

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



FOURTH COMMITTEE, 252nd

MEETING

Wednesday, 22 October 1952, at 3 p.m.

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

	Page
Requests for oral hearings (A/C.4/205, A/C.4/206) (<i>continued</i>)	13
Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter (<i>continued</i>)	17

Chairman: Mr. Rodolfo MUNOZ (Argentina).

Requests for oral hearings (A/C.4/205, A/C.4/206) (*continued*)

1. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee whether it wished to authorize the Secretariat to give a favourable reply to the petitioners who had asked for an oral hearing (A/C.4/205, A/C.4/206).

2. Mr. HOPKINSON (United Kingdom) recalled that his delegation had already clearly stated its position with regard to requests of that type: it recognized that the Charter gave the inhabitants of Trust Territories the right of petition; yet, while there was no doubt about the principle of the matter, the wisdom of replying favourably to every request for a hearing could be questioned for the Committee might then be called upon to devote much of its time to the examination of individual complaints instead of concentrating on broad questions of principle. The first request (A/C.4/205) at present before the Committee concerned questions that had been examined in detail by the Trusteeship Council and its Standing Committee on Petitions. He doubted if further statements by the petitioners would add usefully to the report of the Trusteeship Council (A/2150). He would not however object to the authors of the first request being given a hearing if the Committee felt it would be useful. As far as the communication from the All-Ewe Conference (A/C.4/206) was concerned, his delegation was of the opinion that it should first apply to the Trusteeship Council, which was due to examine the questions raised by the request shortly. They would then be fully entitled to renew their request to appear before the Committee, when it examined the Trusteeship Council's report, if they still wished to persist with it.

3. Mr. PIGNON (France) said that his delegation's position had not changed: in principle, it favoured the oral hearing of petitioners, since the right of petition was laid down in the Charter for the benefit of the inhabitants of Trust Territories. In practice, however, requests for hearings should be examined on their merits, having regard to the established pro-

cedure by which the Fourth Committee acted as an organ of appeal, the petitions having been examined in the first instance by the Trusteeship Council and its organs.

4. With regard to the request from the Union des populations du Cameroun (A/C.4/205), the points it raised were as general as they were vague; according to Trusteeship Council procedure, it should be classified as a communication rather than a petition. It would therefore be well to have the opinion of the Standing Committee on Petitions, which was to meet shortly. It would be all the more premature to take a decision at the present juncture, since the petitioners would be able to submit their complaints to the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, 1952, which would shortly be going to the Cameroons.

5. Mr. HOUARD (Belgium) said his delegation could not vote in favour of the Committee's hearing petitioners so long as the General Assembly had not adopted a decision of principle governing the hearing of persons other than representatives of Member States by Assembly Committees. The communication from the Wa-Meru tribe (A/C.4/205) contained nothing that had not appeared in its earlier requests; as for the request from the All-Ewe Conference, that was a matter for the Trusteeship Council. With regard to the request from the Union des populations du Cameroun, he associated himself with the French representative's statement.

6. Mr. BAZHAN (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) proposed that the representatives of the three groups which had requested an oral hearing should be invited to submit their comments orally to the Committee when it examined the questions that concerned them. He saw no reason to postpone the hearings *sine die* or to refer them to other organs.

7. Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia) supported the Ukrainian representative's proposal. In the statements of the petitioners the Committee would have before it a point of view other than that of the Administering

Authorities when it studied the manner in which the latter were applying the principles of the Trusteeship System. Moreover, democratic principles made it imperative that the peoples of the Trust Territories should have the possibility of making known their views through the medium of their direct representatives.

8. Mr. YURANS (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) also supported the Ukrainian representative's proposal. The General Assembly and the Fourth Committee would be failing in their duty if they refused to allow the representatives of the peoples of Trust Territories to appear before them to state their case. The Fourth Committee should use every possible means of information available to it. It was most important, therefore, that there should be no indefinite postponement of the decision concerning the hearings.

9. Mr. Shiva RAO (India) pointed out that, contrary to what the United Kingdom representative appeared to think, it was not the function of the Trusteeship Council to make a prior classification of the petitions addressed to the General Assembly. Article 87 of the Charter made it clear that it was the General Assembly that was competent to accept and examine petitions; it could delegate its authority to the Trusteeship Council, which in practice examined the petitions when the Assembly was not in session, but there was nothing to prevent the Assembly taking them up itself. Moreover, it was of great psychological importance that the inhabitants of Trust Territories should be allowed to appear directly before the General Assembly. The Indian delegation would therefore vote in favour of the Ukrainian representative's proposal.

