

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



FOURTH COMMITTEE, 291st

MEETING

Wednesday, 3 December 1952, at 3.30 p.m.

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

Page

Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/2150) (<i>continued</i>)	297
---	-----

Chairman: Mr. Rodolfo MUNOZ (Argentina).

Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/2150) (*continued*)

[Item 12]*

HEARING OF THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MERU CITIZENS UNION (A/C.4/221, A/C.4/L.242, A/C.4/L.243, A/C.4/L.244, A/C.4/L.245) (*continued*)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Japhet and Mr. Seaton, representatives of the Meru Citizens Union, took places at the Committee table.

1. Mr. MAHMOUD (Egypt) recalled that at the 290th meeting of the Committee the representative of France had stated that the adoption of the eight-Power draft resolution (A/C.4/L.242) might encourage certain subversive elements and the representative of the United Kingdom had supported that view. Mr. Mahmoud had been particularly struck by the complete similarity between the statement made by the Wa-Meru representatives (286th meeting) and the White Paper¹ distributed by the United Kingdom delegation. All members of the Committee were agreed that the representative of the Meru tribe had pleaded his case with a great deal of intelligence and restraint. The Egyptian delegation would be the last to allow subversive elements to misuse the right of petition recognized by the Charter.

2. The representative of the Dominican Republic had stated at 289th meeting that, as a member of the Trusteeship Council, he could not accept the joint draft resolution under discussion because it did not support the decision adopted on the subject by the Trusteeship Council (resolution 468 (XI)). The representative of the Dominican Republic seemed to be insufficiently aware of the Trusteeship Council's relation to the General Assembly, particularly under Articles 85 and 87 of the Charter. So far as the form of the draft resolution was concerned, the Indian amendment (A/C.4/L.244) should give the representative of the Dominican Republic satisfaction.

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

¹ See *The Meru Land Problem*. White Paper, Legislative Council of Tanganyika, Government Printer, Dar-es-Salaam, 1952.

3. The arguments advanced at the 288th meeting by the representatives of France and Canada to justify the evictions carried out by the Administering Authority had not convinced him. The expulsion of the Wa-Meru had not been a case of expropriation in the public interest. The tribe had been expelled, not in order to clear the way for public works, but solely to serve certain private interests. The Egyptian delegation would vote for any draft resolution the purpose of which was to safeguard not only the present interests of the Meru tribe, but also the property and tranquillity of all the other tribes in the Territory in the future.

4. At a time when the African continent was awakening to national consciousness and modern economic life, it would be unwise not to take account of the aspirations and rights of the indigenous peoples. The Egyptian delegation was convinced that the Administering Authorities, aware of that situation, would succeed in preparing the peoples under their charge for free integration within the community of independent nations. It was not the intention of the Egyptian delegation to censure any delegation or organ of the United Nations; its only aim was to strengthen the confidence which the peoples under trusteeship had placed in the United Nations.

5. He proposed that the words "with the purpose of transferring these lands to European settlers" in the fourth paragraph of the preamble to the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.242) should be deleted and that the words "Expresses disapproval of" in paragraph 1 of the operative part should be replaced by the word "Regrets". The Egyptian delegation was prepared to accept the amendment submitted by the delegation of India, as well as the change which the delegations of Brazil, Ecuador and Peru had proposed should be made in paragraph 3 of the operative part of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.243, para. 3).

6. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) asked that the name of New Zealand should be added to those of the four Powers which had submitted the amendment in document A/C.4/L.245. His delegation could not accept any of the paragraphs of the operative part of the joint draft resolution.

7. He paid a tribute to the representatives of the petitioners, who had replied with much dignity, courtesy and competence to the questions asked by the members of the Committee. The petition from the Meru tribe could be considered only in relation to the general problem of land utilization in Tanganyika. The land offered to the Wa-Meru was a means of remedying the problem of over-population of the area and was of greater economic value than the land from which they had been evicted. New Zealand had taken note of the assurances of the Administering Authority regarding compensation for the damage which the Wa-Meru had sustained.

