



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Organization of the work of the General Assembly	461
Second report of the Credentials Committee (A/2343)	463
Budget estimates for the financial year 1953: report of the Fifth Committee (A/2352)	463
United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund; reports of the Fifth Committee (A/2345, A/2346, A/2347)	464
Administration of the United Nations: report of the Fifth Committee (A/2344)	465
Staff regulations of the United Nations. Question of a probationary period: report of the Fifth Committee (A/2348)	465
Report of the Trusteeship Council: report of the Fourth Committee (A/2342)	465
Complaint of violation by Arab States of their obligations under the Charter, United Nations resolutions and specific provisions of the general armistice agreements concluded with Israel, requiring them to desist from policies and practices of hostility and to seek agreement by negotiation for the establishment of peaceful relations with Israel: report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Political Committee (A/2340)	472
Admission of new Members: report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Political Committee (A/2341 and Corr.1)	473
Measures to limit the duration of regular sessions of the General Assembly: reports of the Sixth Committee (A/2349) and the Fifth Committee (A/2326)	480
Status of claims for injuries incurred in the service of the United Nations: report of the Sixth Committee (A/2353)	480

President: Mr. Lester B. PEARSON (Canada).

Organization of the work of the General Assembly

1. The PRESIDENT: Today there are before us thirteen items on the agenda for consideration and action, which should conclude the business of this part of the session of the General Assembly. However, there is another item which should be put on the agenda this afternoon as soon as we receive a report about it from the General Committee, which has just met. That report, which will be circulated just as soon as it is ready, will recommend the inclusion of a new item in the agenda and its consideration without delay before the suspension of the work of the session.

2. I should like to suggest to the General Assembly that when that report is received, it should be put on our agenda for this meeting, and that this meeting should continue, if necessary, this evening, until these fourteen items have been considered. That would ensure that the work of this part of the session of the General

Assembly would be completed today and that it would have included the consideration of the recommendation contained in the report of the General Committee for the inclusion of a new item in the agenda. All these fourteen items would then be considered this afternoon and, if necessary, this evening. Does that procedure commend itself to the General Assembly?

3. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): In its letter [A/2355] to the President, the Soviet Union delegation requested that the question of "The mass murder of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war by the United States military authorities on the island of Pogyang" should be included on the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly for consideration without delay.

4. The General Committee considered that question and recommended its inclusion in the agenda for im-

mediate consideration. The USSR delegation takes the view that the General Committee should report to the General Assembly on this matter at the beginning of this meeting. The President says that the General Committee's report is not yet ready. I do not know whether it will be long or short; judging from experience it will probably not be more than half a page, and we may therefore hope that it can be prepared in ten or fifteen minutes.

5. If we do not discuss the General Committee's report at the very beginning of this meeting—and the discussion need not take long—my delegation would ask the President and the other representatives if they would agree that the General Committee's report should be considered after we have completed, say, one, or at the most two, items on the agenda, so that, as is only logical, the USSR delegation can be sure that the item it has submitted will be included in the agenda before all the other questions have been disposed of. Otherwise we have no assurance that it will be included in the agenda.

6. I do not think that this point of view can in any way prejudice any delegation's position; delegations will obviously be quite free to adopt whatever position they consider proper on the substance of the question.

7. To sum up, the Soviet Union delegation, I repeat, will not object to the General Committee's report being considered after the first or, at the most, the second, item, since the text has not yet been prepared. I feel that we are justified in making this request. If it proves unacceptable for any reason—although I can see no grounds for objecting to it—we shall reserve the right to raise this question before the Assembly has completed its consideration of the items included in the agenda before the USSR delegation raised this new, additional, urgent and important question.

8. The PRESIDENT: I suggested that, when the report of the General Committee was received, it should be placed as the last item on our agenda, on the understanding that it would be reached and considered today. The Soviet Union representative has suggested that the report should be considered as soon as it reaches the Chair, which would normally be within fifteen, twenty or thirty minutes. This would permit the consideration of only one or two items in the meantime. Is there any objection to the specific proposal of the Soviet Union representative that we should deal with the report when it reaches the Chair and that, in the meantime, we should consider one or two items on the agenda before us?