10. The CHAIRMAN noted that there was a proposal before the Committee that representatives of the groups which had asked for an oral hearing should be invited to appear before it. He asked the Committee to examine the proposal and to vote upon it for each of the three requests.

11. Mr. SHEIKIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) asked for the votes to be taken by roll-call.

12. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Ukrainian representative's proposal to the effect that the request for an oral hearing submitted by the Wa-Meru tribe should be approved.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

New Zealand, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico.

Abstaining: New Zealand, Sweden, Thailand, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Dominican Republic, France, Netherlands.

The proposal was adopted by 39 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

13. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to examine the Ukrainian proposal concerning the request for an oral hearing presented by the Union des populations du Cameroun.

14. Mr. JESSUP (United States of America) pointed out that, in the case of that request, as of the others, there was no question of the right of the General Assembly and the Fourth Committee to hear the petitioners. There was no doubt whatever of the Assembly's competence in the matter or of its right to delegate its powers to a body such as the Trusteeship Council. The question that arose in connexion with the requests, especially the request from the Union des populations du Cameroun, was whether the time had come for the Committee to examine them and whether it would be in the interest of good procedure to deal with them some other way. It was customary for the Trusteeship Council to examine petitions first, but it had not done so in the case of the petition before the Committee. Furthermore, the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, 1952, would be leaving shortly for the Cameroons and the Trusteeship Council was to meet the following month. It would therefore be a more natural procedure for the petitioners to appear first before the Trusteeship Council, on the understanding that they could ask to be heard by the Committee subsequently if they so wished.

15. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland) questioned the validity of the United States representative's argument. According to Article 87 of the Charter, the Trusteeship Council functioned under the authority of the General Assembly when it examined petitions. As the Indian representative had pointed out, it was nowhere stipulated that petitions addressed to the General Assembly were first to be placed before the Trusteeship Council. Any petitioner had a right to request a hearing before the Fourth Committee. The Union des populations du Cameroun should therefore be given the same reply as the preceding petitioners.

16. Mr. FORSYTH (Australia) thought that before taking a decision the Committee should consider very carefully the question of requests for oral hearings; it must not set up a practice which might give rise to an avalanche of similar requests in the future, for in that case it might well find that, to discharge its functions efficiently, it would have to reverse itself and be more restrictive. There was an established procedure for the consideration of petitions; the Trusteeship Council, which had been established under the Charter to assist the General Assembly in carrying out its functions, had itself set up a Standing Committee on Petitions and had from time to time sent visiting missions capable of hearing petitions to the Trust Territories. Those arrangements had worked well so far. A petitioner who was not satisfied with the Trusteeship Council's decision could obviously apply to the General Assembly, but, as a rule, the normal procedure should be followed and the Trusteeship Council and its organs should not be by-passed.

17. He emphasized that his delegation did not challenge the principle of the right of petition but it considered that the customary procedure should be observed and that there was no justification in any of

the three cases under consideration for granting the representatives a hearing before a General Assembly committee. There was all the more reason for taking that view so far as the requests by the Union des populations du Cameroun was concerned when it was remembered that a visiting mission was at the present time in West Africa. The All-Ewe Conference representations should be made before the Trusteeship Council in the first instance. His delegation would therefore vote against the Ukrainian representative's proposal, since the petitioners had every opportunity to appear before the competent body. For the same reason, it would also vote against the third request.

18. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) pointed out that there was nothing in the letter from the Union des populations du Cameroun to indicate that the petitioners intended to comment on the report of the Visiting Mission now in West Africa. On the contrary, it was clear from the second and third paragraphs of the letter that the petitioners wished to state their point of view concerning the reunification of the Camerouns and the position of the Camerouns in relation to the French Union. The Fourth Committee would not be trespassing on the Trusteeship Council's competence in any way in granting the petitioners a hearing. His delegation also thought the hearing should be granted because the previous year the General Assembly had requested the Trusteeship Council to study the question of administrative unions and the status of the Trust Territories under French administration within the French Union; the Council's report on that matter (A/2151) was before the Fourth Committee and the hearing of representatives of the Cameroonian people would obviously be most useful in the consideration of that report.

19. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Ukrainian representative's proposal to the effect that the request for an oral hearing submitted by the Union des populations du Cameroun should be approved.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Burma, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil.

Against: Canada, France, Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium.

