, the established procedure was for the Fourth Committee to act as an organ of appeal, petitions being heard in the first instance by the Trusteeship Council and its appropriate organs, as well as by the periodical visiting missions of the United Nations to the Trust Territories. His delegation would be guided by those considerations in assessing the merits of each request, since, in view of the late distribution of the documents relating to the petitioners' requests, it had not been able to give the matter the attention it deserved.

6. Mr. BOURDILLON (United Kingdom) supported the views expressed by the representative of France. Since the principle of allowing hearings was provided for in the Charter, there could be no objection to it, but as the French representative had pointed out, there was nothing in the Charter which made the granting of such hearings mandatory on the Assembly. He felt that the Committee was under an obligation to consider each case on its merits, in the best interests of the petitioners themselves, the Assembly and the peoples of the Trust Territories. To that end, as his delegation had suggested on previous occasions, rules of procedure should be laid down to deal with requests for hearings. The Committee had, however, already rejected that idea in previous years. The problem had not as yet been handled in the right way. The consideration of

requests for hearings on general questions would do nothing to help either the work of the Committee or the political development of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories.

7. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that he would consider the petitions both from the point of view of principle and individually. Leaving aside the petition from the Juvento, which was connected with an agenda item, the requests of the representatives of the UPC, ESOCAM and INDECAM seemed to be requests for participation in the work of the Fourth Committee rather than for a hearing, and consequently went far beyond the principles laid down in General Assembly resolutions on the subject. Furthermore, there seemed to be an intention to set the Trusteeship Council aside, as the requests had been addressed direct to the General Assembly and not through the Council. Moreover, in the case of the requests for hearings from INDECAM, it was difficult to determine which representative, the Honorary Chairman or the Secretary-General, would be entitled to a hearing. To allow participation of such representatives in the work of the Committee would be going far beyond the General Assembly resolutions referring to the participation in the work of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories of qualified representatives of the peoples of those Territories, appointed by the Administering Power. To grant requests for hearings automatically would mean that any person who indicated a desire to be heard, however unqualified he might be, would be authorized to take part in the Fourth Committee's work, though it would not even be clear what section of the population he represented or what was the real importance of the political parties to which he belonged, for it was a fact that no real knowledge of political trends was available to the Committee.

8. Furthermore, so far no hearing by the General Assembly had benefited an indigenous population or led to a just and fair solution. A hearing simply provided one person with an opportunity to state his views, and he usually did so by reading out a statement which might equally well have been received in writing. Such statements did not help the Fourth Committee to form an opinion. There was besides a real danger that persons who had been to New York for hearings before the Fourth Committee would return to their Territories with enhanced personal prestige and claim to be spokesmen for the United Nations, which might be damaging to the prestige of the General Assembly. The Secretariat might well provide some information as to the nature of the political parties which had requested hearings, particularly the two different sections of INDECAM.

9. The holding of such hearings would mean that the Trusteeship Council was being by-passed in an undesirable manner. What was more, if requests for hearings were accepted indiscriminately, the Committee's task would become unduly heavy.

10. He would vote against all the requests before the Committee.

11. Mr. LALL (India) could not agree with the general views advanced by the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and Belgium. Article 87 of the Charter indicated certain steps that could be taken by the General Assembly in respect of Trust Territories. The present discussion concerned only one item in that Article, namely sub-paragraph *b*, but supposing the

Fourth Committee were to take a view similar to that expressed by previous speakers in respect of the other activities provided for, such as the consideration of reports mentioned in sub-paragraph *c*. That would completely stifle the work of the General Assembly with reference to Trust Territories. He thought that it would be a clear dereliction of duty if sub-paragraph *b* were ignored. The hearing of petitions was one of the ways of ensuring that the functions of the General Assembly in respect of the Trust Territories were completely fulfilled. His delegation would vote on the individual petitions before the Committee in the light of the general principle that hearings were in conformity with the provisions of the Charter.

