



Friday, 7 December 1956,
 at 3.10 p.m.

New York

CONTENTS

	Page
Requests for hearings (<i>continued</i>)	97
Agenda item 38:	
Admissibility of hearings of petitioners by the Committee on South West Africa: advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (<i>continued</i>)	100

Chairman: Mr. Enrique de MARCHENA
 (Dominican Republic).

Requests for hearings (A/C.4/339) (*continued*)

1. Mr. JASPER (United Kingdom) said that, for reasons it had explained at previous sessions of the General Assembly, the United Kingdom considered that the Committee should not grant the request for a hearing submitted by the Reverend Michael Scott (A/C.4/339, para. 1). If the Liberian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.438/Rev.1) relating to agenda item 38 was adopted, it would be possible for Mr. Scott to be heard by the Committee on South West Africa.

2. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) said that his delegation would vote for the Liberian draft resolution, when agenda item 38 was under discussion, because it accepted the advisory opinion of 1 June 1956 of the International Court of Justice.¹ The authorization to grant oral hearings to petitioners, with which that opinion was concerned, appertained to the Committee on South West Africa. While the Fourth Committee's powers were obviously not inferior to those of the Committee on South West Africa, it was clearly preferable that the latter Committee, as the competent specialized body, should conduct any necessary hearings.

3. Mr. RAMAIAH (India) pointed out that Mr. Scott's request for a hearing was addressed to the Chairman of the Fourth Committee, and that it would be in accordance with previous practice for that Committee to hear him.

4. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) thought that the Committee's practice at the tenth session should provide sufficient guidance; she had, however, seen no resolution making it part of the Committee's duty to hear petitioners.

5. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) considered that, while Mr. Scott might indeed be heard by the Committee on South West Africa, there was no reason why he should not be heard by the Fourth Committee; his delegation accordingly favoured the grant of Mr. Scott's request for a hearing.

¹ *Admissibility of hearings of petitioners by the Committee on South West Africa, Advisory Opinion of June 1st, 1956: I.C.J. Reports 1956, p. 23.* (Transmitted to Members of the General Assembly by the Secretary-General under cover of document A/3147.)

6. Ato YIFRU (Ethiopia) said that at the previous session his delegation had abstained in the vote on granting a hearing to Mr. Scott, but in view of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, he would vote in favour of granting him a hearing at the current session.

7. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that he would support the granting of a hearing to Mr. Scott, without prejudice to the latter's right to request a hearing by the Committee on South West Africa. The Fourth Committee was entitled to obtain whatever information Mr. Scott might be able to provide for its guidance in considering the problem.

8. Mr. MUNK (Denmark) felt that the principles laid down by the International Court of Justice with regard to the granting of hearings by the Committee on South West Africa should also apply to the Fourth Committee, i.e., hearings should be granted only to persons who had already submitted written petitions and such petitions should come from the area in question; furthermore, hearings should be granted only provided that the General Assembly was satisfied that such a course was necessary for the maintenance of effective international supervision of the administration of the Mandated Territory. The Fourth Committee should therefore obtain the authorization of the General Assembly before granting hearings. Hence, he would vote against granting a hearing to Mr. Scott.

9. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) pointed out that, according to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 11 July 1950,² the degree of supervision to be exercised by the General Assembly should not exceed that which had applied under the Mandates System, and should conform as far as possible to the procedure followed by the Council of the League of Nations. He asked the Secretariat whether the Council of the League of Nations had ever received petitions or whether they had always been submitted to the Permanent Mandates Commission.

10. Mr. WIESCHOFF (Secretary of the Committee) replied that petitions had been received direct by the Permanent Mandates Commission and the Council had acted only on the recommendations of the Commission. The rules of procedure adopted by the Committee on South West Africa were to a large extent a replica of the rules governing petitions under the Mandates System.

11. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) observed that that question had been raised at the tenth session. According to page 28 of the Court's advisory opinion of 1 June 1956, the Permanent Mandates Commission had had under consideration at various meetings the question of the grant of oral hearings to petitioners,

² *International status of South West Africa, Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1950, p. 128.* (Transmitted to Members of the General Assembly by the Secretary-General under cover of document A/1362.)

both at the request of petitioners and on its own initiative, and had felt that in some cases hearings would be useful in determining whether petitions were well-founded or not. It was true that the Permanent Mandates Commission had never granted hearings to petitioners, but that had not been because such hearings were not admissible but because they had been unnecessary, since the Commission had had the co-operation of the Mandatory Power. The Court's advisory opinion showed that the Council of the League had been competent to decide on the question and *ipso facto* the General Assembly was also competent.

12. He would support the granting of both the hearings requested (A/C.4/339).

13. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said he had not raised the question of competence; he had asked whether the Council of the League of Nations had ever examined petitions or whether they had always been examined by the Permanent Mandates Commission. In his opinion, the Committee would be acting in conformity with the spirit of the Court's opinion by deciding that the petitioners should be heard by the Committee on South West Africa.

14. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said he would vote in favour of granting both requests. In his view, to do so would be entirely in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Court's advisory opinion. The Court had ruled in effect that the General Assembly could authorize the Committee on South West Africa to grant hearings, and therefore logically the General Assembly itself could grant hearings.

15. With reference to the remarks of the Danish representative, he said he saw nothing in the advisory opinion which laid down that hearings could be granted only to petitioners coming from the Territory in question.

16. Mr. GRILLO (Italy) said he would not minimize the importance of the information obtained from petitioners or contest the Committee's competence to grant hearings, but for the reasons advanced by the United States representative he considered that petitioners should be heard first by the Committee on South West Africa—always assuming that the Liberian draft resolution would be adopted.

17. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) said that he had supported Mr. Scott's request for a hearing at the tenth session (A/C.4/313), firstly because he had felt that there was no doubt whatsoever of the Committee's competence to grant hearings and, secondly, for the practical reasons that information concerning South West Africa was very scanty and he considered that the Committee should lose no opportunity of obtaining further data. On page 30 and elsewhere in its advisory opinion of 1 June 1956 the Court expressed the view that the General Assembly, and the Fourth Committee in particular, should utilize every possible source of information.

18. He would vote in favour of granting both requests.

19. Mr. KIANG (China) said that in his view the request from Mr. Mburumba Kerina Getzen (A/C.4/339, para. 2) should be transmitted to the Committee on South West Africa.

20. Mr. NASH (United States of America) entirely agreed with the Chinese representative.

21. He asked the Liberian representative whether paragraph 2 of the Liberian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.438/Rev.1) meant that requests for hearings should be referred to the Committee on South West Africa in advance of, but not necessarily precluding, a hearing by the Fourth Committee.

22. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) replied that although her delegation's draft resolution authorized the Committee on South West Africa to grant hearings to petitioners, it did not necessarily mean that they must appear before that Committee before being heard by the Fourth Committee.

23. Mr. JASPER (United Kingdom) observed that two principles were involved: first, that as far as possible the procedure employed under the League of Nations should be followed, i.e., that the subordinate body should, generally speaking, hear petitioners first; second, the practical point that the Committee's work would be speeded up if the substance of petitioners' observations were sifted by the Committee on South West Africa and incorporated in its report to the Fourth Committee.

24. He would abstain in the vote on Mr. Scott's request, since he felt that, by now, that particular question was a purely procedural one. He would vote against Mr. Getzen's request, which was in a different category.

25. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) moved the closure of the debate.

26. Mrs. MONTEJO (Costa Rica) supported that proposal.

The Committee decided by 47 votes to 3, with 13 abstentions, to grant a hearing to the Reverend Michael Scott.

27. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) referred to page 28 of the advisory opinion of 1 June 1956, which stated that the Rapporteur of the Permanent Mandates Commission, in his report to the Council, had stated that if in any particular case the circumstances should show that it was impossible for all the necessary information to be secured by the usual means, the Council could decide on such exceptional procedure as might seem appropriate and necessary in the particular circumstances. If the Court's opinion were to be honestly complied with and the practice under the League of Nations followed, petitions should be sent in writing to the Committee on South West Africa. If it proved impossible to settle a question on the basis of a written petition, or if the information supplied was insufficient, the General Assembly could then decide to authorize the Committee on South West Africa to grant a hearing to the petitioner. By granting a hearing without first examining a written petition, and in the absence of any exceptional circumstances which would justify such a step, the Committee had exceeded its powers according to the opinion of the Court. For those reasons, he had voted against the proposal.

28. Mr. LOJENDIO (Spain) said he had abstained in the vote, and would abstain again in the vote on the second request, because he had heard no good reason advanced why some petitioners should go direct to the Fourth Committee while others would be heard by the Committee on South West Africa.

29. Mr. KIANG (China) thought the vote on the second request should be taken in the light of Mr. Getzen's original request to present a statement to the Committee on South West Africa after the Court had rendered its opinion. In view of the terms of that application, he thought the Committee should transmit the request to the Committee on South West Africa rather than grant the petitioner a hearing itself.

30. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said he would vote against any proposal to transmit the request for a hearing by Mr. Getzen to the Committee on South West Africa. The petitioner had addressed a number of letters to the Committee on South West Africa about the time of the tenth session of the General Assembly and had withdrawn his request because of the adoption by the Assembly of resolution 942 (X) asking the International Court for an advisory opinion. That opinion having been given, Mr. Getzen had written to the Chairman of the Fourth Committee requesting a hearing by the United Nations. Obviously he had used those words owing to ignorance of United Nations terminology, but it was clear that he wished to be granted a hearing by the Fourth Committee.

31. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) expressed the view that since the letter had been addressed to the Chairman of the Fourth Committee, the Chairman had acted correctly in placing the question on the Committee's agenda. He would vote against the Chinese representative's proposal.

32. Mrs. MONTEJO (Costa Rica) suggested that the question of where Mr. Getzen wished to be heard could be settled simply by asking him.

33. Mr. RAMAIAH (India) said that if the purpose of the Chinese proposal was to transfer the hearing to the Committee on South West Africa, his delegation would vote against it. The petitioner had addressed his application to the Fourth Committee and obviously wished to be heard by it. Moreover, the Committee had already adopted that procedure in the case of Mr. Scott and there was no reason why it should not do so in that of Mr. Getzen.

34. If the Committee adopted the Liberian draft resolution, he hoped that it would not interpret it as implying any abrogation of its own functions. The next item on its agenda was the question of South West Africa, and it would be a proper part of the Committee's function to hear petitioners during its consideration of that question.

35. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that, although the Yugoslav representative had argued that the petitioner was not familiar with United Nations procedure, the fact that he had addressed his letter to the Chairman of the Fourth Committee indicated that he was. Since the petitioner had asked to be heard by the United Nations, and since the organ of the United Nations by which he should properly be heard was the Committee on South West Africa, his delegation felt that the correct reply to Mr. Getzen's request was that the Fourth Committee could not hear him but the Committee on South West Africa could. If the latter Committee then asked for authorization to hear him, the Fourth Committee could request the General Assembly to grant it.

36. In reply to a question by the CHAIRMAN, Mr. KIANG (China) explained that his proposal was that the Committee should take note of the request for a hearing and refer it to the Committee on South

West Africa with the recommendation that it should be granted.

The Chinese proposal was rejected by 40 votes to 7, with 11 abstentions.

The Committee decided by 45 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions, to grant a hearing to Mr. Getzen.

37. Mr. BARGUES (France) said his delegation had voted against the grant of a hearing by the Fourth Committee, because the petitioner had asked to be heard by the Committee on South West Africa.

38. Mr. NASH (United States of America) said his delegation had abstained in the vote, not because it was opposed to granting the hearing but because it thought that, in the interests of orderly procedure, the petitioner should first be heard in the Committee on South West Africa. It would be anomalous for a petitioner to be heard first by the supervisory and then by the subsidiary body.

39. He hoped the Liberian draft resolution would be adopted and that it would be interpreted as authorizing the Committee on South West Africa to grant prior hearings to petitioners.

40. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt) said he had voted in favour of granting the request, because such action was in conformity with the advisory opinion of the International Court. The only objection that had been raised to the hearing of petitioners was that such hearings were not in accordance with the practice of the League of Nations. However, the Court itself had specifically stated that it had not intended to imply that the activity of the General Assembly should be restricted to measures which had actually been applied by the League of Nations.

41. Mr. GRILLO (Italy) said his delegation had no objection to the hearing of any petitioners. However, as it had said earlier, it hoped the Fourth Committee would not become a committee on petitions, and therefore felt that the petitioner should first be heard by the Committee on South West Africa.

42. Mr. JASPER (United Kingdom) said his delegation had always been opposed to the granting of hearings to petitioners from South West Africa in the Fourth Committee. In the case of Mr. Scott, his delegation had abstained in the vote, because the matter was one that had already come before the Assembly on many occasions; in the second case, however, it could see no reason for setting a precedent, and he had accordingly voted against the request.

43. Mr. VELANDO (Peru) said he had abstained in the vote on the Chinese proposal and had voted in favour of granting the hearing, because it seemed logical for the Fourth Committee to authorize it. Having done so, however, it could then refer the petitioner to the Committee on South West Africa. His delegation felt that that should be done, and was therefore in favour of the suggestion made by the United States representative.

44. Mr. KIANG (China) said his delegation's abstention in the vote had apparently given rise to some misunderstanding. His delegation had always thought it desirable to hear petitioners and was certainly in favour of granting hearings to the petitioners whose requests had just been considered. However, it did not think that those hearings should take place in the Fourth Committee.

AGENDA ITEM 38

Admissibility of hearings of petitioners by the Committee on South West Africa: advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (A/3147, A/C.4/338, A/C.4/L.438/Rev.1, A/C.4/L.440) (continued)

45. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that she believed that the revised draft resolution her delegation was now submitting (A/C.4/L.438/Rev.1) met the wishes expressed by members of the Committee at its previous meeting. She wished, however, to make it clear that operative paragraph 2 did not mean that petitioners should be given a prior hearing in the Committee on South West Africa before they could be heard in the Fourth Committee. It meant that the Committee on South West Africa would be authorized to grant hearings to petitioners whenever it wished to do so.

46. Her delegation was unable to accept the Swedish amendment (A/C.4/L.440).

47. Mr. SVARD (Sweden) said he could assure the Committee that the purpose of his delegation's amendment was not to restrict the hearing of petitioners, but only to bring the Liberian draft resolution into conformity with the terms of the International Court's advisory opinion of 1 June 1956. The prerequisites referred to in the amendment were the two conditions specified by the International Court on page 32 of its advisory opinion, namely, that the petitioners should already have submitted written petitions and that the General Assembly should be satisfied that such a course was necessary for the maintenance of effective international supervision.

48. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) pointed out that the revised draft resolution still contained the words "by eight votes to five", which the sponsoring delegation itself had admitted were unnecessary.

49. His delegation felt that the Swedish amendment had the same purpose as the earlier Danish suggestion, to which it had already expressed its opposition at the previous meeting. It would therefore vote against the amendment.

50. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Liberian delegation had agreed to delete the words "by eight votes to five" from its draft resolution.

51. Mr. RAMAIAH (India) wished to clarify a point on which some confusion had arisen at the Committee's last meeting. The substance of the Court's opinion on the question submitted to it was obviously contained in the paragraph, on page 32, following the words "The Court is of opinion", and not in the paragraph immediately preceding those words, which had been quoted to the Committee. There were two distinct points, first, whether the Committee on South West Africa had the power to grant oral hearings to petitioners, and, secondly, whether it could only do so under a previously authorized procedure of the General Assembly. The Court had expressed an opinion on both. The Liberian draft resolution did not purport to lay down any procedure for the hearing of petitioners by the Committee on South West Africa. It only dealt with the opinion of the Court on the question specifically put to it as to the competence of the Committee on South West Africa to grant oral hearings to petitioners. In the circumstances, the adoption of the Swedish amendment would only result in confusion.