Abstaining: Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Peru, Thailand.

The proposal was adopted by 37 votes to 10, with 5 abstentions.

20. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the proposal of the representative of the Ukrainian SSR concerning the request for a hearing submitted by the All-Ewe Conference.

21. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) remarked that the discussion showed a tendency to restrict the functions delegated by the General Assembly to the Trusteeship Council under the Charter. The petitioners themselves linked their requests to the consideration of the report of the Trusteeship Council's Visiting Mission. The Committee must obviously consider that report, but it was for the Trusteeship Council to study it first, together with any petitions received by the Visiting Mission and the Secretary-General. Since the Trusteeship Council had decided to hold the second part of its eleventh session in the near future to consider the Visiting Mission's report, the Fourth Committee would be ill-advised to authorize the representatives of any group to appear before it without first coming before the Council. It was well known that his delegation had always been an ardent champion of the right of petition; at the same time, however, the Trusteeship Council's authority must be upheld. As in the case of the two previous requests, he would abstain from voting on the request of the All-Ewe Conference.

22. Mr. McINNIS (Canada) said that he would vote against the proposal concerning the All-Ewe Conference for the reasons given by the United States and Australian representatives. He was not, of course, challenging the competence of the General Assembly and the Fourth Committee nor the right of petition itself, but he felt that requests for hearing should be examined by some other body first, in order to ensure that the Committee was only seized of matters which really deserved its attention.

23. Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES (Brazil) announced that his delegation would vote in favour of the request under consideration, as it had done in the case of the two previous requests. The General Assembly must be a liberal body in which any representative of the peoples of the Trust Territories could obtain a hearing. He admitted that such an attitude might have to be reviewed if the Fourth Committee were faced with a large number of requests; but since it had received only three requests, no such problem arose in the present case. The argument put forward by the representative of the Dominican Republic did not seem very convincing; the petitioners had requested to be heard by the Committee precisely because they knew that the Committee was going to study the issue that concerned them. The Committee could therefore grant their requests without impairing the Council's prestige. In his opinion there was no doubt that the petitioners were entitled to be present when the General Assembly decided their fate.

24. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland) pointed out that, for the moment, the Committee was not threatened with a flood of requests. Even if it were, however, it should make an effort to meet all its responsibilities.

25. Replying to the Australian representative, he pointed out that the best procedure was that which would convince the peoples of dependent territories that the General Assembly was genuinely interested in their fate.

26. Mr. SHEIKIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) could not accept the interpretation of the Charter advanced by the representatives of the Dominican Republic and Australia, namely that by hearing the petitioners, the Fourth Committee would tres-

pass on the powers of the Trusteeship Council or show that it did not entirely trust it. The petitioners had addressed their request to the Fourth Committee and not to the Trusteeship Council. During the sixth session of the General Assembly, the Fourth Committee had heard (226th, 229th and 234th meetings) the Ewe representatives, who had made a valuable contribution to its work.

27. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) stated, in reply to the representative of the Dominican Republic, that it was clear from the opening lines of Article 87 of the Charter that the right to accept petitions belonged primarily to the General Assembly and only after that to the Trusteeship Council, under the General Assembly's authority.

28. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) thought there could be no doubt that the Committee should hear the representatives of the Wa-Meru tribe and the Union des populations du Cameroun. In the case of the All-Ewe Conference, the United Kingdom representative had rightly pointed out that the Trusteeship Council was going to meet in November to consider the Ewe question; that did not mean that the Fourth Committee should not consider it before the Trusteeship Council. Furthermore, the petitioners had expressly requested to be heard by the Fourth Committee in connexion with its consideration of the Visiting Mission's report.

29. Under Article 87 of the Charter, "the General Assembly and, under its authority, the Trusteeship Council, in carrying out their functions" might accept petitions. It was obvious from that text that the General Assembly and the Trusteeship Council were equally competent to accept petitions. There could be no question of the Assembly's lacking confidence in the Trusteeship Council or *vice-versa*. The Charter did not permit refusal of the petitioners' requests.

30. Mr. HOUARD (Belgium) explained that Belgium had modified its position in the light of the practical suggestions made by the French and United Kingdom representatives and would vote against the proposal that the petitioners of the All-Ewe Conference and of the Union des populations du Cameroun should be heard by the Fourth Committee before being heard by the Visiting Mission and the Trusteeship Council.