8. His delegation thought it regrettable that the Administering Authority should have proceeded to evict the Wa-Meru before the petitioners had been heard by the Trusteeship Council. It had the impression that the Administering Authority had acted in that case with undue haste. New Zealand recognized, however, that responsibility for the administration of the Territory rested with the Government of the United Kingdom.

9. New Zealand accepted the Administering Authority's decision that the application of the principle of the homogeneity of areas occupied by the various races was equitable in the case concerned, but it hoped that when preparing its land utilization plans the Government of Tanganyika would pay special regard to the principle that the interests of the indigenous inhabitants should be paramount.

10. The decision of the Government of Tanganyika, adopted after the most exhaustive consideration of the problem, had been approved by all the European, Indian and African members of the Legislative Council of Tanganyika. New Zealand regretted, therefore, that some members of the Committee had accused the Administering Authority of racial discrimination.

11. Like the representative of the United States, he was of the opinion that the Fourth Committee could not reach a final conclusion unless it made a thorough study of land utilization plans for the whole of Tanganyika. The competent organ to make such a study was the Trusteeship Council. He asked the representative of the United Kingdom to give the Committee the assurance that his Government would give favourable consideration to the possibility of setting aside part of the area concerned for the establishment of a model farm where the Meru and other indigenous tribes would learn modern methods of stock-farming. He also urged the petitioners to make the people of their tribe understand the need for co-operating in the execution of development plans prepared by the Administering Authority. Without such co-operation, the legitimate hopes and ambitions of the Wa-Meru would scarcely have a chance of being realized.

12. Mr. TRIANTAPHYLLAKOS (Greece) associated himself with the members of the Committee who had expressed the emotion they felt on hearing of the hardships of the Wa-Meru. He had been very impressed by the dignity with which the petitioners had placed their case before the Committee. He was prepared to support any practical solution which would enable the Wa-Meru to be reinstated in their rights, and he would therefore vote for the amendment proposed by the five Powers (A/C.4/L.245). He would

like to make it clear that in so voting he would not imply any judgment on the situation as described by the Administering Authority, for his delegation had not had time to form an opinion on that subject. He suggested that the authors of the amendment should add the words "and the present resolution" at the end of paragraph 3 of the operative part.

13. Mr. ABOU KHADRA (Saudi Arabia) recalled that some representatives had attributed to the authors of the joint draft resolution the intention to belittle the authority of the Trusteeship Council and the Administering Authority. He would like to point out that under the powers conferred upon it by the Charter, the General Assembly was supreme. The case under consideration involved 3,000 indigenous inhabitants who had been expelled from the land they had occupied in order to make room for a few Europeans. The delegation of Saudi Arabia criticized not only the methods employed by the Administering Authority, but also the fact that it had not seen fit to ask for the consent of the people concerned.

14. There was no reason why any attempt should be made to justify the action taken by the Administering Authority. The examples quoted by the representatives of Canada and the Netherlands did not apply to the case under consideration, for the measures to which the Wa-Meru had been subjected could not be regarded as providing the best protection of their interests. The representative of France had claimed that the Administering Authority's decision was perfectly legal. The Administering Authority was of course bound to respect the obligations it had contracted under the Charter, but that consideration could not be invoked in the present case. The representative of the United Kingdom had accused the authors of the joint draft resolution of a lack of restraint. Mr. Abou Khadra could assure the United Kingdom representative that the delegations concerned had been guided by their conscience alone.

15. He would vote for the Indian amendment to paragraph 2 of the operative part, but against the deletion of the fourth paragraph of the preamble, which stated the facts of the case. He would also vote against the deletion of paragraph 1 of the operative part. He would abstain when the vote was taken on the new paragraph 3 proposed in the amendments submitted by Brazil, Ecuador and Peru, because he preferred the original text.