12. The French representative had said that he would not be opposed to consideration of the request from the Juvento, but had considered the other requests for hearings to be too general in character. However, some specific points were mentioned in the other requests, and it was in any case not always easy for petitioners to include specific details in their petitions. He thought there was a good case for allowing such petitioners to come and amplify their petitions. The process was to a certain extent progressive, and it was because it was not possible to submit all details immediately in an original petition that hearings served a useful purpose.

13. It had been suggested that the petitioners were not fully representative of public opinion, but he doubted whether the democratic processes had been permitted sufficient development in the Trust Territories to allow of proper representation of majority and minority political views. That was precisely one of the matters which the Fourth Committee was bound to study. Petitioners should be encouraged rather than discouraged, and persons who wished to give the Committee information about the work of the Trusteeship System should be given a fair hearing.

14. Mr. BUNCHE (Secretary of the Committee), replying to a request from the CHAIRMAN, said that he did not feel a political evaluation by the Secretariat of the various organizations concerned would be appropriate but he would endeavour to provide some background information.

15. The Juvento had been established in Togoland under French administration in 1951, its purpose being to promote unification of the two Togolands and early self-government or independence; it was considered by the Administering Authority as a branch of the Comité de l'unité togolaise. Further details could be obtained from documents T/1105, paragraphs 191 to 196, and A/2680, page 208. The UPC, founded in the Cameroons under French administration in 1948, was opposed to the association of the Territory with the French Union and advocated immediate independence of the Territory and its unification with the Cameroons under British administration. The party was alleged to have a membership of 30,000, but the local administration contested that estimate. Further details were contained in document T/1110, paragraphs 87 to 92, and in the official record of the 393rd meeting of the Fourth Committee, held at the eighth session. The ESOCAM had been formed in the Cameroons under French administration in 1948; it favoured association of the Territory with the French Union, and was opposed to the immediate unification with the Cameroons under British administration. Its main objectives were to promote the

development of the Territory within the French Union and to combat communism. Further information appeared in document T/1110, paragraph 93, and in the official record of the 388th meeting of the Fourth Committee, held at the eighth session. The INDECAM had been recently established in the Territory. It favoured the association of the Territory with the French Union. Its main objectives were to unite all Cameroonians to campaign against any group attempting to disturb the peace of the Territory and its relation with the Administering Authority and to promote the political, economic and social development of the Territory within the French Union.

16. Mr. CLAREY (Australia) said that his delegation was fully aware of the provisions of the Charter and had no desire to urge a restrictive interpretation of those provisions, but it would put in a word of caution concerning hearings. One of the functions of the Trusteeship Council was the hearing of petitions, to which end a Standing Committee on Petitions had been established under the Council. Since the Council was already adequately organized for the purpose of examining petitions, the Fourth Committee should regard such examination by the Trusteeship Council as the normal procedure and should not depart from it except in cases which were clearly proved to be exceptional and called for exceptional procedure. Since the requests under consideration were not of that kind, there should be no departure from the normal procedure. His delegation had frequently stated its attitude on the subject and that would explain the vote which he would presently cast. In view of the comments made by the representative of France, he would abstain from voting on the request for a hearing from the Juvento.

17. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland) expressed his general agreement with the Indian representative. The Trusteeship Council was not a court of first instance to which all petitions should be sent initially; it was an auxiliary organ of the General Assembly. Article 7 of the Charter certainly mentioned the General Assembly and the Trusteeship Council together, but later articles, notably Articles 85 and 87, established a very clear hierarchical distinction, which was implicitly reiterated in the various Trusteeship Agreements, where the Administering Authorities undertook to collaborate with the General Assembly and with the Trusteeship Council in the discharge of all their functions as defined in Articles 85 and 87 of the Charter. The right to hear petitioners undoubtedly belonged to the General Assembly and, only under its authority, to the Trusteeship Council. The General Assembly must not relinquish that authority.

18. The question of unduly extending the Committee's debates did not arise, as only six requests for hearings had been received, nor was there any question of indigenous participation. He could not agree with the Belgian representative that the hearing of petitioners served no useful purpose. On the contrary, much more information, and first-hand information, about conditions in the Trust Territories and the peoples' aspirations was supplied by the petitioners than by the reports of the Administering Authorities and the Trusteeship Council.

