



CONTENTS

	Page
Requests for oral hearings (<i>continued</i>).....	23

Chairman: Mr. Santiago PEREZ PEREZ (Venezuela).

Requests for oral hearings (*continued*)

REQUESTS CONCERNING TRUST TERRITORIES (A/C.4/
L.271 AND REV.1) (*continued*)

1. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) emphasized the importance and complexity of the United Kingdom delegation's draft resolution (A/C.4/L.271). If that draft was adopted, the proposed sub-committee would attempt to evaluate the problem, thus introducing a restrictive element. After that, the Fourth Committee would have to make its own study. It was therefore difficult to know whether the sub-committee would facilitate the Fourth Committee's work or whether, on the contrary, it would hinder it.
2. The membership of the sub-committee suggested in the draft resolution gave rise to serious doubts. The draft resolution provided, in fact, that four of the members, that is to say half the membership, should be members of the Trusteeship Council. That was tantamount to transferring competence to a body which was not essentially answerable to the Fourth Committee.
3. The Uruguayan delegation did not object to the setting up of a sub-committee to facilitate the Fourth Committee's work. That was an absolutely normal method of procedure, and the various General Assembly Committees had resorted to such a method many times in order to enable a preliminary examination of complicated problems to be made. His delegation could not, however, support the strange proposal before the Fourth Committee, because it provided for the creation of a sub-committee composed in part of members of a body which was not a General Assembly organ and which, under its terms of reference, would study problems before the General Assembly and make recommendations on the procedure to be adopted by the Fourth Committee. Experience had in fact shown that when questions coming within the competence of the General Assembly—which had rightly been called the court of world thought—were referred to bodies which were not General Assembly organs they became unrecognizable. The present case concerned the exercise of inviolable rights. Under the Charter, the General Assembly must defend such rights, as it had done since the beginning of its existence.
4. While the Uruguayan delegation thought the United Kingdom proposal contained some interesting points, it was unable to support it on account of its

unusual nature and because it was not in accordance with the Charter.

5. Mr. KAISR (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation supported any measure which would expedite and improve the Fourth Committee's work provided no steps were taken which might be harmful to the prestige of the United Nations.

6. The Fourth Committee, whose terms of reference provided that it should study questions relating to Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories, was fully capable of examining the questions before it without receiving advice from a subsidiary body. For example, at its 252nd, 265th and 309th meetings, during the General Assembly's seventh session, the Committee had reached decisions on requests for hearings without the assistance of a sub-committee. There was no doubt whatsoever that it was the right and duty of the Fourth Committee to take decisions in such cases.

7. The majority of the delegations had said that they wished to use all possible sources of information, including hearings of petitioners, to obtain a better idea of the situation prevailing in the Territories. The Czechoslovak delegation had always advocated hearing representatives of the peoples oppressed by the colonial Powers. It had not been surprised to see that delegations which had abstained from voting on requests for hearings were more or less the same as those which supported the United Kingdom delegation's draft resolution. He recalled the provisions of Article 76 of the Charter, and said that his delegation would support every request for a hearing, as it was determined to defend the principles of the Charter by more than words. The hearing of petitioners was bound to add to the information possessed by members of the Fourth Committee about the various Territories. Some delegations were satisfied with the fairly limited and discreet information given in the reports of the Trusteeship Council, visiting missions and the Administering Authorities. Such delegations must have special means of obtaining accurate information on the situation in the various Territories, but the Czechoslovak delegation did not possess such means.

8. He shared the opinion of the Guatemalan representative, who had stated at the 318th meeting that the hearing of petitioners helped greatly in establishing a link between the Fourth Committee and the peoples of the Trust Territories. It was therefore essential that requests for hearings should be studied directly by the Fourth Committee and not by subsidiary bodies.