16. With regard to the amendment submitted by the five Powers, he shared the opinion of the Guatemalan representative and considered that the adoption of that amendment would militate against the very purpose of the joint draft resolution. He was convinced that all the members of the Committee, including the representative of the United Kingdom, thought that it was their duty to adopt an impartial attitude in attempting to repair the injustice that had been done. The authors of the joint draft resolution had never imagined that their draft would be approved by everybody, but they were convinced that it would secure the approval of world public opinion. He accepted the amendments proposed by the Egyptian representative.

17. Mr. AGUIRRE (Uruguay) said the conclusions reached by the delegation of Uruguay were different from those on which the joint draft resolution was

based and approximated to the position taken by the Trusteeship Council in its resolution 468 (XI). He recalled that the Council had adopted that resolution by 8 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions, and that the only contrary vote had been that of the representative of the Soviet Union.² That representative had himself proposed a draft resolution (T/L.287) similar to the joint draft resolution under consideration (A/C.4/L.242), and it had been rejected by a very large majority. After a full consideration of the question, the Council had adopted resolution 468 (XI), in which it regretted that the Administering Authority should have found it necessary to move any of the Meru people from their land, urged the Administering Authority to do all in its power to relieve the hardships suffered by families of the Meru people, to grant them compensation and to assist them in resettlement, and recommended that the Administering Authority should intensify its educational campaign and direct the activities of the Meru people into constructive channels.

18. With regard to paragraph 4 of the Council resolution, the delegation of Uruguay agreed with the delegation of the Dominican Republic that the Trusteeship Council was not in a position to say that the larger scheme in course of implementation was advantageous to the majority of the indigenous inhabitants. That consideration could be applied even more forcibly to the Fourth Committee, which did not have the impartial technical advice to enable it to reach the conclusions on which the joint draft resolution was based. The Committee could neither censure the Administering Authority nor express disapproval of the resolution of the Trusteeship Council.

19. It should not be forgotten that the Wa-Meru might have been displaced for reasons of public interest. Expropriation, after equitable compensation, was provided for in the laws of almost all countries and it would be easy to cite cases where expropriation had occurred against the wishes of individuals or groups of individuals. Obviously it must be recognized that the indigenous inhabitants and the Administering Authority were not on the same level and there was nothing to ensure that the indigenous inhabitants were treated on an equal footing with the authority of the Territory, although that was the case in other countries. The United Nations had an important mission to accomplish in eliminating those differences and ensuring that the rights of the indigenous inhabitants would be protected. Considerations of public interest were an essential element in such cases. It was, however, obvious that the Fourth Committee, like the Trusteeship Council, was not in a position to determine that element because it did not have the necessary technical advice on the subject. It could not, therefore, possibly reach the conclusions on which the joint draft resolution was based.

20. The amendments of Brazil, Ecuador and Peru improved the joint draft resolution somewhat, but the Uruguayan delegation did not consider them satisfactory because the Administering Authority could not be requested to return immediately to the members of the Meru tribe the lands from which they had been expelled, before ascertaining whether or not the action

taken was based on considerations of public interest. Similarly, the amendments of the five Powers were not entirely satisfactory. The Uruguayan delegation would like the Committee to express regret that the Administering Authority had deemed it necessary to transfer the Meru tribe, urge that no effort should be spared to compensate the families concerned and request the Administering Authority and the petitioners to provide supplementary information on the situation so that the General Assembly could take a decision in full knowledge of the facts.

21. In conclusion, he observed that, even if they did not receive complete satisfaction, the petitioners should at least recognize that tremendous progress had been made since the German administration inasmuch as they had been able to come to United Nations Headquarters to express their views in complete freedom. They could be certain that nothing would prevent the United Nations from continuing on the course it had set to attain its objectives.