9. Mr. GROSS (United States of America): If I understood the President correctly, his suggestion, in response to the comments of the representative of the Soviet Union, was that debate should be begun on the items now on our agenda, and that it should be suspended after the first or second item had been disposed of, upon receipt of the report of the General Committee by the President. At that time the Assembly would be asked to act upon the report of the General Committee, giving it priority over the pending items.

10. I rise to request the President for a clarification of his comments and to learn whether my understanding is correct.

11. My delegation believes that the thirteen items now on the agenda of this meeting should be disposed of in the order in which they appear on the agenda, and that the item proposed by the Soviet Union should be placed on the agenda as the fourteenth item, to be taken up after the consideration of the items now on the agenda has been concluded.

12. I do not understand whether a ruling was intended and I should be grateful if the President would clarify his comments.

13. The PRESIDENT: I think the United States representative correctly understands the Soviet Union proposal—that is, that the General Assembly should proceed with the consideration of the first two items on its agenda; that, at the conclusion thereof, when the General Committee's report has probably been delivered to me, the Assembly should interrupt its consideration of subsequent items on the agenda to deal with that report; and that the Assembly should then resume its consideration of other items on the agenda.

14. Mr. GROSS (United States of America): I am grateful to the President for his clarification of the Soviet Union proposal.

15. My delegation would oppose the course suggested by the Soviet Union. There seems to be no reason whatsoever for dealing with the matter in that way. We believe that the thirteen items now on the agenda should be considered and disposed of, and that the General Assembly should then consider the General Committee's report and vote on the inclusion of the new item in the agenda.

16. The PRESIDENT: It would seem to me that if we are to give consideration to any item at all this afternoon, we should dispose of this procedural question at once and that, for that purpose, I should put the Soviet Union proposal to the vote of the General Assembly without delay.

17. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The United States representative's statement has only increased our misgivings, since it seems to us that those delegations which are really in agreement with the General Committee's recommendation for the inclusion of the USSR proposal in the agenda can surely have no objection to considering the General Committee's report as soon as it is ready.

18. In reply to the representative of the United States, I should like to point out that the questions originally included in the agenda for consideration by the General Assembly relate to a variety of subjects. The USSR delegation is not suggesting that the discussion of any particular item should be interrupted. It is merely proposing that the General Committee's report should be considered as soon as the Assembly has finished the first or second item, but before we take up the next item. I do not see how this procedure could in any way complicate our discussions. I feel that the United States delegation should not object to the USSR delegation's purely procedural proposal that the General Committee's report should be considered as soon as it reaches us. My delegation will thus have the assurance that our item is included in the agenda. The United States delegation and any other delegation

will obviously be entitled to make any observations it considers necessary on the substance of the item.

19. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the procedural proposal submitted by the Soviet Union delegation.

The proposal was rejected by 37 votes to 8, with 10 abstentions.

20. The PRESIDENT: I recognize the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

21. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The USSR delegation stated before, in the General Committee, and considers it necessary to repeat here, that it will of course reserve its right to raise this question after the Assembly has completed the first, second or third item of the original agenda. We are entitled to do that; and it seems to me that the rejection of my delegation's proposal on this purely procedural question will lead to a far greater loss of time than its acceptance. I think the USSR delegation's position in this matter is entirely justified.

22. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly has just taken a decision on the order in which it will consider the items before it today. It had decided that the thirteen items will be considered in the order in which they appear in the agenda. The new item, the report of the General Committee, will be included as the fourteenth item and will be considered when the Assembly has completed its consideration of the other items. I shall be guided by that decision in proceeding with the General Assembly's work this afternoon.

Pursuant to rule 67 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss items 3, 42, 45, 69, 49, 12, 68, 19, 50, 57, 56, 25 and 11 of the agenda of the General Assembly.

Second report of the Credentials Committee (A/2343)

[Agenda item 3]

The draft resolution contained in the report was adopted without discussion.

Budget estimates for the financial year 1953: report of the Fifth Committee (A/2352)

[Agenda item 42]

Mr. Brennan (Australia), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee, presented the report of that committee (A/2352).

23. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on draft resolutions A, B, C and D contained in the report.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 50 votes to 5.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 53 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution C was adopted by 51 votes to 6, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution D was adopted unanimously.

24. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The USSR delegation wishes to explain its vote on the question of the 1953 budget. It voted against the appropriations

for next year, as submitted by the Fifth Committee, for the following reasons.

