

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TENTH SESSION  
Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 471st  
MEETING**

Wednesday, 5 October 1955,  
at 10.40 a.m.

**New York**

**C O N T E N T S**

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Tribute to the memory of Marshal Alexandros Papagos,<br>Prime Minister of Greece ..... | 5    |
| Requests for hearings ( <i>continued</i> ) .....                                       | 5    |
| Programme of work .....  | 9    |

**Chairman:** Mr. Luciano JOUBLANC RIVAS  
(Mexico).

***Tribute to the memory of Marshal Alexandros  
Papagos, Prime Minister of Greece***

1. The CHAIRMAN expressed the Committee's deep sympathy with the Greek Government and people on the death of the Prime Minister, Marshal Papagos.

2. Mr. TRIANTAPHYLAKOS (Greece) thanked the Chairman and the Committee for their sympathy. Marshal Papagos, as Commander-in-Chief of the Greek Army, had contributed to the Allied victory which had made the United Nations possible.

***Requests for hearings (A/C.4/302) (continued)***

3. The CHAIRMAN said that the five requests for hearings that he had mentioned at the previous meeting had been circulated to the members of the Committee in document A/C.4/302.

4. The Permanent Observer of Italy had asked to be allowed to participate in the discussion of all matters relating to the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration. As one of the requests for a hearing came from the Somali Youth League, he proposed that the Permanent Observer of the Government of Italy should be invited to take a seat at the Committee table and participate in the debate.

*It was so decided.*

*At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Casardi, Permanent Observer of Italy to the United Nations, took a place at the Committee table.*

5. Mr. CASARDI (Permanent Observer of Italy to the United Nations) said that the Italian Trusteeship Administration in Somaliland had always considered it desirable that responsible persons from the Trust Territory should have an opportunity to be heard by the Committee. He therefore had no objection to the granting of a hearing to the Somali Youth League.

6. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) proposed that in order to save time there should be no general debate on the requests for hearings, but the members of the Committee should be allowed to explain their votes.

*It was so decided.*

7. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) explained that as a matter of principle his delegation had always voted

in favour of granting requests for hearings. He would vote in favour of the requests submitted by the Somali Youth League and Juvento (Mouvement de la jeunesse togolaise). Haiti was a member of the United Nations Visiting Mission which would shortly visit the Cameroons under French administration and hear anyone who wished to make representations. He did not wish to prejudge the actions of the Visiting Mission as a whole or of Haiti as a member of the Mission, and he would therefore abstain from voting on the three requests from the Cameroons under French administration.

8. Mr. S. S. LIU (China) said that in principle his delegation was in favour of granting all requests for hearings, but that he was in the same position as the Haitian representative with regard to the three requests from the Cameroons. China was the other non-administering member of the Visiting Mission and he would like to reserve his delegation's opinion on those requests. He would therefore abstain on the three Cameroonian requests, but would vote in favour of the other two.

9. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said that he would vote against all five requests for hearings. The requests from the Somali Youth League and Juvento were not in fact petitions but requests to appear before the Fourth Committee and participate in the debate. No provision for such participation was made in the rules of procedure.

10. At previous sessions the Committee had spent hours hearing petitioners and the outcome of its deliberations had invariably been to refer their petitions to the Trusteeship Council, to which they should have been sent in the first instance.

11. As far as the Juvento request and the three requests from the Cameroons under French administration were concerned, one of the 1955 United Nations Visiting Missions had just returned from Togoland and the other would shortly be visiting the Cameroons. In those circumstances, it would be absurd to make people spend money on coming to New York, particularly as the Visiting Mission would have an opportunity to investigate their allegations on the spot.

12. Mr. HOPKINSON (United Kingdom) said that his Government's general position on the granting of requests for hearings had been made abundantly clear at previous sessions. He would abstain from voting on the requests from the Somali Youth League and Juvento.

13. In the case of the three Cameroonian requests, the situation had changed substantially from previous years when representatives of the organizations concerned had been granted hearings. During the past year the French Government had proscribed the Union des populations du Cameroun and affiliated organizations. The Committee should not hear representatives of those organizations as that would amount to an

attempt to overrule the French Government's decision. Under the Trusteeship Agreement the French Government had full rights of legislation and jurisdiction in the Trust Territory and it would be contrary to the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreement if the United Nations, which was also a party to that Agreement, were to act in opposition to the Administering Authority. The three requests should therefore be refused, and he would vote against them.