22. Mr. GAJEWSKI (Poland) said that the Polish delegation would vote against the amendments contained in documents A/C.4/L.243 and A/C.4/L.244 because the original text to which those amendments related seemed preferable. He considered that the fourth paragraph of the preamble, describing the tragic position of the Meru tribesmen, should be retained. He also considered that the draft resolution should express disapproval of the brutal measures taken by the Administering Authority as well as of resolution 468 (XI) of the Trusteeship Council, which did not provide an equitable solution of the problem. He preferred the original paragraph 3 of the operative part to the new paragraph proposed by Brazil, Ecuador and Peru because it was drafted in more direct language and requested that the legal rights of the members of the Meru tribe should be restituted. In connexion with the Indian amendment, he considered it preferable to express disapproval rather than regret.

23. The Polish delegation was unable to accept the five-Power amendment (A/C.4/L.245), which was not consistent with its position. That amendment failed to mention the only equitable solution, i.e., immediate restoration to the Wa-Meru of the lands taken from them. The Polish delegation would vote in favour of the joint draft resolution even if the amendments contained in documents A/C.4/L.243 and A/C.4/L.244 were adopted. It wished to state, however, that it preferred the original text.

24. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) said that he would vote against the joint draft resolution. In passing, he wished to point out that he found it difficult to have faith in the sincerity of the sentiments expressed by the USSR representative toward the Wa-Meru inasmuch as everyone knew what was happening behind the Iron Curtain. The delegation of the Dominican Republic would vote in favour of paragraphs 1 and 2 of the amendment submitted by Brazil, Ecuador and Peru, which called for the deletion of the paragraphs to which it had objected. His delegation would abstain in the vote on paragraph 3 of that amendment because its provisions already appeared in resolution 468 (XI) of the Trusteeship Council. It would also vote against the Indian amendment but would support the five-Power amendment. He noted

² See *Official Records of the Trusteeship Council, Eleventh Session*, 452nd meeting.

that he had already stressed the importance of having a clear understanding of the situation, account having been taken of the attitude of the Administering Authority and the facts presented by the petitioners.

25. Mr. PIGNON (France) said that he would vote for the amendment contained in document A/C.4/L.245, the only text with a fair and reasonable point of view.

26. He proposed, however, that the authors of that amendment should alter paragraph 2 of their new operative part to read as follows: "Requests the Trusteeship Council to invite the Administering Authority..." The suggestion contained in that paragraph would normally be transmitted to the Administering Authority through the Trusteeship Council.

27. He would point out to the representative of Egypt that he had not said that the eight-Power draft resolution would encourage subversive elements; he had said that only subversive elements could welcome the results of such a draft resolution. He had never claimed that the members of the Meru tribe were subversive.

28. Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) had been impressed by the dignity and the moderation shown by the representative of the petitioners in his statement and his replies to the members of the Committee. The question was extremely complex and must be considered in the context of the general programme of land adjustment and economic development in the Territory. The problem involved human relations in the most direct sense. His delegation was not satisfied that so-called direct action necessarily produced the results sought by its proponents. Frequently, the situation might be aggravated thereby.

29. The Administering Authority and the Trusteeship Council had been criticized for failing to deal with the problem with all the attention that it deserved. He thought that those criticisms were unjustified. It was impossible for him to accept the fourth paragraph of the preamble and the operative part of the joint draft resolution, on account of its broad and sweeping statements and summary condemnation. The Danish delegation was of the opinion that the question should be settled on the spot by the parties concerned. The General Assembly should restrict itself to creating a climate favourable to such a settlement. That was precisely the purpose of paragraph 1 of the new operative part proposed in the amendments of the five Powers. Paragraph 2 of that operative part was also appropriate because it invited the Administering Authority to explore the possibility of establishing an experimental farm in the area concerned for training the Meru people in modern cattle-raising methods. In operative paragraph 3 of the same text, the General Assembly expressed its concern for the Wa-Meru; that paragraph assured them that the question would continue to receive careful study by the Trusteeship Council and that a report would be submitted at the following session of the General Assembly. He was convinced that the five-Power amendment offered the best prospect of achieving a satisfactory solution.

30. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom delegation had not yet received instructions from its Government regarding the five-Power amendments, but that it would consider that text

in the spirit in which it had been submitted. The United Kingdom Government and the Government of Tanganyika would not fail to give serious consideration to the provision contained in paragraph 2 of the operative part as proposed in those amendments, if it were adopted.

31. Mr. MIKAOUI (Lebanon) associated himself with the members of the Committee who had expressed sympathy for the Wa-Meru. In principle, his delegation approved the joint draft resolution but considered that the Indian amendment, the oral Egyptian amendments and some of the amendments of Brazil, Ecuador and Peru would definitely improve the form of the draft resolution. The Lebanese delegation would therefore vote for the Indian and Egyptian amendments and for paragraphs 2 and 3 of the amendments of Brazil, Ecuador and Peru, it being understood that paragraph 2 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution would be replaced by the Indian amendment.

32. On the other hand, the Lebanese delegation would vote against paragraph 1 of the amendments of the three Powers, calling for the deletion of the fourth paragraph of the preamble of the joint draft resolution. It would also vote against the five-Power amendments.

33. Mr. TAJIENAPIS (Indonesia) stated first of all that his delegation was unable to accept the five-Power amendments, because the aim of the joint draft resolution, namely the restoration of the lands of the Meru tribe, could not be achieved thereby.

34. The Indonesian delegation would also vote against paragraph 1 of the amendments of Brazil, Ecuador and Peru, and against the deletion of paragraph 2 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution, proposed in paragraph 2 of those amendments.

35. On the other hand, it would vote in favour of the first Egyptian amendment, to the effect that the last clause of the fourth paragraph of the preamble of the joint draft resolution should be deleted; it would also support the second Egyptian amendment altering the beginning of paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution, if that paragraph was not deleted.

36. Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the Indian amendment, the oral Egyptian amendments and paragraph 3 of the amendments of Brazil, Ecuador and Peru. It could not accept the five-Power amendments since it had participated in the preparation of the joint draft resolution.

37. The delegation of El Salvador would not stand in the way of measures taken by the Administering Authority in Tanganyika or by any other Administering Authority when such measures were in the interests of the indigenous inhabitants, but it would always oppose violence and arbitrary decisions. It had been guided by that principle when it had associated itself with the sponsors of the joint draft resolution.

38. Mrs SKOTTSBERG-AHMAN (Sweden), speaking also on behalf of the delegations of Canada, the Netherlands and Norway, thanked the New Zealand delegation for associating itself in the submission of the amendment contained in document A/C.4/L.245.

39. She also indicated that the sponsors of that amendment accepted the oral amendment of Greece for the addition of the words "and the present resolution" at the end of paragraph 3 of the operative part. They also accepted the oral amendment of France that the beginning of paragraph 2 of the operative part should read as follows: "Requests the Trusteeship Council to invite the Administering Authority . . ."

40. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) said that, in a spirit of conciliation, his delegation and the delegation of Haiti accepted the two oral amendments of Egypt, the Indian amendment and paragraph 3 of the amendment of Brazil, Ecuador and Peru.

41. The CHAIRMAN noted that at the 290th meeting the delegations of Guatemala and the Byelorussian SSR had asked whether the proposal of Canada, Netherlands, Norway and Sweden (A/C.4/L.245) should be regarded as an amendment to the joint draft resolution. He commented that rule 129 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly applied in the case under consideration, and quoted the provisions of that rule.

42. After an exchange of views between the CHAIRMAN, Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala), Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium), and Mr. McINNIS (Canada) on the question whether the nature of a proposal should be determined by a ruling from the Chair or by a vote of the Committee, the CHAIRMAN suggested that the five-Power proposal should be regarded, and voted on, as an amendment so as to expedite the proceedings.

It was so decided.

43. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) said that his delegation disapproved of the procedure of representing new proposals as amendments for the purpose of obtaining priority for them in the vote.

44. Mr. PEON DEL VALLE (Mexico) wondered whether the five-Power amendment should be voted on at that juncture, as it had been presented only that morning. He referred, in that connexion, to the provisions of rule 119 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure.