9. For those reasons, the Czechoslovak delegation could not support the United Kingdom draft resolution.

10. Mr. CALLE Y CALLE (Peru) recalled that Article 87 b of the Charter empowered the General Assembly and the Trusteeship Council to accept and study requests for hearings. There were several provisions on the subject in the Council's rules of procedure and those provisions might also serve as a guide to the General Assembly. It was not intended that the pro-

posed sub-committee should lay down rules for the implementation of Article 87, but that it would merely make recommendations. To that extent, its work might be useful.

11. It would, however, be advisable to delete the passage in the draft resolution which provided that the sub-committee should include four members of a body which was not a General Assembly organ.

12. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) shared the opinions of the delegations which had opposed the United Kingdom draft resolution.

13. It had been stated, in support of that draft resolution, that by laying down criteria, the sub-committee in question would save time and facilitate the Fourth Committee's work. The Polish delegation did not think that a body need be set up to save time for the Fourth Committee, since past experience had shown that requests for hearings had never been very numerous. It was of little importance if requests made to the Committee compelled it to hold one or two additional meetings during the session.

14. The delegations of the colonial Powers had shown that the sole purpose of establishing the sub-committee was to provide as little opportunity as possible for the Fourth Committee to hear representatives of the populations of Trust Territories. The representative of France had made that fact very clear. The United States delegation had reviewed the criteria which the sub-committee might formulate; the Polish delegation thought that, far from facilitating the work of the Fourth Committee, such criteria would hamper it.

15. Mr. NAJAR (Israel) said that his delegation had hitherto taken little part in the debate because it had on the whole seemed satisfactory so far. He did not, however, wish it to be thought that the Israel delegation had voted haphazardly on the requests for oral hearings which had been submitted. In resolution 655 (VII) the General Assembly had decided to refer to the Trusteeship Council the consideration of the questions raised in the statements by the petitioners from the Cameroons under French administration, and had asked that body to report to it at its eighth, and not at its ninth, session. The vote which the Israel delegation had cast at the previous meeting was therefore in conformity with that resolution. There was no need for concern at the fact that a majority had declared itself in favour of general acceptance of requests for hearings, for it would be better to hear all the representatives of the population of a Territory than to discriminate between them. It was obvious that, in accordance with the Charter, the Trusteeship System was supposed to operate under the authority of the General Assembly. It was in fact the only field where the authority of the General Assembly could not be contested.

16. The Israel delegation was prepared, however, to declare without hesitation that it would vote for the United Kingdom draft resolution. It saw no need to justify its action to the persons who were posing as champions of human rights or defenders of the Charter. There was no ground for saying that the draft resolution was contrary to the provisions of the Charter. The Fourth Committee would be entirely free either to accept or to refuse the recommendations of the proposed sub-committee. The draft resolution was merely designed to organize the work of the General Assembly in the exercise of its functions in connexion with requests for oral hearings.

17. The matter must be faced from a realistic angle.

There was profound disagreement in the Fourth Committee between the Powers responsible for administering Trust Territories and the other Powers. The question arose whether an effort should be made to reduce that disagreement or whether it should be allowed to continue, and even to increase. The Powers which were not responsible for administering any Territories certainly had the right to know what was going on in the Trust Territories, but they should remember that the Powers administering those Territories exercised authority therein. An effort should therefore be made to reconcile the two opposing views, since the General Assembly's Fourth Committee could not carry out its task except in collaboration with the Administering Authorities.

18. The Israel delegation would vote for any measure likely to bring about some degree of reconciliation of views, since that would be in the best interests of the Trust Territories and of the petitioners themselves.

19. Mr. BENITES VINUEZA (Ecuador) said that the Ecuadorian delegation was opposed to any measure likely to restrict the rights of petitioners under Article 87 of the Charter. The populations of the Trust Territories had the right to be heard by the Fourth Committee, which had been established to promote their advancement and their progressive development towards self-government.

20. His delegation did not agree with the view expressed by the representative of the Union of South Africa at the 319th meeting. Under Article 87 of the Charter, the General Assembly and, under its authority, the Trusteeship Council, might accept petitions and examine them in consultation with the Administering Authority concerned. Rule 99 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly stated that the Fourth Committee was the Trusteeship Committee. There was no contradiction between those provisions and the establishment of a sub-committee to make recommendations, always provided that those recommendations were merely suggestions and were not binding upon the Fourth Committee. If that were the intention of the United Kingdom draft resolution, there would be no objection to its adoption; but there were certain omissions from that draft resolution which gave rise to doubt.

