

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



FOURTH COMMITTEE 242nd

MEETING

Thursday, 10 January 1952, at 3 p.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

	Page
Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (<i>continued</i>)	275
Rural economic development of the Trust Territories: report of the Trusteeship Council (A/1856)	280
Programme of work	281

Chairman : Mr. Max HENRÍQUEZ UREÑA (Dominican Republic).

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (*continued*)

[Item 36]*

CESSATION OF THE TRANSMISSION OF INFORMATION UNDER ARTICLE 73 E OF CHARTER IN RESPECT OF THE NETHERLANDS ANTILLES AND SURINAM (A/C.4/200)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.197) submitted by Cuba, Denmark, India, Philippines and the United States of America on the cessation of the transmission of information under Article 73 e of the Charter in respect of the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam.

2. Mr. SPITS (Netherlands) said that in accordance with the resolution adopted by the Special Committee on Information transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter (A/1836, p.7), the Fourth Committee was to consider the data provided by his Government under General Assembly resolution 222 (III) concerning the cessation of the transmission of information in regard to the territories of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles.

3. From the reference in the fifth paragraph of the preamble of the Special Committee's resolution to the conference to be held at The Hague in March 1952, it appeared that the Special Committee thought the results of that conference should be taken into account in deciding whether the provisions of Article 73 e continued to apply to those territories. In his Government's opinion, however, the results of the conference were not relevant in that connexion. The obligation to transmit information under Article 73 e did not apply if the territories in question had attained a full measure of self-government in their internal affairs. Since his Government and the representative bodies of the two

territories believed that such a measure of self-government had been achieved after the coming into force of the Interim Orders and the new Constitution of the two territories, it was bound to terminate the transmission of information. Consequently, his delegation could not subscribe to paragraph 3 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution before the Committee (A/C.4/L.197).

4. The operative part of the Special Committee's resolution noted the communication of the Netherlands Government and transmitted it together with its report on General Assembly resolution 334 (IV) and the summary records relating to those questions to the current session of the Assembly for any necessary action.

5. The information transmitted by his Government under General Assembly resolution 222 (III) was contained in document A/C.4/200, which included an explanatory note by the Netherlands Government on the termination of transmission of information, a copy of the principal relevant articles of the Netherlands Constitution, and a copy of the Interim Order and Constitution of the Netherlands Antilles.

6. After the Second World War the Netherlands Government had reconsidered the status of its overseas territories and established a new order for those territories. Lengthy conferences had been held with representatives of the inhabitants of the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam as a result of which it had been decided that, in conformity with the inhabitants' wishes, those territories would form component parts of a new Kingdom of the Netherlands on an equal footing with the part of the Kingdom in Europe. As a first step, a new order for the governments of both territories had been established on an interim basis, pending the necessary provisions in the Constitution of the Kingdom.

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

7. The new status of the territories guaranteed them a full measure of self-government in internal affairs, in particular in the fields for which the obligation existed in Article 73 e to transmit information to the Secretary-General. Consequently, his Government felt obliged to cease to transmit such information since to continue to do so would have meant keeping the territories in a subordinate status. Moreover, his Government had no longer been in a position to transmit such information since the national governments of the territories were no longer willing to collaborate in that respect.

8. He indicated that Mr. Debrot, general representative of the Government of the Netherlands Antilles to the Netherlands Government, would be glad to give the Committee further clarification with regard to the matter under consideration.

9. Mr. DEBROT (Netherlands) said that the statements made by many representatives in the Committee indicated the importance of the problem before it. He would explain briefly the constitutional system in force in the Netherlands Antilles, outlining for that purpose the recent phases in its political evolution.

10. From the beginning of the century the idea had been gaining strength that the peoples of the Antilles were entitled to a considerable degree of autonomy in their domestic affairs. The first indications of such autonomy were to be found in the Netherlands Constitution as revised in 1922. In that year, the colonial clauses of the Constitution had been fundamentally amended. The first article of the Constitution, in its new version, had spoken not of colonies and possessions but of territories. Article 61 of the amended Constitution had been a compromise: its conservative element had been reflected in the provision that the supreme authority was vested in the King, while its progressive element had been reflected in the establishment of a representative body in the overseas territories. It must be understood that the expression "the King" meant the head of the government together with his ministers who were responsible to Parliament.