45. The CHAIRMAN agreed that if rule 119 were strictly complied with, the vote on certain written and oral amendments should be postponed; however, in view of the fact that the members of the Committee knew all about the question, there might be no objection to the Committee proceeding to the vote at once. Members of the Committee were, of course, free to make a formal motion for adjournment of the vote, if they so desired.

46. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) thought that the Committee should vote only after it had acquainted itself with all the facts of the case. He therefore formally moved the adjournment of the debate until the following meeting, in accordance with rule 115 of the rules of procedure.

47. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) opposed the motion for adjournment. The item had been discussed sufficiently and the members of the Committee knew well the import of the various proposals before them.

48. Mr. SHEIKIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) also opposed the motion for adjournment.

49. Mr. N. RIFAI (Syria) supported the New Zealand representative's motion; the Committee would be better able to take a decision at the following meeting.

The motion for adjournment was rejected by 28 votes to 6, with 15 abstentions.

50. The CHAIRMAN accordingly put to the vote the first three paragraphs of the preamble to the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.242).

51. Mr. GAJEWSKI (Poland) asked for a vote by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

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

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Those paragraphs were adopted by 51 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

52. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that paragraph 1 of the amendment submitted by Brazil, Ecuador and Peru (A/C.4/L.243) and paragraph 1 of the five-Power amendment (A/C.4/L.245) both called for the deletion of the fourth paragraph of the preamble to the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.242). He therefore put to the vote the proposal to delete the fourth paragraph of the preamble.

53. Mr. GAJEWSKI (Poland) asked for a vote by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Sweden, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Greece, Honduras, Israel.

Against: Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia.

Abstaining: Thailand, Chile, Ethiopia.

That proposal was rejected by 25 votes to 24, with 3 abstentions.

54. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the authors of the joint draft resolution had accepted the Egyptian representative's oral amendment to the effect that the words "with the purpose of transferring these lands to European settlers", at the end of the fourth paragraph of the preamble, should be deleted. He put the fourth paragraph of the preamble (A/C.4/L.242), as amended, to the vote.

55. Mr. GAJEWSKI (Poland) asked for a vote by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico.

Against: New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Sweden, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, France, Greece, Luxembourg, Netherlands.

Abstaining: Venezuela, Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Honduras, Israel.

That paragraph was adopted by 29 votes to 17, with 7 abstentions.

56. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 2 of the five-Power amendments (A/C.4/L.245), to the effect that paragraphs 1 to 6 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution should be replaced by three new paragraphs.

57. Mr. GAJEWSKI (Poland) asked for a vote by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: France, Greece, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Union of South Africa, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic.

Against: Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador.

Abstaining: Peru, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, China, Ethiopia.

That paragraph was rejected by 31 votes to 17, with 5 abstentions.

58. Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES (Brazil), supported by Mr. PONCE YEPEZ (Ecuador) and Mr. SALAZAR (Peru), explained that paragraph 2 of the

amendments submitted by Brazil, Ecuador and Peru originally had called for the deletion of both paragraphs 1 and 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution. Inasmuch as the authors of the joint draft resolution had agreed to substitute for paragraph 2 of their original text the text proposed by the Indian representative (A/C.4/L.244), the proposal in paragraph 2 of the three-Power amendments should now apply only to paragraph 1 of the operative part.

59. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 2 of the amendment submitted by Brazil, Ecuador and Peru (A/C.4/L.243), as amended, to the effect that paragraph 1 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution should be deleted.

60. Mr. GAJEWSKI (Poland) asked for a vote by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Thailand, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Greece, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Sweden.

Against: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Iran, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia.

Abstaining: Venezuela, Burma, Chile, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia.

That paragraph was adopted by 27 votes to 17, with 8 abstentions.

61. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the text of the Indian amendment (A/C.4/L.244), which would replace the original paragraph 2 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution.

62. Mr. GAJEWSKI (Poland) asked for a vote by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan.

Against: Sweden, Thailand, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Greece, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru.