21. With regard to the membership of the sub-committee, there was no indication of the status of those members who were not members of the Trusteeship Council. Were they to be chosen on the same principle, in other words, were there to be two representatives of Administering Authorities and two of non-administering Powers? Difficulties might be caused by that lack of precision. It would be better either to choose the two groups of members on the same principle or else members should be freely chosen by the Fourth Committee.

22. With regard to the terms of reference which had been proposed for the sub-committee, the first provision under which that sub-committee was to "make recommendations regarding the procedure to be followed by the Fourth Committee in considering applications for hearings from petitioners in respect of the affairs of Trust Territories" was quite clear. The remainder, however, "including the considerations to be taken into account by the Fourth Committee in reaching decisions on individual cases" would make it appear that the sub-committee was to establish principles and make recommendations which the Fourth Committee would be obliged to take into account. It might be objected that the sub-committee's work would have no practical

effects; but it would be better if the words "to be taken into account" could be replaced by some expression such as "to be used as a basis," to make it clear that the recommendations of the sub-committee laid no obligations or restrictions on the Fourth Committee.

23. The Ecuadorian delegation was not, however, convinced that the establishment of a sub-committee of that type would be of any real assistance to the work of the Fourth Committee; it would abstain from the voting.

24. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) paid a tribute to the spirit of co-operation shown by the United Kingdom representative and his efforts to make a constructive contribution to the Committee's work. The Mexican delegation would nevertheless vote against the United Kingdom draft resolution, since it doubted the usefulness of establishing the proposed sub-committee. The argument that the work of the sub-committee would save time for the Fourth Committee was refuted at once by facts: the Committee had spent far more time discussing the principle of establishing that subsidiary organ than in examining the seven requests for oral hearings before it. Furthermore, the debates had revealed such profound differences of opinion that it was very unlikely that a smaller, and therefore less representative, group of delegations would be able to produce generally acceptable criteria. It might be feared that the same discussions would begin all over again when the Fourth Committee came to examine the sub-committee's report. The Fourth Committee's time was not likely to be taken up by hearings of purely personal petitions, since the Committee members had been unanimous in deciding that requests of that nature should not be granted. On the other hand, it would be very useful if the Committee could, as at previous meetings, consider arguments for and against granting requests for oral hearings and, if necessary, decide by a vote.

25. Mrs. MENON (India) recalled that when the United Kingdom draft resolution had been submitted, it had appeared to be designed merely to provide a procedure whereby the Committee could use practical methods in examining requests for oral hearings. The Indian delegation, which was always in favour of establishing such procedures, had therefore been inclined to support the proposal. It would appear, however, that the attitudes of representatives had stiffened. The ideas put forward by certain speakers hardly seemed to take into account the assurances of good faith given by the United Kingdom representative. Certain delegations had already firmly made up their minds; it had even been alleged that the General Assembly would be exceeding its powers under the Charter, which did not provide for the right of oral hearings. The statements of the New Zealand and South African representatives (318th and 319th meetings) had dispelled any illusions about the purpose of the proposed sub-committee. The Indian delegation felt that the sole aim of the United Kingdom draft resolution was to limit the right to submit applications for hearings. The differences that had arisen during the debate were regrettable. The concern of the Committee should be not to limit the hearing of petitioners but to reduce the opportunities for disagreement between groups of delegations called upon to work out the standards to be applied. The discussion had shown such a divergence of views that it would be useless to establish a sub-committee. That was why the Indian delegation would vote against the United Kingdom draft resolution.