14. Mr. HARARI (Israel) said that the right of petition was embodied in Article 87 b of the Charter and it was the Committee's duty to hear and examine petitions. At the same time, it had never been made clear how the Committee should discharge its duty. He therefore suggested that a small sub-committee might be set up to draft rules of procedure for the presentation of petitions to the Fourth Committee. Until such rules were adopted, his delegation would continue to vote in favour of all requests for hearings. He was not making a formal proposal, as he would like to discuss the matter with other delegations.

15. Mr. DJERDJA (Yugoslavia) maintained that a question of principle was involved. Under the Charter, it was the Committee's duty to hear petitioners. He would therefore vote in favour of all five requests, and he asked for a roll-call vote.

16. Miss ROESAD (Indonesia) said that she would vote in favour of all the requests for hearings, in keeping with her delegation's previous position. She could not agree that the hearings served no useful purpose. On the contrary, the statements of earlier petitioners had been most elucidating and had helped the Committee to understand the feelings and problems of the peoples of the Trust Territories.

17. Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador) said that his delegation believed that the Committee should hear petitioners as a matter of principle and he would vote in favour of all the requests. Under the Charter the General Assembly was entrusted with the task of supervising the administration of Trust Territories. The composition of the Trusteeship Council was such that it might affect the results of hearings. Petitioners should therefore be given a chance to state their views in the Committee, with its wider membership.

18. Mr. SOLE (Union of South Africa) said that his delegation had always been guided in the first instance by the views of the Administering Authority. The Italian Government had indicated that it had no objection to the granting of a hearing to the Somali Youth League, and he would therefore vote in favour of the request. There had been no indication of the Administering Authority's views on Juvento's request, and he would abstain from voting on it. He would vote against the three requests from the Cameroons. The French Government's actions during the past year made it quite clear that it would not consider it desirable for the petitioners in question to be granted a hearing. As the United Kingdom representative had said, if the Committee were to hear the Cameroonian petitioners, that might be construed as direct intervention in the Administering Authority's rights of administration under the Trusteeship Agreement. Furthermore, the Visiting Mission would be going to the Cameroons in the near future.

19. Mr. MANI (India) said he would vote in favour of granting all the requests for hearings as a matter of principle. The right of petition was inherent in the Charter and the Committee was in duty bound to

examine all petitions and grant all requests for hearings.

20. Mr. GHANEM (Egypt) said he, too, would vote in favour of all the requests on principle. The petitioners' statements would, moreover, be helpful to the Committee and give it additional information on conditions in the Trust Territories.

21. Mr. TAZHIBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that in principle his delegation considered that indigenous inhabitants had full rights to present their views before the General Assembly. He would therefore vote in favour of granting all five requests.

22. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) said that his delegation had always been in favour of granting every facility to the non-self-governing peoples. Nothing should be done to hamper the exercise of rights granted by the Charter. He felt that, in the case of Trust Territories, it was difficult to refuse hearings, and he recalled in that connexion that the right of petition dated back to the Mandates System. As a matter of principle he would therefore vote in favour of granting all the requests.

23. Mr. KAISR (Czechoslovakia) said that the representatives of the indigenous peoples had every right to present petitions and make statements to the Committee. It was the Committee's duty to uphold their rights and he would therefore vote in favour of granting all the requests. He suggested that the hearings should be held before the general debate on the Trusteeship Council's report, at a date to be fixed in advance.

24. U ON SEIN (Burma) pointed out that his delegation had consistently voted in favour of granting all requests for hearings and that it would continue to do so.

25. Mr. TURGEON (Canada) said that the Canadian delegation had always recognized that the Charter gave the inhabitants of the Trust Territories the right of petition. That did not mean, however, that his delegation was necessarily prepared to grant all requests for hearings which might come before the Fourth Committee. In accordance with its view that the Committee should function as expeditiously and effectively as possible, the Canadian delegation had always held, and continued to hold, that it was important to devise a method which, while safeguarding the right of petition, would ensure that the Committee should not be so inundated by requests for oral hearings as to prevent it from dealing with the important business before it.

26. Since it had not so far been possible to devise such a method, the Canadian delegation, in deciding whether or not the requests before the Committee for hearings should be granted, would consider whether the matter raised by the petitioners was so urgent as to merit a special hearing by the Assembly; whether it had not already been studied by the Trusteeship Council or its Standing Committee on Petitions; and whether it was not to be examined by one or another of the Visiting Missions to the Trust Territories and subsequently reported on to the Council for consideration and action. Judged by those criteria, very few of the requests before the Committee would be entertained.