31. Mr. JESSUP (United States of America) called attention to the fact that the Ewe question was the last item on the Committee's agenda, and the Trusteeship Council would presumably deal with it before the Committee did. The important thing was to give the representatives of the All-Ewe Conference the opportunity of coming to New York during the next two months. The United States delegation would therefore vote in favour of the application for a hearing.

32. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) recalled that his country had always been one of the most active supporters of the right of petition. The question that arose at the moment concerned merely the need for adopting an ordered and logical procedure in accordance with the Charter's provisions on relations between the General Assembly and the Trusteeship Council. The Fourth Committee should advise the petitioners to apply first to the Trusteeship Council. If not satisfied with the conclusions of that body, the petitioners could address themselves to the Fourth Com-

mittee, which would serve as a court of appeal. While it was true that the Trusteeship Council exercised its powers by delegation from the General Assembly, the Assembly had never revoked the delegation of those powers.

33. Mr. PIGNON (France) remarked that France was not opposed in principle to the hearing of petitioners by the Fourth Committee. Here, however, as he had already pointed out, it was a question of practice and method. He noted, in that connexion, that the Philippine representative seemed to think that all petitioners had representative powers *a priori*. Actually, the Union des populations du Cameroun, for example, represented only a very small minority of the inhabitants of that Territory; the list of candidates it had put forward at the last elections had won only 1.5 per cent of the votes. Perhaps the Philippine representative was unaware that the Union des populations du Cameroun really represented the Communist Party in the Cameroun.

34. Mr. FORSYTH (Australia) expressed the hope that the representative of the Dominican Republic would submit his last proposal formally. His delegation would then vote for it.

35. The CHAIRMAN expressed the hope, on the contrary, that the representative of the Dominican Republic would not press his suggestion, because, from the procedural point of view, it would be better to put the application for a hearing from the representatives of the All-Ewe Conference to a vote. If the application was rejected by the Committee, it would then be for the petitioners to submit a new application to the Trusteeship Council.

36. Mr. HOPKINSON (United Kingdom) said he largely shared the opinion of the representatives of the Dominican Republic and the United States. He wondered whether, instead of merely accepting or rejecting the application of the petitioners, the Committee could not advise them to apply first to the Trusteeship Council. If the Committee was of the opinion that it should vote merely on whether to accept or reject the application for a hearing, the United Kingdom would vote against accepting it.

37. The CHAIRMAN expressed the opinion that the Committee could refrain from replying to applications, but pointed out that to advise the petitioners to apply elsewhere would be tantamount to a rejection.

38. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) said he did not wish to submit a formal proposal. He would abstain when the vote was taken.

39. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Ukrainian proposal to the effect that the request for an oral hearing submitted by the All-Ewe Conference should be approved.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Peru, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelo-

russian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Panama.

Against: Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Netherlands.

Abstaining: Sweden, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, New Zealand.

The proposal was adopted by 41 votes to 7, with 4 abstentions.

40. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) explained that he had abstained because he thought that, though the Fourth Committee might, with advantage, hear the petitioners, it was nevertheless entitled to advise them to apply first to the Trusteeship Council.

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter (continued)

[Item 33]*

41. Mr. ALGHOUSSEIN (Yemen) recalled that on several occasions the delegation of Yemen had disputed the right of the Government of the United Kingdom to transmit information on the so-called Protectorate of Aden. The Government of Yemen had always regarded that territory as an integral part of Yemen. Furthermore, his Government reserved the right, at a later stage in the discussion, to contest the veracity of certain information communicated by the Government of the United Kingdom on the subject of that territory.

42. Mr. HOPKINSON (United Kingdom) reserved in his turn the position of his Government on the statement of the representative of Yemen.

43. Mr. JESSUP (United States of America) welcomed with satisfaction the statement of the United Kingdom representative (251st meeting) describing the important tasks which his Government had undertaken in the territories it administered. He also associated himself with the wise remarks of the Egyptian representative (251st meeting) to the effect that the work of the United Nations, and particularly the work of the Committee, depended on the goodwill of the Administering Members. The members of the Committee would, however, agree in admitting that their work also depended on the goodwill of all the Members of the United Nations. The delegation of the United States had been deeply impressed by the statement of the Indian delegation (251st meeting), and the constructive proposals submitted by Mr. Shiva Rao would certainly receive the attention they deserved. Lastly, the Brazilian representative had surveyed (251st meeting) the problem from a very wide point of view and had made a number of suggestions to which the United States delegation would give very careful study.