25. The budget estimates approved for 1953 amount to \$48,327,700, which is \$2 million more than the budget estimates approved by the General Assembly for 1952 and nearly \$4 million more than the actual expenditure of the United Nations in 1951. Thus there has been a steady increase in the budget: over the last six years, United Nations expenditure has nearly doubled. The USSR delegation considers that this is absolutely intolerable, and shows that United Nations funds are being expended by the Secretariat in a wasteful and uneconomical manner.

26. During the discussion of the budget estimates for 1953 in the Fifth Committee, the USSR delegation cited comprehensive data showing that the increase in appropriations asked by the Secretariat to maintain its excessively swollen apparatus were quite unjustified. According to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, the total staff costs for 1953 amount to \$31,730,000, or 66.43 per cent of the total budget, as compared with \$29,783,000 in 1951. For 1953, 4,103 posts are planned, that is, almost one-and-a-half times as many as in 1947. There is nothing to justify such an increase in the number of posts, particularly when it is considered that the initial period of organization is long past. There are intermediary posts in the structure of the Secretariat which have been created needlessly. Commenting on this question, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions states in paragraph 73 of its first report to the seventh session of the General Assembly [A/2157], with reference to the size of the staffs attached to the offices of Assistant Secretaries-General and Directors, that it fails to see the necessity for substantive personnel who in many cases constitute unnecessary intermediary points between Assistant Secretaries-General and Directors and between the latter officials and chiefs of sections. The confusion which reigns in the organization of the Secretariat has resulted in a number of cases in duplication of work. The Department of Economic Affairs, the Department of Social Affairs, and the Technical Assistance Administration, are glaring examples of this state of affairs. The Advisory Committee's recommendations with regard to the elimination of intermediary points and of duplication of work between departments have been ignored by the Secretariat.

27. It should also be pointed out that the budget estimates provide for large appropriations for staff costs due to the system of double taxation which continues to be imposed on a certain section of the staff—in particular, United States citizens. In spite of the General Assembly's decision [resolution 239 C (III)], the responsible United States authorities have still not exempted United States citizens who are members of the Secretariat from the federal income tax. As a result, the Member States of the United Nations were forced to pay over \$1,500,000 to the United States Treasury for 1952 alone. In the last few years, the United Nations has paid about \$7 million to the United States in respect of income tax for United States nationals who are staff members.

28. Furthermore, the estimates provide for appropriations in respect of measures which are being carried out in violation of the United Nations Charter. As

the USSR delegation pointed out during the consideration of the relevant sections of the estimates in the Fifth Committee, the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans and the United Nations Special Field Service were set up in disregard, and in violation, of the Charter. The USSR delegation opposed the appropriation of funds for the maintenance of these organs. The delegation of the Soviet Union also opposes the appropriation of funds for the support of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, since this body's activities impede the repatriation of refugees and are aimed at binding them to countries to which they were sent under duress. The USSR delegation has opposed and still opposes any appropriations whatever for the maintenance of any illegally constituted organs of the United Nations.

29. The delegation of the Soviet Union considers that appropriations for the 1953 financial year should be reduced by about \$6 million; this means that the net expenditure of the United Nations in 1953, allowing for miscellaneous income, should not exceed \$30 million. This sum is quite adequate for the normal work of the Secretariat and for the discharge of its responsibilities. The USSR delegation feels that the estimates approved by the General Assembly for 1953 are excessive, and are not warranted by the real needs of the United Nations.

30. The USSR delegation also voted against the draft resolution relating to the Working Capital Fund for 1953, which provides for raising the Working Capital Fund from \$20 million to \$21,500,000 by transferring the balance of surplus accounts for previous years. The delegation of the Soviet Union considers that there are no grounds for raising the Working Capital Fund above the figure of \$20 million established on a previous occasion by the General Assembly [*resolution 473 (V)*]. If the Secretariat is more economical in its spending, a working capital fund of \$20 million will prove quite sufficient for the normal operation of the United Nations. There is therefore no need to increase the fund.

31. Mr. PSCOLKA (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from Russian*): The Czechoslovak delegation wishes to explain briefly why it voted against the budget estimates for 1953 proposed by the Fifth Committee in its report (A/2352).

32. On objective and critical examination of the budget estimates for 1953, the Czechoslovak delegation cannot help noting that, as in preceding years they in no way correspond to the real needs of the United Nations, given the fact that the main purposes of the Organization, as laid down in the Charter, are the maintenance of international peace and security and the development of friendly relations among the peoples of all nations.