27. In accordance with those principles, the Canadian delegation had consistently held that, normally, petitioners should be heard by the Trusteeship Council

before being granted a hearing by the Fourth Committee. The existing arrangements for dealing with petitions appeared to have worked very well. Indeed, the value of the petitions system of the Council had been implicitly recognized by the Fourth Committee at the ninth session, when it had voted, at its 449th meeting, to refer back for necessary action to the Trusteeship Council the question raised by the petitioners from the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under French administration.

28. Similar views had been expressed at past sessions by the delegations of Australia, the Dominican Republic, France, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, the United States and others. It was presumably by now clear to all delegations that, in the interests of orderly procedure, there was need for a commonly accepted set of criteria to which the Committee could refer in coming to a decision on specific requests. That would be a far more effective procedure than the practice hitherto followed of having protracted debates and endless votes cast on specific issues.

29. At the seventh session, as members would recall, the hearings of petitioners had taken so long that at the end of the session the Committee had had no time to consider the case presented by the petitioners from the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration and had been constrained to refer the whole matter back to the Trusteeship Council. At the ninth session the Committee had considered some twenty requests for oral hearings and had spent a considerable amount of time questioning petitioners. In the light of the debate which had followed the hearing of the majority of those petitioners, it was seriously open to question whether the Committee's work had really been advanced as a result of granting their requests.

30. In conformity with the principles he had just outlined, the Canadian delegation would not oppose the granting of hearings to Juvento and to the Somali Youth League. On the other hand, it would vote against the granting of all three requests from the Cameroons under French administration.

31. Mr. MALLI (Pakistan) observed that under Articles 85 and 87 b of the Charter petitioners were explicitly given the right to be heard by the General Assembly. In the light of the spirit of the Charter and the purposes and principles which had governed the establishment of the United Nations it would be a logical absurdity to place any other interpretation on those Articles.

32. There were many practical advantages in granting hearings to petitioners. First, the General Assembly acquired recent and first-hand information from the political organizations concerned; secondly, the granting of hearings by the General Assembly was an encouragement to the politically backward masses; thirdly, it enhanced the prestige of the United Nations in the eyes of the world.

33. In the absence of any fixed criteria and in view of the fact that in previous years such requests had always been granted, he felt that it would be wrong to refuse any of the requests. He therefore hoped that the Committee would grant a hearing to all five petitioners.

34. Mr. Rolz BENNETT (Guatemala) said that he would vote in favour of all five requests. He felt that in accordance with the terms of Article 87 b of the

Charter the Committee was obliged to do so. Furthermore, the granting of such hearings enabled the United Nations to come in contact with the peoples of the Trust Territories, which was both necessary and desirable.

35. Mr. FORTEZA (Uruguay) said he would vote for all five requests. He would not reiterate the arguments used by his delegation on previous occasions but would merely refer to the statements it had made to the Committee on the subject, particularly at the ninth session (398th meeting).

36. Mr. PIMENTEL BRANDAO (Brazil) said he would vote in favour of granting the request from the Somali Youth League. He would abstain on the request from the National Committee of Juvento, since he did not possess sufficient information to enable him to vote for or against it, and would abstain on the three requests from the Cameroons under French administration in view of the absence of the Administering Authority.

37. Mr. VERGARA (Chile) said he would vote in favour of granting the hearings, which his delegation considered to be a matter of principle. He was confident that the Chairman would check any attempt to use the occasion as an opportunity for propaganda or demagoguery.

38. Mr. ALTMAN (Poland) said he would vote in favour of all five requests, in accordance with his delegation's usual practice. The hearing of representatives from a Trust Territory enabled the members of the Committee to understand the position in those Territories and facilitated the Committee's work. He urged that all petitioners should be granted hearings, whatever their political opinions might be.

39. Mr. PASTORE (United States of America) said that the right of peoples to petition was in accordance with the spirit of the Charter and the United States Constitution. His delegation had always firmly supported the right of the inhabitants of Trust Territories to lay their grievances before the United Nations. That right was not at issue.

40. The question that should be considered was what was the most effective way of examining the problems raised by the requests in the interests not only of the United Nations but of the petitioners themselves. A system for dealing with oral as well as written petitions had been developed which provided opportunities for petitioners to be heard by various organs of the United Nations specially concerned with Trusteeship matters.

41. In the opinion of the United States delegation, the Fourth Committee should examine petitions or grant hearings only after the existing specialized machinery had had full opportunity to operate or when the questions raised were especially important or urgent.

42. His delegation had been glad to hear from the Italian Observer that his Government had no objection to the granting of a hearing to the representative of the Somali Youth League. He would therefore vote in favour of granting that request.