44. Such a beginning justified the hope that the Committee would make an important contribution to the task which the United Nations had undertaken to accomplish in relation to the Non-Self-Governing Territories. He was convinced that the discussions in the

Committee would provide not only the representatives of the Administering Members, but all the Members of the United Nations with an excellent opportunity to exchange views on problems which in many respects were universal and not peculiar to a limited number of territories. Those who had to deal with such problems should visualize their aims in human terms and not in the abstract terms of legal definitions if they wished to make a proper judgment of the efforts of the United Nations and thus help all peoples to attain self-government in the form of independence or of association with another State or group of States.

45. The benefits to be derived from such exchanges of views would not necessarily take the form of resolutions. Thus, in several particular cases, the Government of the United States had put into effect, in the territories which it administered, suggestions that had emanated from discussions in the Assembly but that had not been the subject of formal resolutions or recommendations. As the representative of an administering Power, he would like to say that he felt not at all like a defendant, but like one who, with a decent sense of accomplishment and mutual purpose, had sat down with a group of friends to benefit from their experience and suggestions.

46. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that conditions in each of the widely scattered territories were unique. A wide variety of arrangements must therefore be sought under which every individual in the various territories would be enabled to achieve the full development of his personality as a human being.

47. He congratulated the members of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories on the report they had submitted (A/2219 and Corr.1), as well as on the example of harmonious co-operation they had constantly provided, even when separated by divergencies of view. It was obvious that most of the members of that Committee were anxious not to gain debating points, but to help in improving the living conditions of millions of human beings inhabiting the Non-Self-Governing Territories. He also paid a tribute to the Secretariat and to the representatives of the specialized agencies.

48. In his opinion the special report on social conditions (A/2219 and Corr.1, part two) was in no way inferior to the preceding reports on economic conditions and education (A/1836, part three, and A/1313/Rev.1, part two), and it represented an excellent basis for the Committee's work. The United States delegation was of the opinion that the General Assembly should approve the report in its general terms, bring it to the attention of the specialized agencies and other organizations and individuals interested in the social advancement of the non-self-governing peoples, and recommend it for the consideration of the Administering Members. In several places, the report observed that it was desirable to obtain the participation of the peoples of those territories in all aspects of social development, so that new social structures would not seem to them to be imported from outside but to be an outgrowth of local needs. On that point, the United States delegation was entirely in agreement with the representative of Brazil.

49. The United States delegation attached great importance to the part of the special report dealing with the delicate problem of race relations. In the words of

* Indicates the item number on the agenda of the General Assembly.

the report, all who desired the maintenance of peace must know how important it was to improve race relations among all peoples. As had already been said, that problem arose in almost all countries. It was therefore in the general interest to overcome prejudice which might hinder co-operation. Such prejudice, incidentally, was not always directed against a particular race. It was often the result of situations which no longer existed and opinions that had been outgrown. The Committee had examined that problem in its general and special reports, and its principal conclusions were embodied in a draft resolution (A/2219 and Corr.1, part one, annex II) which he hoped the General Assembly would adopt.

50. The report emphasized the necessity of organizing a co-ordinated social service programme giving equal importance to preventive and curative measures. That balanced concept had perhaps become a truism now, but it was salutary to stress it in the case of territories in which social services had only recently been established.

51. The Committee had also stated in its report that international assistance to Non-Self-Governing Territories must be increased. It had recognized that the administering Powers provided considerable assistance to those territories, for example through the organization of administrative or advisory services, grants-in-aid and loans for substructural expenditures, and the development of education and occupational training. The summaries of the annual reports transmitted to the Secretary-General showed that the Administering Members were already putting into execution broad programmes of economic and social development. The report noted that, while all forms of international assistance could be useful in that field, it was particularly important to help administrations implement programmes designed to meet the particular needs of the various territories. He was certain that the Committee would approve that extremely practical approach.

52. It was not, however, sufficient that the experts who were to communicate technical knowledge should possess that knowledge and desire to share it with other peoples; they must also be able to establish relationships of understanding and mutual sympathy, on a basis of equality, with peoples different from themselves. The Committee was therefore right in stressing the quality of experts rather than their number and in indicating that, as far as possible, those experts should be familiar with conditions in the areas where they would be called upon to work.

53. He agreed with Mr. Shiva Rao that Article 73 must become a living reality for the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories. Fortunately the differences existing among the members of the Committee did not relate to the goal to be sought but only to the time required to achieve that goal and possibly also to the methods best adopted to attain it. Was it possible to hope that, through the peaceful discussion in the Fourth Committee and in the Second and Third Committees, the United Nations might make so great a contribution to the happiness of mankind that the political committees would be decreasingly confronted with questions representing a threat to the peace?