33. The budgetary estimates for 1953 amount to \$48,327,700, or nearly \$4 million more than the total expenditure in 1951. The Czechoslovak delegation considers that this constant increase in the United Nations budget is undesirable and dangerous, and testifies to poor budgetary policy on the part of the Secretariat. For example, the estimates for temporary staff and consultants amount to almost \$1,500,000. This entails a further considerable increase in staff costs, which in 1953 constitute almost 75 per cent of the total budget.

In the view of the Czechoslovak delegation, staff costs should be greatly reduced, and should not exceed 50 per cent of the total budget. A further reason why the Czechoslovak delegation voted against approving the budget estimates for 1953 is that they include large appropriations for the activities of a number of illegally created organs. During the detailed consideration of the budget estimates in the Fifth Committee, we had occasion to voice our objections, as a matter of principle, to the sections relating to expenditure for the work of illegally created United Nations organs, that is, the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees, the Korean Commission, the Special Committee on the Balkans, the Field Service, and others, against whose activities and purposes the Czechoslovak delegation had strongly protested at previous sessions of the General Assembly.

34. The Czechoslovak delegation has sincerely striven to achieve economy, and in the Fifth Committee it supported all the USSR delegation's proposals for a reduction of United Nations expenditures to a total of \$35 million net, a sum which, in the opinion of the Czechoslovak delegation, is fully adequate for the normal operation of the United Nations.

35. For these reasons, the Czechoslovak delegation voted against the budget estimates for 1953.

36. The Czechoslovak delegation also voted against the draft resolution relating to the Working Capital Fund, providing for an increase of the fund from \$20 million to \$21,500,000 by transfer of the balance of surplus accounts for previous years. The Czechoslovak delegation considers that any increase in the Working Capital Fund is contrary to the principles of sound budgetary policy, and strengthens the unhealthy tendency to increase it still further, despite the fact that last year, according to the Advisory Committee, the fund was fully adequate for the normal financing of United Nations activities.

37. For the foregoing reasons, the Czechoslovak delegation voted against the draft resolutions submitted by the Fifth Committee relating to the budget for 1953.

38. Mr. WECKMANN (Mexico) (*translated from Spanish*): The Mexican delegation voted in favour of the budget estimates of the United Nations for 1953, in view of the various economies and cuts made in the original estimates by the Fifth Committee, with the valuable assistance of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. However, this affirmative vote should also be interpreted in the light of the remarks and reservations made by my delegation during the debate in the Fifth Committee.

39. In keeping with these reservations, we voted against draft resolution C [A/2352] relating to the Working Capital Fund, because an increase in that fund beyond the original amount of \$20 million is contrary to the interests of those countries which, like ours, punctually fulfil their financial obligations towards the United Nations.

United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund: reports of the Fifth Committee (A/2345, A/2346, A/2347)

[Agenda item 45]

The draft resolutions contained in the reports were adopted without discussion.

Administration of the United Nations: report of the Fifth Committee (A/2344)

[Agenda item 69]

40. The PRESIDENT: I put to the vote draft resolutions A and B contained in the report.

Draft resolution A was adopted unanimously.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 47 votes to 6, with 2 abstentions.

Staff regulations of the United Nations. Question of a probationary period: report of the Fifth Committee (A/2348)

[Agenda item 49]

The draft resolution contained in the report was adopted unanimously.

Report of the Trusteeship Council: report of the Fourth Committee (A/2342)

[Agenda item 12]

Mr. Scott (New Zealand), Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee, presented the report of that committee (A/2342), and then spoke as follows:

41. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand), Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee: The five draft resolutions contained in the report by the Fourth Committee reflect adequately the time and the consideration given by the Committee to what has become, particularly at this session, an important aspect of its work. Indeed, the hearing of petitioners and representatives from the Trust Territories by the Fourth Committee has raised the problem of the time that the Committee should spend and what procedures it might adopt in the future on the hearing and the consideration of petitions. Although no conclusion was reached in the Committee at this session on these matters, many representatives believe that some thought should be given to them, possibly with a view to reaching a decision at the next session of the General Assembly.

42. May I say that the deliberations of the Fourth Committee revealed many successful efforts to reconcile differences of opinion which necessarily exist. In most cases, solutions have been found which have been considered satisfactory by the great majority of the Committee.