11. The new political organization called for by the 1922 Constitution had been achieved only some fourteen years later with the adoption of the Constitutional Law of 1936. The latter had proved satisfactory neither to the conservatives nor to the progressives. It had given little scope for self-determination. The government had been in the hands of the Governor, as the representative of the Crown, and the representative body had represented only part of the population. The political organization thus set up would not have remained long in force had it not been for the Second World War, which had in any case clearly brought out its political inadequacy.

12. Relations between the Netherlands and its territories had been interrupted by the enemy occupation of the Netherlands and the Antilles had undergone a period of almost autonomous development. The imperfections of the Constitutional Law of 1936 had emerged even more clearly and the idea of achieving the country's autonomy had gained ground. It had been strengthened by the speech made by Queen

Wilhelmina on 7 December 1942, which had promised the establishment of a kingdom in which the Netherlands Indonesia, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles would participate, each autonomously dealing with its domestic affairs. The spirit prevalent among the people immediately after the war had been reflected in a petition submitted by the representative body of the Netherlands Antilles to Queen Wilhelmina, expressing the islands' earnest desire for autonomy.

13. Already in 1945 two commissions had been appointed to investigate opinions both in the Netherlands and in the Antilles with respect to the future status of the latter. The practical realization of the desire for autonomy had been dominated by the idea of a tripartite settlement. For the Antilles it had been necessary to adopt a settlement which would take account of the joint interests of the Netherlands, Surinam and the Antilles, which would guarantee the latter's autonomy, and which would respect the right of self-determination of each of the islands.

14. Those three aspects of the settlement had been taken up more or less concurrently. On 27 January 1948 a conference had been convened to deal with the settlement in respect of the joint interests. That conference had adopted resolutions favouring a change in the existing relationship between the Netherlands, Surinam and the Antilles and the union of the three in a new kingdom based on freedom, equivalence and alliance. A commission had been established to draft a constitution for the Kingdom in accordance with the principles adopted by the conference. The settlement with regard to the joint interests had not assumed its final form in the years 1948 to 1950 because attention had been devoted rather to the immediate achievement of autonomy.

15. The principle of the Kingdom's future statute was established explicitly in article 208 of the Netherlands Constitution, which said that a new constitutional order should be established for the territories, under which they would independently assume responsibility for their domestic affairs and promote their joint interests on an equal footing. At the request of the Antilles Government, representatives of the three Governments had just met in Curaçao to draw up a plan for the holding of a round-table conference in March 1952 to complete the work. No official information was therefore available as yet with regard to the final settlement.

16. The settlement in respect of the national political organization of the Antilles and their autonomy, the so-called Interim Settlement, was however another matter, and one which had frequently given rise to misunderstanding. The word "Interim" did not relate to the principle of autonomy. Autonomy had been established under the 1950 constitutional settlement for the Antilles based on the principle of the parliamentary system and the responsibility of ministers. Under that settlement there was representation of the people, universal suffrage, a governmental executive body with ministers holding the political responsibility of government, and a constitutional Governor. While

the form of autonomy might at any time be altered, nothing could change the principle itself. Just as the constitutional settlement was based on the principle of the parliamentary system, so the autonomy of the islands was based on the same principles as that of the Netherlands municipalities—system.

17. On the basis of that summary of the constitutional system of the Antilles, it would appear relatively easy to answer the questions currently occupying the Committee. In the first place, the Netherlands Antilles were not sovereign and had no intention of claiming sovereignty which, according to their concept, would be vested in the new Kingdom composed of the Netherlands, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. The Netherlands Antilles were, however, entitled to self-determination, with regard, *inter alia*, to those matters listed in Article 73 e of the Charter. The Central Government of the Antilles was therefore of the opinion that the Netherlands Government could not submit information under Article 73 e without intervening in the domestic affairs of the Antilles, and the former was consequently compelled to decline to furnish the Netherlands with the information necessary for the submission of the reports contemplated in Article 73 e. It would moreover feel obliged completely to dissociate itself from any report which the Netherlands Government might arbitrarily submit to the United Nations without its knowledge, not from any sentiment of animosity towards the Netherlands but solely in order to establish its legal right to protest in any case which might prejudice its domestic affairs.