54. All the countries represented on the Fourth Committee were directly interested in the solution of the

problems of the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories by peaceful means, for human destinies were so closely intertwined that all men must inevitably rise or fall together.

55. Mr. KHATTAK (Pakistan) congratulated the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories on the valuable report it had presented. His delegation was also gratified to note the presence among the members of the Fourth Committee, of the Minister of State for Colonial Affairs of the United Kingdom, which showed that that country earnestly desired to discharge its responsibilities to the United Nations and to the people of the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

56. He expressed the hope that the differences existing between Indonesia and the Netherlands would be settled by negotiation.

57. Without exception, all the Administering Members had constantly reminded the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories that they alone were responsible for the administration of those territories. He wished to correct that entirely erroneous opinion. Actually no delegation would deny the contribution which certain administering Powers had made in the realm of social legislation and education. The sole objective of the non-administering Powers was to help the administering Powers because they were aware that no country, however great, could solve its problems by itself. Moreover, the administering Powers did not give up any of their sovereignty over those territories by seeking the advice of other States or by answering inquiries regarding conditions in the territories they administered.

58. One of the major social problems arising in the Non-Self-Governing Territories was the problem of racial discrimination. The problem was complex and universal but its existence was particularly shocking in the Non-Self-Governing Territories where an infinitesimal minority considered itself superior to the inhabitants of the territory whose fate it controlled.

59. The delegation of Pakistan regretted the fact that, in 1952, after the holocaust of the Second World War, some Powers that had subscribed to the principles of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights continued to claim that racial discrimination was a domestic question. A self-governing country was fully entitled to state that a given question was domestic, but it was unbecoming for an administering Power to adopt that position regarding a question of vital concern to the inhabitants of the territory it administered. If all countries took that position on questions they did not wish to consider publicly, the United Nations would have no further *raison d'être* because all questions submitted to it might be considered of a domestic nature and therefore within the internal jurisdiction of individual States. Moreover, the administering Powers should not forget that, under Article 73 of the Charter, they recognized the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories were paramount and accepted as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost the well-being of the inhabitants.

60. Among the various fields in which national reconstruction should be undertaken, it seemed that education should be given priority because education was

the basis for all lasting progress. Wherever possible, education should be given in the language of the inhabitants. For example, Arabic provided a strong argument in point because it was a highly developed language which could be used in the universities as well as the schools. Nevertheless he considered that in Arab countries a Western language should also be taught to enable the inhabitants to maintain contact with Western civilization.

61. The report of the Committee did not indicate whether films were being used in education. In countries where the inhabitants were illiterate, films could help to teach the fundamental principles of health and citizenship. They could also serve to make the population understand the need for eliminating certain social evils which stood in the way of progress.

62. It was essential to obtain the consent and the active co-operation of the inhabitants of a given territory before instituting social reform. To that end local prejudices should not be flouted; once undertaken, however, a reform should not be abandoned on the pretext that the population was ignorant and bound by the traditional state of affairs.

63. From the economic and technical points of view, the Non-Self-Governing Territories were at a very low level of advancement and were being used primarily as sources of cheap raw material. The United Nations could remedy that situation by providing technical assistance to those territories because, in some cases, the metropolitan country was too absorbed by its own economic difficulties to be able to assist the country it administered.

64. The delegation of Pakistan had noted that some territories had a monopoly of certain raw materials needed by all countries and that that monopoly was the source of the prosperity of the population. It had, however, also noted that in some cases the administering Power did not try to use the surplus income to equip the territory but instead, allowed the inhabitants to use their increased purchasing power to obtain luxury items from the metropolitan country. The administering Powers must set aside all selfish considerations and seek only the well-being of the populations they administered. They should also try to avoid inflation and to direct surplus wealth into productive channels. Only in that way could the Non-Self-Governing Territories benefit from the technical assistance provided by the United Nations.

65. The administering Powers should seek to raise the standard of living which at the present time was incredibly low. Health conditions should also be improved in order to make possible increased productivity.

66. If the populations were to achieve self-government or independence, it was essential to give positions of responsibility to indigenous inhabitants and to create a civil service made up of those inhabitants.

67. The dual trade-union movement represented an obvious form of racial discrimination designed to perpetuate the privileged position of a particular race and to split the labour movement into two hostile factions.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.