19. His delegation was in favour of hearing all the petitioners regardless of their political opinions, and he formally moved that all six requests for hearings should

be granted. That would be in keeping with the Committee's previous practice.

20. He hoped that all the petitioners invited would obtain passports from the Administering Authority and visas from the United States in order to facilitate their early arrival in New York.

21. Mr. HASSAN (Pakistan) said that, as a matter of principle, his delegation had always supported and would always support requests for hearings. The General Assembly must be informed of the trend of political thought and activity in the Trust Territories and it would be wrong to refuse the petitioners an opportunity to supplement the information supplied by the Administering Authorities. It was the Administering Authorities' duty to promote the political advancement of the peoples of the Trust Territories and it was regrettable that more was not being done in that direction. There might be some truth in the assertion that the political parties requesting hearings were not truly representative and merely wished to enhance their own prestige, but, as the people became politically more mature—and that would happen only if political thought and activity were encouraged—they would become more critical and those parties that were unsound would sooner or later be rejected. He did not agree with the previous speaker that all requests for hearings should be granted indiscriminately but, in the case at issue, only six requests had been received and they could be dealt with on their merits. No useful purpose would be served by denying the petitioners a hearing, and he would vote in favour of granting all six requests.

22. Miss ROESAD (Indonesia) said that her delegation was always in favour of granting requests for hearings before the Fourth Committee. By granting such hearings, the General Assembly showed its real interest in the Trust Territories and considerably increased its understanding of conditions there. Her delegation would therefore vote in favour of granting all the hearings.

23. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt) said that it was difficult for the General Assembly to evaluate conditions in the Trust Territories. The confrontation of divergent political views, whether majority or minority views, would help the Committee to form a clear picture of the real situation in those territories. He would therefore vote in favour of granting the requests.

24. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) noted that the problem could be approached from two angles, the legal and the practical. So far as the legal angle was concerned, Article 87 of the Charter made it quite clear that the General Assembly and, under its authority, the Trusteeship Council were entitled to accept petitions and examine them. Hence, there was no doubt that the Assembly was competent to grant the requests for hearings.

25. One of the practical arguments invoked against granting the hearings was that special international machinery for the consideration of petitions existed in the Trusteeship Council. From three years' experience, he knew that the procedure to which petitions were subjected in the Council and its committees virtually nullified the right of petition embodied in the Charter. His country, like others that had experienced centuries of colonial domination, valued that right at its true worth and believed that it should be developed so as to give the millions of dependent peoples who had

hitherto been voiceless an opportunity to be heard on matters vitally affecting their very future. He would therefore vote in favour of granting all six requests.

26. Mr. ARENALES (Guatemala) said that the Charter clearly recognized the right of petition. The only question was to what extent the exercise of that right could be limited. The French representative had referred to the political affiliations of some of the organizations concerned and had expressed the opinion that they would not make a positive contribution to the Committee's work. That argument defeated its own ends, for the Committee could scarcely pass judgment on an organization's sincerity without granting it a hearing. The Belgian representative had contended that some of the petitioners wished to participate in the Committee's work. Obviously, they could not be allowed to do so, and that restriction should be made clear to them; it was hardly, however, a reason for rejecting their requests. The Belgian representative had further argued that, if the Committee accepted all requests indiscriminately, such requests would pour in and the Committee would be faced with an impossibly heavy programme of work. The problem might arise at some future date, but until the Assembly adopted rules of procedure for determining which requests should be granted, the Committee had no course open to it but to abide by the Charter and grant each and every one. In that connexion, the Committee might attempt to establish some procedure for obtaining information about the various organizations making requests. It was not the Secretariat's duty to pass judgment on them. In any event, he agreed with the Indian representative that it was immaterial whether an organization wished to express the majority or the minority point of view: if it wished a hearing, it must be heard.