26. Mr. CAMPOS CATELIN (Argentina) said that

he had received with sympathy the United Kingdom delegation's proposal for organizing the work of the Committee. However, while he considered it useful to instruct a sub-committee to make recommendations regarding the procedure to be followed in considering applications for hearings, he could not agree that the sub-committee's recommendations might also deal with the considerations to be taken into account by the Committee in reaching decisions on individual cases. Each case must be dealt with on its own merits, and there should be no restrictions, in advance, on the sacred right of petition. True, that was not the object of the United Kingdom proposal, but it might have that result.

27. He agreed with the representative of Uruguay on the composition of the sub-committee and pointed out that, far from simplifying the Committee's work, the step favoured by the United Kingdom would mean that the discussion which took place in the sub-committee would be repeated in the full Committee. Consequently, the Argentine delegation would not be able to support the United Kingdom proposal.

28. U ON SEIN (Burma) said that while he did not oppose the principles behind the United Kingdom proposal and did not in the least doubt the sincerity of the motives that inspired it, his delegation thought that the differences between the Powers administering the Trust Territories and other States went so deep that nothing useful could come out of the proposed sub-committee. The Burmese delegation would therefore vote against the United Kingdom draft resolution.

29. Mr. PIGNON (France) emphasized that the United Kingdom's initiative was a legitimate proposal despite the allegation that it was in conflict with the provisions of the Charter. Article 87 provided that the General Assembly and, under its authority, the Trusteeship Council, "may . . . accept petitions and examine them . . .". In no language was the verb "may" synonymous with "must". The General Assembly need not therefore accept all the petitions it received.

30. With reference to the Iraqi representative's remarks, in particular, he pointed out that the elaboration of criteria to determine the admissibility of an application in no way challenged the Committee's freedom of decision; on the contrary, the Committee would have to read the requests, evaluate them and take a decision on the substance of every one of them. Considerable time would be saved by avoiding lengthy discussions of principle that in no way helped to solve specific problems. Moreover, there would be a marked improvement over the present state of affairs in which petitions were automatically accepted and definite responsibilities were shirked on the grounds that certain obligations had to be fulfilled. As the Dominican representative had said, all that had to be done was to make a preliminary study. As some members of the Committee had sharply criticized the Trusteeship Council, the Committee could not do less than the Council, which had at least tried to understand the problem. An Assembly which claimed to be offering guidance could not avoid studying the question without showing that it was afraid not of infringing the rights of petitioners—those rights would not be affected because the final decision lay with the Assembly—but of depriving itself of an easy and irresponsible solution. While he did not claim that the Trusteeship Council had found the perfect solution or that it had never taken a demagogic decision, it had to be admitted that the Council had obtained results by making a distinction between petitions and communications, by sometimes referring applications for hearings

to the Standing Committee on Petitions for preliminary study, and by inviting petitioners to meetings at which matters of interest to them were considered.

31. As for the composition of the sub-committee, it was hard to understand the Uruguayan representative's objections. There had never been any question of appointing Council members to the sub-committee who were not members of the General Assembly. On the other hand, the experience of members of the Trusteeship Council would be useful to the sub-committee. Finally, Article 87 of the Charter provided that the General Assembly might examine petitions in consultation with the Administering Authority of a Territory and the inclusion of two such countries on a sub-committee considering matters of direct interest to them appeared to be not only entirely normal but based on the Charter itself.

32. In conclusion, he said that he did not agree at all with the interpretation put by the Polish representative on earlier statements by the French delegation.

33. Miss ROESAD (Indonesia) said that she was not in a position to support the United Kingdom proposal. Her delegation could not agree that half of the proposed sub-committee should consist of members of the Trusteeship Council. The Fourth Committee had received applications for hearings precisely because the Council had failed to carry out its duties as it should. Again, there was apparently no use establishing a sub-committee since the full Committee had hitherto itself been equal to the task of examining the applications it had received.

34. Mr. JUSTINIANO (Chile) shared the doubts of the Uruguayan and Ecuadorian representatives and agreed with their reservations. The arguments presented in favour of the establishment of a sub-committee had not convinced him. The Chilean delegation had always respected the right of petition of the inhabitants of Trust Territories. It could not join in any step likely to infringe that right, which was enshrined in the Charter. While it recognized the sincerity of the United Kingdom representative's motives, it could not vote for his draft resolution.