18. Since the Committee appeared to wish to postpone consideration of the question to its following session, it would perhaps be unnecessary for representatives to question him at that time. He would however be glad to provide any further information which might be requested.

19. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) wished to explain the reasons which had led his delegation to co-sponsor the joint draft resolution before the Committee.

20. During discussion of the matter in the Special Committee, the Philippine delegation had advocated reaffirmation of the General Assembly's statement, in resolution 222 (III), welcoming any steps in the Non-Self-Governing Territories leading towards self-government. At the same time, it had judged it wise to warn the Special Committee that the issue to be decided was whether the territory concerned had acquired the full measure of self-government stipulated in Article 73 of the Charter. It had also commended the Netherlands Government for its co-operation with the Special Committee. It was therefore glad to associate itself with paragraphs 1 and 2 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution.

21. Again, in the Special Committee, his delegation had raised a number of constitutional points with the Netherlands special representative, *inter alia*, whether sovereignty was yet vested in Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles since the proposed new constitution for 1952 had not yet materialized or whether in fact the position of those territories was not similar to that

of Indonesia in 1948 to 1949, at which time the Netherlands Government had claimed the right to continue to transmit information up to the final transfer of sovereignty. He did not intend again to undertake a detailed analysis of the issues raised by such questions. That would be premature at the present juncture for two reasons: first, the final form had not yet been given to the factors to be taken into account in determining whether a territory had acquired full self-government, and, secondly, the present arrangements for governing Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles were merely temporary.

22. The joint draft resolution had indeed been submitted with the object of forestalling protracted and pointless debate by asking that consideration of the matter should be deferred until the seventh session of the General Assembly. At that time the report of the *ad hoc* committee to be appointed to study the factors to be taken into account in deciding whether a territory was or was not a territory whose people had not yet attained a full measure of self-government, and also the result of the negotiations regarding the new constitutional arrangements would be available for the Committee's guidance.

23. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) welcomed the gesture of the Netherlands Government in communicating information of a political nature in respect of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles, thus demonstrating its agreement with Cuba's view that, although the administering Powers might confine the information transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter to social, educational and economic matters, in order to discontinue the transmission of information, they were obliged to provide the United Nations with information on political matters. Obviously, self-government in any field was dependent upon political self-government and a Non-Self-Governing Territory had to fulfil all requirements before it could be removed from the list of territories falling under Chapter XI of the Charter.

24. There were two points in connexion with the 1948 revision of the Netherlands Constitution on which he would like clarification from Mr. Debrot. First, he asked what was the exact meaning of the phrase "equal partners", as used in article 208. Did it mean that the various constituent parts of the new kingdom would enjoy equal sovereignty under the Constitution? Secondly, did Mr. Debrot consider that there could not be economic, educational or social self-government without political self-government?

25. Mr. DEBROT (Netherlands) interpreted article 208 as meaning that each territory would, independently, have charge of its own domestic affairs and would, as an equal partner, foster the common interests of the new Kingdom, without its being implied that the same task would be at all times attributed to each of the three components. He did not believe that economic self-government was possible without political self-government; self-government was indeed one and indivisible.

26. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) still did not clearly understand article 208. A fundamental issue

was involved—whether each component part would enjoy equal status in expressing the sovereign will of the Kingdom.

27. Mr. DEBROT (Netherlands) observed that the Cuban representative had revealed the crux of the problem of co-operation for the common interests, which had to be solved at the forthcoming round-table conference. The term “equal partners” had been used in previous negotiations; there was therefore no question of one territory being subordinate to another within the new Kingdom. However, the issue would come up for settlement at the conference to be held in March 1952 and the final outcome could not be forecast now.

28. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) introduced his amendment (A/C.4/L.198) to the joint draft resolution, the object of which was to ensure that the information communicated by the Netherlands Government would be made available to the *ad hoc* committee to be established under the draft resolution adopted at the 241st meeting. He submitted a further verbal amendment: substitution of the word “received” for the word “noted” in the fourth paragraph of the preamble of the joint draft resolution. The word “noted” implied a positive action on the part of the General Assembly and was therefore too strong in the circumstances.