43. In view of the fact that the inhabitants of Togoland under French administration and the Cameroons under French administration had had or would shortly have an opportunity to explain their grievances to a visiting mission, he would vote against the requests from those Territories.

44. Mr. CORTINA (Argentina) said he would maintain his delegation's traditional position that the right of petition must be respected. He would therefore vote in favour of granting all five requests.

45. Mr. JOSKE (Australia) said he had no desire to canvass a restrictive interpretation of Article 87 of the Charter; nevertheless, each specific application for a hearing should, he believed, be considered in the light of obvious and overriding criteria.

46. No established procedure existed under which the General Assembly could examine petitions. The Trusteeship Council, on the other hand, was provided with the necessary procedure and, notwithstanding doubts that had been expressed by certain delegations, he felt it had always operated in a manner greatly conducive to the benefit of all petitioners. If that were not so, the Council's procedure would surely have fallen into disuse; whereas in fact it was at least as much utilized today as ever in the past.

47. Hearings had been granted on many occasions by the Fourth Committee. The basic consideration was, however, whether the petitioners, or, what was more important, the Trust Territories had derived any benefit from them. The Australian delegation was convinced that in the majority of cases the petitioners had not really benefited, and that in a number of instances actual harm had been done to the Territory from which they had come.

48. At the ninth session the petitions from the Cameroons under French administration had been referred back to the Trusteeship Council, where alone they could be given adequate consideration. Two out of the three requests from that Territory which were now before the Committee came from organizations which had been given hearings at the ninth session. The Australian delegation had opposed granting them a hearing the previous year and would oppose it again, especially in view of the fact that a visiting mission was about to visit the Territory. To grant any of the three requests for a hearing in the Fourth Committee would be tantamount to suggesting that they should by-pass the Visiting Mission and the Trusteeship Council, which would be an inexcusable discourtesy to the Council and the Mission and would mislead the petitioners as to the means whereby their interests would best be promoted.

49. Similar considerations applied to the request from Togoland under French administration. A visiting mission had just returned from that Territory and had doubtless given the fullest attention to the opinions of the petitioners. To grant a hearing in those circumstances would be wholly unjustified and he would vote against it.

50. He would also oppose the granting of a hearing to the representative of the Somali Youth League; only two months previously a representative of that organization had been given an exhaustive hearing by the Trusteeship Council, and there was no evidence of any new facts to be brought forward.

51. Miss DAVILA (Colombia) said that she would vote in favour of the request from the Somali Youth League and abstain on the other four requests.

52. Ato YIFRU (Ethiopia) said he would support the granting of all five requests, as his delegation had always favoured such requests in the past.

53. Mr. CALLE Y CALLE (Peru) said that a distinction should be drawn between petitions and requests

for hearings. The requests before the Committee were not petitions; their authors did not ask the Committee to take any action on their statements, but merely wanted to be given a hearing in connexion with an item on the Committee's agenda.

54. He would vote in favour of granting hearings to the Somali Youth League and Juvento. With regard to the three requests from the Cameroons under French administration, he would be unable to support them in view of the absence of the French delegation.

55. Mr. AZIZ (Afghanistan) said that, as in the past, he would vote for the granting of all five requests.

56. Mr. TRIANTAPHYLAKOS (Greece) said that, in his delegation's view, requests for hearings should not be rejected merely because a visiting mission had visited or was about to visit a Trust Territory. Nor did it feel that the consent of an Administering Authority was needed before a hearing could be granted. He would therefore vote in favour of all five requests.

*At the request of Mr. Djerdja (Yugoslavia) a vote was taken by roll-call on the request from the Somali Youth League (A/C.4/302).*

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

*In favour:* Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia.

*Against:* Australia, Belgium.

*Abstaining:* Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Canada.

*The request was granted by 51 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.*

*At the request of Mr. Djerdja (Yugoslavia), a vote was taken by roll-call on the request from the National Committee of Juvento (A/C.4/302).*

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

*In favour:* Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece.

*Against:* United States of America, Australia, Belgium.

*Abstaining:* Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Sweden, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic.

*The request was granted by 40 votes to 3, with 13 abstentions.*

*At the request of Mr. Djerdja (Yugoslavia), a vote was taken by roll-call on the requests from the Political Section of the Union des population du Cameroun, the Executive Committee of the Jeunesse démocratique du Cameroun and the Political Section of the Central Board of the Union démocratique des femmes camerounaises (A/C.4/302).*

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

*In favour:* Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

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

*Abstaining:* China, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Turkey, Brazil.

*The request was granted by 36 votes to 11, with 9 abstentions.*

57. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would notify the petitioners of the decisions taken by the Committee.