27. On the question of the relative competence of the Assembly and the Trusteeship Council, he agreed with previous speakers that the answer lay in Article 87. He would not go so far as to contend that the Assembly had priority; on the other hand, neither did the Trusteeship Council. In his view petitions could properly be submitted to either body and the fact that they had been submitted to one first rather than to the other was no reason for rejecting them.

28. From the practical point of view, it was not certain that the Committee would derive further information from the petitioners, but it should not exclude that possibility. He would therefore vote in favour of granting all the requests.

29. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) pointed out that the Charter provided for oral hearings and that precedents for such hearings existed in the Committee. Nevertheless, he could not agree with the Polish representative that all requests should be granted indiscriminately. To do so might contradict the provisions of Article 87 b of the Charter, which provided that petitions should be accepted and examined "in consultation with the Administering Authority". In the case at issue, however, there seemed nothing in the documents before the Committee or the information supplied by the Secretariat to warrant rejection, and his delegation would therefore vote in favour of granting hearings.

30. Mr. QUIROS (El Salvador) explained that both in the Trusteeship Council and in the General Assembly his delegation had always voted in favour of all requests for a hearing addressed to either body provided that

they were not manifestly inconsequential. His delegation believed that the six requests before the Committee were all of sufficient importance to justify hearings. The UPC might well be less important than it claimed, but it did represent a section of public opinion and was, he believed, a legal party in the Trust Territory. It should therefore be allowed to state its views.

31. He had no doubts concerning the Committee's right to grant hearings but, in any case, the Committee's competence had been fully established by its past decisions in that respect.

32. The Belgian representative's argument that some of the petitioners wished to participate in the Committee's work was based on too narrow an interpretation of their requests. He was sure that all the organizations in question wanted to be heard when the Committee was studying conditions in their particular Trust Territory.

33. He would vote in favour of granting all the requests for hearings, although he felt that it might be necessary, at a later date, to clarify whether or not two separate requests had been received from INDECAM and two representatives wished to appear. He was inclined to believe that the second letter (A/C.4/264) merely confirmed the first (A/C.4/262).

34. Mr. ROBBINS (United States of America) said that his delegation was not opposed in principle to the right of petition embodied in the Trusteeship System. Nevertheless, it would vote against all requests for hearings before the Fourth Committee unless it was convinced that a matter of urgency was involved. Where there was no urgency, the petitioners should first be heard in the Trusteeship Council. The only one of the requests before the Committee which could in any way be regarded as urgent was that from the Juvento, which related to an item on the current agenda. It would not be in the best interests of the United Nations and would detract from the Committee's prestige were the Committee to grant all requests for hearings indiscriminately.

35. When the Committee had decided which hearings to grant, his delegation should be informed of the names of the individuals and parties concerned so that it could use its good offices to expedite the granting of visas.

36. Mr. VEJVODA (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation believed that the hearing of petitioners facilitated the Committee's work. In view of that consideration and of the fact that the Charter clearly and unreservedly recognized the right of petition, he would vote in favour of all the requests for hearings.

37. Mr. GALVEZ (Argentina) said that his delegation had always been in favour of granting hearings, without limitations or restrictions. The first-hand information received from petitioners was of great assistance to the Committee in analysing the situation in the Trust Territories. His delegation would follow its traditional policy in voting in favour of granting all the requests.

38. Mr. JOUBLANC RIVAS (Mexico) said that his delegation would vote in favour of granting all the requests for hearings. In regard to the fear expressed in connexion with the request from the ESOCAM that it would be permitted to assist the General Assembly in the drafting of resolutions concerning the Cameroons, he felt that the petition was obviously poorly worded. The representative of the organization would clearly not

participate directly in the work of the Fourth Committee; on that understanding, the application should be granted.

39. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that his delegation had no objection in principle to the hearing of petitioners from the Trust Territories by the Fourth Committee. Article 87 b of the Charter provided that the General Assembly might—it did not say that it must—accept petitions and examine them, in consultation with the Administering Authority. However, the Trusteeship Council was a principal organ of the United Nations set up to supervise the administration of the Trust Territories, and it was therefore primarily to the Trusteeship Council that the task of examining petitions should fall. He noted with regret that certain of the requests under consideration had been transmitted directly to the Secretary-General or the President of the General Assembly, thus by-passing the Trusteeship Council. If petitioners were to be heard by the Fourth Committee, it must in the near future establish adequate rules of procedure for the consideration of requests for hearings, along the lines of those already adopted by the Trusteeship Council. The Fourth Committee had heard representatives of the UPC and of the ESOCAM at its previous session and had transmitted their statements to the Trusteeship Council for special study. The results of that study were embodied in the report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly (A/2680). In view of the fact that no new material appeared to have been introduced into the petitions submitted to the General Assembly at the current session, he was doubtful whether their reiteration would be of any value.

40. With regard to the request from the Juvento, the fact that the Committee's agenda contained two specific items relating to the future of the people of Togoland gave some justification for granting it. His delegation would therefore not vote against it. He suggested that a separate vote should be taken on the request from that organization at least.

41. Mr. FORTEZA (Uruguay) said that his delegation wished merely to reiterate its traditional position on the question of requests for hearings received from Trust Territories: as a matter of principle, every petitioner from those Territories should be heard by the General Assembly, subject only to the restrictions dictated by law, justice and common sense. Moreover, Article 87 b of the Charter, as his delegation had always maintained, should be interpreted in its widest sense because it laid down basic principles. As no new circumstance had arisen and no argument had been advanced to cause his delegation to alter its traditional stand in the matter, he would vote in favour of granting all the requests received.

42. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) said that his delegation shared the view that all requests for hearings received from inhabitants of the Trust Territories should be granted. He did not agree that petitions should in the first instance be addressed to the Trusteeship Council. He noted that certain representatives had contended that the requests received did not relate to matters of great urgency, but there was no mention of urgency in the Charter. All the requests received did in fact relate to specific items on the Committee's agenda, since the report of the Trusteeship Council was largely made up of comments on the information received from the

various Trust Territories. His delegation would vote in favour of granting all the requests received.

43. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that her delegation would support all the requests for hearings. She felt that no judgment could be passed on the validity of the petitions received until the petitioners had presented their cases to the Fourth Committee.

44. Mr. ITANI (Lebanon) said that in principle his delegation was in favour of granting all requests for hearings from all political parties in any of the Trust Territories. If the right was accorded to all such organizations without discrimination, the granting of the requests should not make the work of the Administering Authorities more difficult or create disturbances in the Trust Territories. Previous years had shown that valuable supplementary information could be gleaned from the statements made at such hearings. The Administering Authorities and their officials would be present at the hearings to oppose mis-statements and give further explanations, thus guaranteeing that the Committee would not be given a one-sided view. He would therefore vote in favour of granting the requests.

45. Mr. LYRA (Brazil) believed that it would be a negation of the principles of the Charter for the Fourth Committee to reverse its usual procedure of granting requests for hearings. He intended to vote in favour of granting the requests received.

46. Mr. ZUNIGA FUENTEALBA (Chile) said that as it was his delegation's policy to support the granting of all requests for hearings, in the belief that any additional information must be of help in solving the problems of the Trust Territories, he would vote in favour of granting the requests.

47. Mr. HARARI (Israel) said that there could be no doubt that, according to the Charter, persons and organizations in the Trust Territories were entitled to address petitions to the Fourth Committee and to be heard by that body. It seemed strange, however, that the Committee had not as yet adopted any rules of procedure determining how and when such petitions could be presented and what subjects were regarded as sufficiently important to warrant a hearing. He endorsed the statement made by the representative of the Dominican Republic at the 317th meeting of the Fourth Committee, during the eighth session of the General Assembly, to the effect that at some juncture the Committee must reach a general decision on how best to deal with the problem. The Israel delegation considered that, until such rules had been adopted, the petitioners were entitled to a hearing. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of granting all the requests.

48. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) said that his delegation also wished to reaffirm its position regarding the granting of requests for hearings. Petitioners from Trust Territories were undoubtedly entitled to a hearing according to the Charter, and in fact their statements often threw valuable light on the situation in the various Trust Territories. He could not agree with the representatives of France and Belgium that the organizations requesting hearings had no new information to give the Committee and that to grant their requests would merely afford their representatives an opportunity for personal aggrandizement. The Committee should not reject any opportunity of further enlightenment in

regard to the situation in the Trust Territories. He would therefore vote in favour of granting all the requests received.

49. U HLA AUNG (Burma) said that his delegation would maintain its stand in favour of granting all requests for hearings.

50. Mr. ROMANACCE-CHALAS (Dominican Republic) said that requests for hearings fell into the same category as petitions, and the right of petition was an essential feature of the Trusteeship System. His delegation had consistently upheld the right of petition in the Trusteeship Council and in the General Assembly, and he would vote in favour of granting hearings in reply to the requests received.

51. Mr. PIGNON (France), replying to the point raised by the representative of El Salvador, said that the UPC was a legal party in the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under French administration, just as the Communist Party was a legally recognized political party in France. He added that he did not know of any dissidence between the Mbalmayo branch of the UPC and that party's Bureau.

52. The CHAIRMAN said that the Polish representative had proposed a blanket acceptance of all the requests for hearings. However, in view of the fact that certain delegations had asked for separate votes on some of the requests, he would suggest that separate votes should be taken on the requests in the order in which they appeared in documents A/C.4/262 and A/C.4/264.

It was so decided.

The Committee decided by 41 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions, to grant the request for a hearing received from the National Chairman of the Mouvement de la jeunesse togolaise (A/C.4/262).

The Committee decided by 40 votes to 11, with 1 abstention, to grant the request for a hearing received from the Secretary of the Mbalmayo branch of the Union des populations du Cameroun (A/C.4/262).

The Committee decided by 41 votes to 11, with 1 abstention, to grant the request for a hearing received from the General Chairman of the Evolution sociale camerounaise (A/C.4/262).

The Committee decided by 39 votes to 11, with 2 abstentions, to grant the request for a hearing received from the Vice-Chairman of the Bureau of the Union des populations du Cameroun (A/C.4/262).

The Committee decided by 41 votes to 11, with 1 abstention, to grant the request for a hearing received from the Permanent Secretary-General of the Co-ordination des indépendants camerounais (A/C.4/262).

The Committee decided by 41 votes to 11, with 1 abstention, to grant the request for a hearing received from the Honorary Chairman of the Co-ordination des indépendants camerounais (A/C.4/264).

53. Mr. QUIROS (El Salvador) said that his delegation had voted in favour of granting both requests from the INDECAM, but wondered whether the Secretary could give any indication whether two representatives were in fact to be expected.

54. Mr. BUNCHE (Secretary of the Committee) said that two requests had been received from the same organization but it was not clear whether more than one representative would be sent. Such organizations had on occasion sent a delegation of several representatives, and the Committee had determined subsequently which of them it would hear.

55. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that, in view of the remarks made by certain representatives, he wished to explain his vote. He had voted against granting the requests for hearings, but not because he was not in favour of the right of petition. Written petitions, particularly if they had been properly addressed in the first instance to the Trusteeship Council, would have received his support. He objected, however, to the oral presentation of petitions, which was not provided for in the Charter. Moreover, it was untrue to say that he had asserted that no useful information came out of the statements made by petitioners. He had said that neither the Trusteeship Council nor the General Assembly gained any special advantage from the reading of such statements by representatives in person.

56. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) trusted that note had been taken of the request by the Polish representative that the authorities concerned should take all steps to expedite the granting of the required documents and visas to the petitioners to be heard by the Fourth Committee.

57. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would inform all the parties concerned of the Committee's decisions. He expressed the Committee's appreciation to the representative of the United States for the offer of his delegation's good offices in connexion with the granting of United States visas.

58. He suggested that the representative of the Juvento should be heard when the items relating to the Trust Territories of Togoland under British and Togoland under French administration were discussed, and the representatives of the various organizations in the Cameroons in connexion with the report of the Trusteeship Council.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.