29. The joint draft resolution was conceived in the same spirit as the draft resolution adopted at the 241st meeting by an overwhelming majority. Accordingly, the Venezuelan delegation looked upon it favourably.

30. Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) remarked that he was happy to be a co-sponsor of the joint draft resolution. The Danish delegation welcomed the constitutional advances made in respect of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles, being convinced that they represented the attainment of real self-government. It therefore felt that the General Assembly should record its appreciation on that account and also express to the Netherlands Government its appreciation for the full information communicated in compliance with General Assembly resolution 222 (III).

31. The Danish delegation would have been prepared merely to note the information received but, having regard *inter alia* to the time factor involved, had found it possible to agree to recommend that consideration of the matter should be deferred until the seventh session of the General Assembly.

32. The Venezuelan amendment in document A/C.4/L.198 was quite acceptable to him. The verbal amendment to the fourth paragraph of the preamble, however, seemed rather pointless and he would prefer to maintain the original text.

33. In conclusion, he paid a tribute to the Netherlands Government for including representatives of the indigenous inhabitants of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles in its delegation both to the Special Committee and to the General Assembly.

34. Mr. PEDROSA (Brazil) considered the information communicated by the Netherlands Government

on constitutional developments in Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles an excellent point of departure for examination of the position. It was unfortunate that the Special Committee had not been able to undertake a more complete study of the matter; it had perhaps been handicapped by the lack of time and also of established criteria for its guidance. As a matter of fact, definition of the relevant factors to be taken into account would greatly help the General Assembly to settle the matter. Admittedly, the determination of factors would remain largely academic if the United Nations were not from time to time called upon to decide whether a territory had reached full independence and hence was no longer in need of protection under Chapter XI of the Charter.

35. It was also regrettable that the Special Committee had not examined all aspects of the electoral college system in operation in the Non-Self-Governing Territories under Netherlands administration. For instance, he wondered whether the 26,000 indigenous inhabitants in the interior of Surinam took any part in the political life of the territory or in the organs of self-government, and whether the population in general had been as fully informed of the import of the decision in regard to the proposed new constitutional arrangements as the populations of Curaçao and the Netherlands Antilles. The future *ad hoc* committee and the General Assembly should consider, before reaching a decision, whether the population of Surinam had had the opportunity fully to express its opinion in the matter.

36. The Belgian representative had stressed in the Special Committee how hard it was to evaluate the effects of constitutional changes in Non-Self-Governing Territories. The consequences to Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles could be appreciated only after the changes were finally incorporated in the Constitution. The interim arrangements could not be regarded as a solid basis for the General Assembly's decision. The final form of co-operation to be established between the constituent parts of the new Kingdom was to be discussed at the conference to be held in March 1952. The results of that discussion would be fundamental to the United Nations because the two territories were not yet on the same footing as the Netherlands in respect of their mutual relationships. The complex matters involved were of the greatest interest to the United Nations and to all countries like Brazil which were particularly concerned with political developments in the Caribbean area.

37. Sovereignty over Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles continued to rest solely with the Netherlands; as yet there had been no transfer or redistribution of sovereignty. In 1948 and 1949 the Netherlands Government had claimed that, so long as sovereignty over Indonesia remained in its hands, it had the right to transmit information on the territory to the United Nations under Article 73 e of the Charter. Similarly, he believed that, until the final transfer of sovereignty to Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles had actually taken place, the General Assembly was not in a position to authorize the Netherlands Government to discontinue the transmission of information on those territories.

38. He had no desire to weary the Committee by analysing the interim arrangements now in operation. He would merely emphasize that the Central Government had not full control over the economic and social affairs of the Netherlands Antilles. The Governor continued to exercise wide powers over legislation, and to control the national finances. There was accordingly no full measure of self-government in the true meaning of the term. In those circumstances, it was hard to accept the cessation of the transmission of information on the territory.

39. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the General Assembly would be able to find an appropriate solution to the problem at its seventh session, in the light of the results of the conference to be held at The Hague and of the report of the future *ad hoc* committee.