*Mr. Casardi, Permanent Observer of Italy to the United Nations, withdrew.*

### **Programme of work**

58. Mr. EQUIZABAL (El Salvador) proposed that the item "Report of the Trusteeship Council" should appear on the agenda of the Committee's next meeting in order to allow his delegation to present a proposal relating to the question of the attainment by the Trust Territories of the objective of self-government or independence, dealt with in the section of the Trusteeship Council's report relating to questions referred to the Council by the General Assembly (A/2933, part I, chap. 5, para. 9). The Council had decided at its sixteenth session (644th meeting), by a very small vote, not to have a special section on that topic in its report to the General Assembly. Consequently the Fourth Committee would have no basis on which to discuss the matter when it came up in connexion with the report of the Trusteeship Council, despite the hope expressed by the General Assembly in resolution 858 (IX) that the Council would include its conclusions and recommendations on the question of the attainment by the Trust Territories of the objectives of self-government or independence in its next and succeeding reports.

59. The delegation of El Salvador wished to make a formal proposal that the Fourth Committee should establish a sub-committee to continue and complete the work left pending by the Trusteeship Council and to prepare a factual account to form a basis for discussion. The draft report prepared for the Trusteeship Council (T/L.579 and Add.1) would be available

to the sub-committee, and could be brought up to date and completed in a very short space of time. The Fourth Committee would then have the required information available to it when the report of the Trusteeship Council was discussed in earnest. He emphasized that the Salvadorian proposal would be purely procedural and would not engage the Committee in a substantive debate on the report of the Trusteeship Council at its next meeting.

60. Mr. HOPKINSON (United Kingdom) objected that the subject of the attainment by the Trust Territories of independence or self-government could not be divorced from the report of the Trusteeship Council as a whole. It would be improper to pick out one aspect of that report and proceed to discuss it in isolation, in advance of the rest of the document.

61. Mr. VERGARA (Chile) agreed in principle to the request of El Salvador. He suggested, however, that the proposal should merely be submitted at the next meeting and circulated in writing, but not discussed at all for several days, as many members of the Committee had not yet had an opportunity of studying the Trusteeship Council's report.

62. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti), Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) and Mr. CHAMANDI (Yemen) endorsed the Chilean representative's suggestion.

63. Mr. TAZHIBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the proposal would have to be circulated in writing before delegations would be in a position to comment on it. Hence he would not oppose allowing the representative of El Salvador to submit it at the next meeting.

64. Mr. JOSKE (Australia) felt that the proposal was very far from being purely procedural. The Committee must be given time to reflect before deciding when it should be discussed.

65. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal to put the item "Report of the Trusteeship Council" on the agenda of the Committee's next meeting, in order to allow the representative of El Salvador to introduce a proposal for the establishment of a sub-committee on the attainment by the Trust Territories of the objective of self-government or independence.

*The proposal was adopted by 27 votes to 13, with 11 abstentions.*

66. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) wished to re-emphasize the Salvadorian representative's point that any discussion of the Salvadorian proposal at the next meeting of the Committee would be purely procedural. The Committee was only to be asked to decide whether it wished to establish a sub-committee to devote further study to a certain aspect of the Trusteeship System already discussed and left pending by a committee of the Trusteeship Council.

67. Mr. CALLE Y CALLE (Peru) said that he had abstained from voting on the proposal to alter the programme of work adopted by the Fourth Committee. If the Syrian representative had given his explanation before the vote was taken, he would have voted against it. His delegation would have to study the report of the Trusteeship Council very carefully in order to learn what the committee of the Trusteeship Council had achieved, before it would be in a position to weigh the merits of the suggestion to set up a sub-committee of the General Assembly. He hoped

that the proposal of El Salvador would be circulated in writing and the matter then postponed in order to give all delegations time to study the documents.

68. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) said that his delegation was in a very similar position. Like Peru, Venezuela was not represented on the Trusteeship Council, and the Venezuelan delegation was therefore not in a position to decide whether the Council had carried out the task entrusted to it by the General Assembly, or whether it was advisable to set up a sub-committee to complete the task instead of letting the Council itself complete it at future sessions. He had therefore abstained from voting.

69. Mr. DIPP GOMEZ (Dominican Republic) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the proposal because it was not fully acquainted with the matter, and the documents relating to it were not yet available.

70. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) said he had voted against the proposal, for he felt that a question of substance was involved. The Fourth Committee could not set up a sub-committee to complete the work of a committee of the Trusteeship Council without a revision of the Charter.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.