35. Mr. LAWRENCE (Liberia) did not think that the establishment of a sub-committee would enable the Committee either to save time or to carry out its terms of reference. The full Committee would have to take action on the sub-committee's recommendations whatever they might be, and they would thus be subjected to a second debate. On the other hand, the sub-committee would not be really representative of the Committee and would not feel that it was fully responsible to it. Finally, he had gained the impression from the discussion that in the opinion of many delegations the United Kingdom proposal aimed at limiting the right to present petitions to the Committee. Liberia had been created to offer a refuge to the victims of one of the most revolting forms of oppression and it could not support any measure tending to limit the right of inhabitants of Trust Territories to present petitions. He would therefore vote against the United Kingdom proposal.

36. Mr. STAHL (Sweden) said that he would vote in favour of the United Kingdom resolution. Far from seeking to limit the right of petition, it constituted a practical step which would make it possible to work out more sensible rules and a more efficient procedure for examining applications for hearings. It met a very real need, as the work of the Committee showed. When the

sub-committee had presented its report, it would be for the Committee to decide what action to take; the establishment of the sub-committee did not prejudge the substance of the problem in any way.

37. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) said that at first his delegation had welcomed the step taken by the United Kingdom representative. Like other delegations, it had been aware for some time of the need to improve the procedure for handling applications for hearings. However, the proposal would appear to be unacceptable to a majority of the Committee especially on account of the proposed composition of the sub-committee. It must be admitted that in that respect the draft resolution of the United Kingdom was somewhat surprising since the members of the sub-committee would be selected outside the General Assembly. Moreover, the Ecuadorian delegation, among others, had criticized the text as being inadequate in several respects. Other delegations, including that of Uruguay, had taken the view that it would be better to wait until the number of applications for hearings created a serious problem before considering the establishment of a sub-committee. The Venezuelan delegation was inclined to take the same view. Finally, while it was true, as the French representative had recalled, that Article 87 required the General Assembly to examine petitions in consultation with the Administering Authorities, that Article could not be invoked as justification to confer upon the Administering Authority of a Territory the combined functions of judge and litigant instead of those of adviser.

38. For the reasons given, the Venezuelan delegation, which approved the intentions underlying the United Kingdom proposal but could not approve its form, would abstain from voting.

39. Mr. ARAOZ (Bolivia) appreciated the sincerity of the United Kingdom representative's motives. He had not objected to the draft resolution at the outset but the ensuing debate had prompted the Bolivian delegation to make its position clear. It was fully aware of the fact that various methods could be applied to facilitate implementation of the Charter. In the present case, however, extreme caution was essential because the problem upon which the Committee was to decide closely affected the interests of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories. There was a constitutional aspect to the problem, because constitutional provisions were applicable in some countries without the promulgation of an Act to implement them. Therefore, that principle might be invoked if the Charter was regarded as a constitution governing relations between peoples and, more particularly, the fields dealt with in Chapters XI and XII. He himself did not share that view because the attempt which had been made to compare the United Nations to a parliament had not convinced him.

40. He wondered, therefore, whether the drafting of rules for the examination of applications for hearings was desirable and whether procedural regulations would suffice to reconcile various points of view and to prevent disputes. The General Assembly was a political organ and there was therefore the danger that purely political factors might influence the application of whatever rules were laid down. The sub-committee would set forth a number of conditions which petitioners would have to meet to justify their application for a hearing. Whatever those conditions might be, each delegation would base itself upon its own criteria and upon the political concepts it advocated in determining whether or not

those conditions had been met. In that connexion, the differences of opinion which had already arisen were an indication of the difficulties which might arise in the future.

41. Finally, while the United Kingdom draft resolution reflected a constructive effort to facilitate the Committee's work, it was nevertheless true, as the Uruguayan representative had pointed out, that some of its provisions might prejudice and influence not only the sub-committee's decisions but also those which the Committee itself would have to take on the various cases before it.