52. The United Kingdom representative had drawn his attention to the paragraph on page 25 of the Court's opinion defining the expression "grant oral hearings to petitioners". It seemed clear, however, that what the Court had had in mind in that paragraph was the difference between the procedure available to the League of Nations and the situation with which the United Nations was faced. In other words, the Court was explaining the fact that the petitioners were coming directly to the supervisory body rather than approaching it through the Mandatory Power.

53. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) considered that the first of the two prerequisites referred to in the Swedish amendment would lead to difficulties and confusion. In his view, the Committee on South West Africa should be left free to decide whether or not to grant hearings in each individual case.

54. Nor did his delegation feel that the second prerequisite was mandatory; in its view, the United Nations could decide to hear petitioners regardless of the procedure followed in the League of Nations. However, even supposing that the second prerequisite was in fact mandatory, the very fact of the adoption of the Liberian draft resolution by the Assembly would mean that the situation envisaged in that prerequisite had come about, and the proposed amendment was therefore unnecessary.

55. For those reasons, his delegation would vote against the Swedish amendment.

56. Mr. VIXSEBOXSE (Netherlands) said that his delegation would have welcomed an opportunity to reaffirm its respect for the decisions of the International Court of Justice by voting for the Liberian draft resolution in its original form (A/C.4/L.438), but would be obliged to abstain on the revised draft resolution (A/C.4/L.438/Rev.1). That abstention did not, however, imply any disagreement with, or disrespect for, the International Court's opinion. The Netherlands would likewise abstain in the vote on the Swedish amendment (A/C.4/L.440).

57. Mr. MAKSIMOVICH (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he would vote against the Swedish amendment, firstly, because the Committee's attitude to the International Court's opinion was clearly defined in operative paragraph 1 of the revised draft resolution; and secondly because, in his delegation's view, the amendment might prove a source of ambiguity and confusion in the future, and thus interfere with the hearing of petitioners by the Committee on South West Africa.

58. Mr. NOGUEIRA (Portugal) observed that, in its revised form, the draft resolution dealt with two separate matters: the Committee's attitude to the International Court's opinion, and the action to be taken by the Committee. In order to enable delegations to distinguish between those two subjects in casting their votes, he asked for a separate vote on operative paragraph 2.

59. Mr. JASPER (United Kingdom) took the view that the International Court's opinion could only be understood in the light of the whole text beginning in the seventh line on page 32. Furthermore, despite the Indian and Yugoslav contentions, it should be read with reference to the statement on page 25 that the Court understood the expression "grant oral hearings to petitioners" to relate to persons who had submitted

written petitions to the Committee on South West Africa. The passage concerning the Mandatory's refusal to co-operate, to which the Indian representative had drawn attention, did not affect the issue. His delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution on the understanding that the word "petitioners" in operative paragraph 2 meant petitioners who had submitted written petitions. The United Kingdom would oppose any proposal from the Committee on South West Africa to the effect that a petitioner who had not submitted a written petition should be heard.

60. The rejection—and not, as it had been claimed, the adoption—of the Swedish amendment would be a potential source of confusion, and the amendment would receive his delegation's support.

The Swedish amendment (A/C.4/L.440) was rejected by 39 votes to 11, with 11 abstentions.

The preamble and operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.438/Rev.1) were adopted by 52 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution was adopted by 46 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions.

The draft resolution (A/C.4/L.438/Rev.1) as a whole was adopted by 51 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

61. Mr. NASH (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution. It had also voted for the amendment which, it considered, would have clarified the resolution. In the subsequent proceedings in the Committee on South West Africa it would regard the substance of the Swedish amendment as a necessary implication of the International Court's opinion.

62. Mr. SVARD (Sweden) said that Sweden had abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, because the rejection of the Swedish amendment had left it incomplete. It had, however, voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole out of respect for the Court's opinion and on the understanding that the Committee accepted the opinion *in toto*, including the stipulation that the Committee on South West Africa might grant hearings to petitioners who had already submitted written petitions.

63. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution as a whole, because the amendment to operative paragraph 2 had been rejected.

64. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) said that, while Syria had been anxious to abide by the Court's opinion as a whole, it had been obliged to abstain in the vote on the Swedish amendment, because it considered the word "prerequisites" unclear.

65. Mr. LOOMES (Australia) said that his delegation shared the United Kingdom view that the Court's opinion was not to be regarded as wholly included in the three lines ending on the twentieth line on page 32 of that opinion. The rejection of the Swedish amendment had made it necessary for Australia to vote against operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

66. Mr. BARRIGA (Ecuador) said that at the tenth session his delegation had taken the view that the grant or rejection by the Assembly of requests for hearings was a procedural matter on which no advisory opinion from the International Court was required. However, the Court had held that the necessity for

international supervision of the administration of mandated territories continued to exist despite the disappearance of the supervisory organ under the Mandates System; that the degree of supervision should conform as far as possible to the procedure followed by the Council of the League of Nations; that the General Assembly in carrying out its supervisory functions had the same authority as the Council, and that the scope of that authority could not be narrowed by the fact that the Assembly had replaced the Council; that the General Assembly would not be able to follow precisely the same procedures as had been followed by the Council; that the grant of oral hearings by the Committee on South West Africa to petitioners would not involve an excess in the degree of supervision to be exercised; and that oral hearings might enable the Committee to submit its advice to the General Assembly with greater confidence. His delegation had therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution, in order to express both its support for United Nations supervision of the administration of South West Africa and its respect for the International Court's opinion.

67. Mr. KAISR (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution at all stages in the voting. It had been unable, however, to vote for the amendment, which might have restricted the right of petition to and the freedom of action of the Committee on South West Africa.

68. Mr. NOGUEIRA (Portugal) said that his delegation had opposed the amendment, not because the text was objectionable in itself, but because it would have formed part of a text unacceptable to Portugal. He had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because, while his Government respected the decisions of the International Court, it could not accept the interpretation of the opinion of 1 June 1956 on which the draft resolution was based.

69. Mr. TAZHIBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution for reasons he had explained at the previous meeting. He had opposed the amendment because his delegation believed that the right of petitioners to be heard by the United Nations could not be restricted. The Committee would note that even the majority of the Judges who had adopted the opinion had not been unanimous on some aspects of the question.

70. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation had abstained on operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution for the reason which, at the previous meeting, had led the United States representative to refrain from submitting a formal amendment to the same effect: namely, that authorization was implicit in the preceding portion of the text.

71. Mr. GRILLO (Italy) said he had supported the amendment and abstained in the vote on the draft resolution, because he felt that the Court's opinion could not be adequately implemented without a reference to the submission of written petitions and to the General Assembly's being satisfied that the grant of oral hearings was necessary for the maintenance of effective international supervision. Furthermore, the grant of hearings did nothing to achieve the objectives of the Mandates System, namely the well-being and development of the peoples concerned. The United Nations should first endeavour to secure the co-operation of the Mandatory in order to render the inter-

national supervision of the administration of the Mandated Territory effective.

72. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) said that his delegation had supported the first part of the draft resolution but had abstained on operative paragraph 2 on the ground that its purpose was adequately served by the preceding provisions.

73. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on General Assembly resolution 942 (X), because it had felt that the Assembly was fully competent to grant hearings to petitioners. Since, in its opinion of 1 June 1956, the International Court had taken the same view, Guatemala had voted in favour of the Liberian draft resolution. It interpreted operative paragraph 2 of that text to mean that the General Assembly, in authorizing the

Committee on South West Africa to grant oral hearings, would retain the power to grant hearings itself whenever it saw fit. Guatemala had not voted in favour of the amendment which, in its view, was a potential source of confusion and ambiguity.

74. Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, which merely confirmed the view consistently expressed by Venezuela, which was that the General Assembly was fully competent to grant hearings on South West Africa, a territory which, in its opinion, should be under the Trusteeship System. It had opposed the amendment for the same reasons as the Guatemalan representative.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.