Abstaining: Canada, Colombia, Ethiopia, Honduras, Israel.

The Indian amendment was adopted by 27 votes to 20, with 5 abstentions, as paragraph 2 of the operative part.

63. Mr. TAJIBNAPIS (Indonesia) stated, on behalf of the authors of the joint draft resolution, that they accepted the text proposed in paragraph 3 of the amendments of Brazil, Ecuador and Peru (A/C.4/L.243) in substitution for paragraph 3 of the operative part of their draft.

64. Mr. PIGNON (France) asked that the new text of paragraph 3, as contained in the three-Power amendment (A/C.4/L.243) should be put to the vote in two parts, the first part ending with the words "from which they were expelled".

65. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first part of the new paragraph 3, as set forth in document A/C.4/L.243, ending with the words "from which they were expelled".

66. Mr. GAJEWSKI (Poland) asked for a vote by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

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

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

Abstaining: Dominican Republic, Greece, Israel.

The first part of the new paragraph 3 of the operative part was adopted by 34 votes to 15, with 3 abstentions.

67. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second part of the new paragraph 3, beginning with the words "to compensate them".

68. Mr. GAJEWSKI (Poland) asked for a vote by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina.

Against: Australia, Canada, Colombia.

Abstaining: Belgium, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Luxembourg, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The second part of the new paragraph 3 of the operative part was adopted by 43 votes to 3, with 6 abstentions.

69. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) explained that he had abstained in the vote because his delegation trusted the motives of the Administering Authority.

70. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) explained that he had abstained for the same reason.

71. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) had also abstained for that reason; furthermore, he thought that the relevant resolution of the Trusteeship Council adequately covered the point with which the text just adopted was concerned.

72. Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) said that he, too, had abstained in the vote for the reasons stated by the preceding speakers.

73. Mr. FORSYTH (Australia) explained that, in voting against the text which had just been adopted, he had by no means wished to deny the Wa-Meru the compensation to which they were entitled, but his delegation had considered that the Trusteeship Council resolution adequately provided for such compensation.

74. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 4 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.242).

75. Mr. GAJEWSKI (Poland) asked for a vote by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

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

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

Abstaining: Uruguay, Dominican Republic, Greece, Israel, New Zealand.

That paragraph was adopted by 36 votes to 11, with 5 abstentions.

76. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) explained that his delegation had voted against paragraph 4 because the French text contained the word "*habitants*" (inhabitants) whereas his delegation would have preferred the equivalent of the word "*poblaciones*" (population) used in the Spanish text.

77. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on paragraph 5 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.242).

That paragraph was adopted by 40 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

78. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on paragraph 6 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.242).

That paragraph was adopted by 38 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.

79. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that his delegation had voted against paragraph 6 because it could not support the draft resolution as a whole and it did not consider that the Administering Authority was bound to take measures to implement that resolution.

80. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the joint draft resolution as a whole (A/C.4/L.242), as amended.

81. Mr. GAJEWSKI (Poland) asked for a vote by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

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

Against: Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Union of South Africa, United

Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, France, Greece.

Abstaining: Peru, Thailand, Israel.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 32 votes to 17, with 3 abstentions.

82. Mr. ARAOZ (Bolivia), explaining his delegation's vote, said that in supporting the joint draft resolution his Government wished in particular to ensure that the land in question would be returned to its legitimate owners. Expropriation should be permitted only in the public interest, in other words, in the interest of the population directly concerned. It was in that spirit that the Bolivian delegation had voted for the fourth paragraph of the preamble and paragraph 1 of the operative part.

83. Mr. SHEIKIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) explained that although his delegation had voted for the joint draft resolution in its amended form, it would have preferred the original text.

84. Mr. JAPHET (Meru Citizens Union) expressed his appreciation for the courtesy with which the Committee members had heard the Wa-Meru representatives. The work that the Fourth Committee had just accomplished had earned it the gratitude of all the inhabitants of Tanganyika.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.