42. The Bolivian delegation was therefore unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

43. Mr. S. S. LIU (China) recalled that early in the debate he had taken a rather favourable view of the United Kingdom proposal. He had not considered it to be an attempt to limit the exercise of the right of petition granted under the Charter to the populations of Trust Territories but a proposal which embodied a practical step intended to facilitate the Committee's task by enabling it to organize its work in a business-like manner. However, the wide differences of opinion which had been expressed during the debate led him to wonder whether the establishment of such a sub-committee was desirable since the disagreements among the members of the Committee would not fail to arise in a subsidiary organ. The time which would be consumed in the examination of applications for hearings could more profitably be used in hearing the petitioners themselves. The Chinese delegation would therefore abstain from voting on the United Kingdom proposal.

44. Mr. L. S. BOKHARI (Pakistan) appreciated the merit of the motives which had led the United Kingdom delegation to submit its proposal. However, he feared that the establishment of a sub-committee might merely result in a useless repetition of the same debate both in the sub-committee and in the Committee itself. The Committee had so far given favourable consideration to nearly every application for a hearing, which proved that it had all the necessary factors to decide on each application. Therefore, the establishment of a sub-committee was, for the time being, completely unjustified. However, the delegation of Pakistan would have supported the United Kingdom proposal had it not provided for an organ in which an equal number of Administering Authorities and non-administering Powers would be represented.

45. Mr. HOPKINSON (United Kingdom) wished to allay the anxiety of certain delegations which feared that the United Kingdom proposal was seeking to limit the right of petitioners to be granted a hearing by the Committee. He thanked those delegations which had appreciated his good faith and wished to state positively once again that the purpose of the draft resolution was merely to improve the procedure applied in examining applications for hearings. The Committee should, in order better to judge a petition, have the assistance of a sub-committee the findings of which would not be binding but which would simply provide certain lines of guidance to which the Committee could refer.

46. With regard to the composition of the sub-committee, the United Kingdom delegation was prepared not to insist upon the presence of members of the Trusteeship Council. That would leave only members of the Committee chosen on their merit. Moreover, the United Kingdom delegation agreed to allow the sub-

committee one or two weeks in which to submit its report to the Committee.

47. Referring to some of the arguments which had been adduced during the debate, he particularly regretted the emphasis on the divergence which existed in the Committee and which had been regarded as a justification for the conclusion that the establishment of the sub-committee was not desirable. The allegation that the sub-committee would hamper rather than help the Committee in its task was equally inaccurate. The sub-committee's functions would not be complicated at all, as the Uruguayan representative seem to fear. There was nothing in the rules of procedure of the General Assembly to prevent the Committee from establishing a sub-committee to provide the Committee with guidance when the latter was required to take decisions on individual cases.

48. Mr. NAUDE (Union of South Africa) regretted that the Indian representative had misinterpreted the reasons which had prompted the South African delegation to welcome the United Kingdom draft resolution in the spirit of the urgent and sincere appeal which Mr. Menon had made to members of the General Assembly (48th plenary meeting) to avoid offensive epithets and sterile differences of opinion. The present debate in the Committee convinced him more than ever that the principles upon which the United Kingdom resolution was based were just.

49. Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) appreciated the sincere and praiseworthy desire to facilitate the Committee's task which had led the United Kingdom to submit its proposal. Some delegations had noted with concern that the Trust Territories were assuming the very heavy burden of sending a representative to New York. For them to do so without hesitation, despite the meagre financial resources of some of them, meant that they were convinced that the trip was necessary. That argument, among many others, militated in favour of the rejection of the United Kingdom proposal which would merely raise a further barrier to prevent the petitioners from reaching the Committee. Adoption of the draft resolution would therefore place a dangerous weapon in the hands of some delegations. Moreover, the Committee had always fully discharged its duties in so far as the examination of applications for hearings was concerned. The establishment of a sub-committee was therefore unnecessary. It had also been argued that time would be saved if the sub-committee were set up. The rejection of some applications on the pretext of alleviating the task of the Committee, whose mission it was to protect the interests of the petitioners and the populations of Trust Territories as provided for under the Charter, was intolerable. Consequently the Yemenite delegation would vote against the United Kingdom proposal.

50. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) recalled that he had said at the previous meeting that his delegation did not object in principle to the United Kingdom draft resolution. However, the ensuing debate had disclosed the existence of such varied views on the possible consequences of the proposal that the Haitian delegation, anxious to assert its unswerving attachment to the cause of the populations of the Trust Territories and firmly resolved to oppose anything which might conceivably limit the petitioners' right to gain a hearing before the Committee, preferred to abstain from voting.

51. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay), replying to some of the remarks made by the French and

United Kingdom representatives concerning the composition of the sub-committee, felt that since there were no members of the Trusteeship Council that were not members of the General Assembly, it was not enough to say that the members of the Trusteeship Council appointed to the sub-committee would sit as members of the Assembly. That would undeniably constitute a transfer of competence completely incompatible with the provisions of the Charter.

52. The United Nations Charter empowered the General Assembly to accept and to examine petitions from the populations of the Trust Territories. That sacred right should be protected and dependent peoples should be guaranteed an opportunity to come before the organ specifically set up for their benefit, for the first time in the history of the world, and freely express their aspirations to self-government. The Uruguayan delegation had never for a single moment believed that the purpose of the United Kingdom proposal was to limit the right of petitioners to obtain a hearing before the Committee. The objections which he had raised during the debate were designed merely to help the Committee and the United Nations to protect the populations of the Trust Territories with ever-increasing efficiency.

53. Ato Katama ABEBE (Ethiopia) observed that Article 87 of the Charter, which empowered the General Assembly to grant hearings to petitioners, did not specify the nature of the hearings which it was authorized to grant. It was therefore reasonable to assume that the General Assembly was required to give favourable consideration to every application for a hearing without distinction. Some delegations which supported the United Kingdom proposal claimed that applications for hearings which might be harmful to the very interests of the populations of the Territories concerned should be rejected. No criterion was available upon which to base in advance the conclusion that a particular application would have that effect, and it was therefore unnecessary to set up a sub-committee which would formulate recommendations regarding the procedure to be adopted in the examination of applications for hearings. Moreover, the argument that to do so would save time was faulty because there would inevitably be a repetition

of debate in the sub-committee and in the Committee itself. Furthermore, the Committee might disagree with the sub-committee as to the method of applying the criteria which the latter established. The Ethiopian delegation would therefore vote against the United Kingdom draft resolution.

54. At the request of the CHAIRMAN, Mr. BUNCHE (Secretary of the Committee) read out the revised text of the United Kingdom proposal (A/C.4/L.271/Rev.1).

55. Mr. L. S. BOKHARI (Pakistan) expressed satisfaction at the amendments to the text of the United Kingdom draft resolution. The Pakistani delegation would have preferred the sub-committee to consist of nine members instead of eight, but felt nevertheless that the revised text met its objections.

56. The CHAIRMAN put the revised United Kingdom draft resolution (A/C.4/L.271/Rev.1) to the vote.

The revised draft resolution was rejected by 23 votes to 22, with 12 abstentions.

57. Mr. QUIROS (El Salvador) explained that although the delegation of El Salvador agreed with the principle upon which the United Kingdom draft resolution was based and was convinced that it did not conceal any attempt to infringe the rights of the petitioners, it had nevertheless deemed it necessary to abstain in view of the concern which many delegations had expressed. The present climate was not propitious to the establishment of the sub-committee provided for in document A/C.4/L.271/Rev.1. Moreover, the Committee had never been seized of so many applications for hearings that it could not examine them all. He would give sympathetic consideration to a similar proposal if one were submitted at a later stage and in more favourable circumstances.

58. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) moved the adjournment of the meeting in view of the late hour.

The motion was adopted by 22 votes to 7, with 20 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.