40. Mr. PANT (India) said that, in recent years, Administering Members had ceased to transmit information under Article 73 e of the Charter for a number of territories, and the Indian delegation had in consequence devoted particular attention to all aspects of the question of the cessation of the transmission of information in respect of the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam. Post-war developments had led the Netherlands Government to reconsider its relationship with all its dependent territories and he was glad that new constitutional arrangements were in process of being drafted for the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam. However, the development of new relationships—whether on the legal, constitutional or human plane—must be approached with the greatest care. The Indian delegation had therefore been pleased to sponsor the joint draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.197 because it felt that the information received would need closer study before any conclusion could be reached.

41. Any measure of self-government for the Non-Self-Governing Territories was to be welcomed, but only a full measure, in the words of Article 73 of the Charter, could be really satisfactory. Further, the fate of Non-Self-Governing Territories about which the General Assembly ceased to receive information was a matter for careful consideration. Under the auspices of the Charter of the United Nations, sixty nations enjoying self-government and independence came together as equal partners to build up the pattern of peace. They bore a collective responsibility for the welfare of the peoples of the Trust Territories and the Non-Self-Governing Territories and must view with concern the position of a territory which ceased to be protected by Article 73 of the Charter without at the same time appearing as a free and equal member of the international community. The representative from the Netherlands Antilles had referred to a system of co-partnership between equals existing as between the territories and the Netherlands. The Indian delegation wondered whether the Netherlands Government would at some future date sponsor the admission of the territories to the United Nations as fully self-governing and independent States.

42. The best relationship between nations was less a legal or constitutional partnership than a free asso-

ciation of free peoples. The United Kingdom had achieved that relationship with India within the British Commonwealth by accepting the principle of complete independence first and leaving the constitutional arrangements to follow. He commended that example to other countries. Not all dependent peoples were sufficiently mature for immediate freedom, but that should remain the ideal. The Fourth Committee's special interest was in the means of bringing about that freedom, and it welcomed the co-operation of the Netherlands Government in providing such full information on the development of the new constitutional arrangements with the Territories of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles.

43. The exchange of questions and answers had convinced the Indian delegation of the necessity of awaiting the results of the forthcoming conference at The Hague before reaching any decision. He wished the conference every success and hoped that the aspirations of the people would be answered by a full measure of self-government, to their own and the Fourth Committee's satisfaction.

44. Mr. TOBIAS (United States of America) reiterated the opinion already expressed by his delegation in the general debate on Non-Self-Governing Territories, that the Netherlands Government was to be commended for its attitude of unreserved co-operation. The available evidence showed that the territories had been given freedom of choice, and if they desired to become associated in equality under the Netherlands Crown, their wishes should be encouraged. The United States delegation had been pleased to co-sponsor the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.197) and hoped that it would meet with general approval. It was prepared to accept the Venezuelan amendment in document A/C.4/L.198, if the other sponsors of the draft resolution were also willing. It was more doubtful of the merits of the verbal amendment proposed by the Venezuelan representative.

45. Mr. MATTOS (Uruguay) said that the most dramatic note of the current session of the Fourth Committee had been its struggle in defence of the interests of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories, one aspect of which was the question of the cessation of the transmission of information on the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam. The Uruguayan delegation had been with the majority in defending those interests and would therefore support the joint draft resolution. It was also in favour of the Venezuelan written amendment (A/C.4/L.198) to paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution and the verbal amendment to the fourth paragraph of the preamble.

46. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) suggested beginning the fourth paragraph of the preamble with the words "Having regard to the information...".

47. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) agreed to that proposal.

48. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba), Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark), Mr. PANT (India), Mr. INGLES (Philippines) and Mr. TOBIAS (United States of America), co-sponsors of the draft resolution, accepted the

proposal of the representative of Iraq. They also accepted the Venezuelan written amendment to paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution.

49. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) thought the Venezuelan amendment contained in document A/C.4/L.198 superfluous, since the Committee had already decided that all the relevant information should be transmitted to the proposed *ad hoc* committee.

50. Mr. PIGNON (France) asked that a separate vote should be taken on paragraph 3 of the operative part.

Paragraph 3 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.197) was approved by 41 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

The remainder of the joint draft resolution, as amended, was approved by 44 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The draft resolution (A/C.4/L.197) as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 41 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

51. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) explained that his vote had been determined purely by the merits of the draft resolution as a procedural measure and did not necessarily reflect the views of the United Kingdom Government on the substance of the matter.

52. Mr. SPITS (Netherlands) thanked those members of the Committee who had expressed appreciation of his Government's action in communicating information.

53. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) recalled that he had suggested at the 241st meeting that the summary records of Sub-Committee 9, on the factors to be taken into account in deciding whether a territory was or was not a territory whose people had not yet attained a full measure of self-government, should be distributed in triplicate to members of the Fourth Committee.

The Committee decided that that should be done.

Rural economic development of the Trust Territories : report of the Trusteeship Council (A/1856)

[Item 33]*

54. Mr. ATTAR (Syria) observed that the fact that resolution 438 (V) had been adopted unanimously by the General Assembly indicated the Assembly's interest in the economic and social development of the Trust Territories through an equitable distribution and adequate utilization of land. In accordance with the terms of that resolution the Trusteeship Council had set up the Committee on Rural Economic Development of the Trust Territories. The Committee had obtained a certain amount of information from the Administering Authorities and circulated it, but its work was still in an early stage. Its progress report (T/926) drew attention to the complexity of the problem and pointed out that some time must elapse before any definite conclusions could be reached.

55. The Trusteeship Council was of course a political organ and the Committee had been chosen from among its members. The earliest and latest stages of the Committee's work would be carried out by the present members, but for the intermediate stage—the analysis

of the situation in the Trust Territories—he felt that technical experts would be needed and it was for that reason that the Syrian delegation had joined with the delegations of Burma, India and Yemen in submitting a joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.167).

56. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) supported the joint draft resolution but suggested the addition of the words “and the International Labour Organisation” after “Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations”, in paragraph 1 of the operative part.

57. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) said that the Trusteeship Council had given the most serious attention to the recommendations contained in General Assembly resolution 438 (V). The Committee it had set up had taken up the first of the three technical and legal problems in connexion with its study of the question: the compilation of statistical data in relation to systems of land tenure. After completing its study of that question the Committee would have to consider the question of the utilization of land from a social point of view and then that of the distribution of land. Those were complicated questions and some time would be required to study them thoroughly.

58. He felt that the sponsors of the draft resolution had not really understood the complexity of the matter. The last paragraph in particular would complicate the Committee's task. It took a long time to make a primitive community understand the system of individual ownership of land.

59. In spite of his objections, however, he would support the joint draft resolution.

60. Mr. S.S. LIU (China) whole-heartedly supported the joint draft resolution. It would be for the Trusteeship Council to decide what specialized agencies should be invited to assist it and when their assistance would be needed.

61. The Chinese Government regarded the subject of rural economic development, and particularly land reform, as most important. As he had observed in his statement in the general debate (227th meeting), Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the Father of his country, had devoted great attention, in his monumental work entitled *The Three Principles of the People*, to the question of land reform. The present Prime Minister of China, who had been instrumental in bringing about land reform in Taiwan and earlier on the mainland, had written a treatise on the subject, English translations of which the Chinese delegation would shortly distribute to all delegations.

62. He considered paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution to be superfluous inasmuch as the Trusteeship Council fully realized the importance and urgency of the matter, as was shown by the fact that it had set up a Committee to study the problem. He hoped the sponsors of the draft resolution would be willing to delete that paragraph.

63. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) made a formal proposal that paragraph 1 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution should be deleted.

64. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) supported that proposal.

65. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) felt that he had no need to remind the Committee of the deep interest of the United States in the question of land reform. His delegation would support the joint draft resolution but suggested that its language might be improved by replacing the word "invite" in paragraph 2 of the operative part by "consider inviting". That would give the Trusteeship Council and its Committee on Rural Economic Development freedom to determine which specialized agencies it would ask for assistance and when.

66. U HLA MAUNG (Burma), Mr. MANI (India), Mr. ATTAR (Syria) and Mr. TARCICI (Yemen), co-sponsors of the draft resolution, accepted the

suggestions made by the delegations of Guatemala and the United States and the proposal to delete paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution.

The joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.167), as amended, was approved unanimously.

Programme of work

The Committee decided to hear at its 244th meeting a statement from the Reverend Michael Scott in clarification of the question of the appearance of the Herero spokesmen in connexion with the resolution adopted by the Committee at its 204th meeting, on 16 November 1951 (A/C.4/190).

The meeting rose at 6.15 p. m.