43. There is another document before the General Assembly on this item. I refer to the draft resolution jointly sponsored by Canada, Denmark, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden and Uruguay [A/L.141], concerning the Meru land case in Tanganyika under United Kingdom administration.

44. If I may be permitted for a moment to speak as the representative of NEW ZEALAND, I would indicate that our joint draft resolution is based upon amendments which were unsuccessfully moved in the Committee by some of the sponsors who were satisfied that the draft resolution proposed by the Fourth Committee had little chance of implementation by the Administering Authority. We are concerned to ensure that the Meru people receive from the General Assembly an answer to their petition, and we believe that the proposals which we now move reflect the interest and the sympathy of the Assembly in their case

and present a practicable solution of their difficulties. I shall, however, leave to the representative of Sweden a more detailed introduction of these proposals.

45. Mr. AGUIRRE (Uruguay) (*translated from Spanish*): The Uruguayan delegation will vote against draft resolution A contained in the report [A/2342], on the subject of the Wa-Meru, because it has fundamental objections to each of the main paragraphs of the draft.

46. In the first place, the fourth paragraph of the preamble, which states that "these statements clearly indicate that the Administering Authority expelled some 3,000 Wa-Meru tribesmen from their lands, forcibly and against their will," is quite incomplete. If it is intended to describe the events which gave rise to the draft resolution, it should be stated that if the expulsion in fact took place in the manner described, it was in pursuance of a plan for the redistribution of lands which the Administering Authority considered to be in the public interest. It seems to us essential, in a resolution of the General Assembly, to state the whole truth and not just a part of the truth.

47. Secondly, paragraph 1 of the operative part says that the General Assembly "regrets that the steps taken by the Trusteeship Council to solve this problem have proved inadequate". The resolution (468 (XI)) of the Trusteeship Council was adopted on 22 July 1952, that is, two months and twenty days before the opening of this seventh session of the United Nations General Assembly. It was known even before that time that the question dealt with in the Trusteeship Council resolution was going to be discussed by the Assembly, so that in fact the resolution never took the form of a final decision. It has remained an open question since the end of July 1952, pending a resolution of the Assembly. In those circumstances, as evidenced by the facts and events, how can the Assembly, two-and-a-half months later and in a controversy which did not culminate in a final resolution, say to the Trusteeship Council that the steps taken by that principal organ of the United Nations have proved inadequate when there has not been time to prove their effectiveness and the question is not closed?

48. With regard to the first part of paragraph 2 of the operative part, which invites the Administering Authority to take appropriate steps to return immediately to the members of the Meru tribe the lands from which they were expelled, my delegation again raises the objection that, by proceeding as it did, the Administering Authority acted in pursuance of a plan which it considered to be in the public interest. The Fourth Committee could not and did not presume to discuss whether that motive—the public interest—was justified or not. It did not have the necessary information by which to judge whether the circumstances cited really existed or not. Thus, as it cannot discount the reason given, that of the public interest, the General Assembly has no right to make the request contained in this paragraph, because it may be blindly adopting resolutions contrary to the general interests of the population.

49. Lastly, with regard to paragraph 3 of the operative part, although we agree with the basic concept which is also embodied in the Trusteeship Council resolution, we are not satisfied with the wording: Ac-

ording to its terms, the Administering Authority will not in future be able to undertake any project for the redistribution of land, even when it is in the general interest and would increase the productivity of the land and maintain or improve the standard of living of the inhabitants. As that provision can easily be abused in practice, it will be possible for the inhabitants, by putting up a minimum of resistance, rightly or wrongly, to obstruct any works project of the Administering Authority.

50. For those reasons, my delegation will vote against the draft resolution, and trusts that the vote will not result in giving this text the force of a resolution of the General Assembly. On the other hand, bearing in mind the purpose of the draft, it also considers that the Assembly would be failing in a sacred duty and shirking its responsibilities if it adopted no resolution at all concerning the Meru. Therefore my delegation, consistently with its position, is submitting a draft resolution (A/L.141) to the Assembly, jointly with the delegations of Canada, Denmark, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway and Sweden.

51. We consider it absolutely indispensable to adopt a resolution which represents an effective gesture of protection for the Meru tribe whose delegates came to this Assembly personally. It is essential that these men, like all the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territories and Non-Self-Governing Territories, should have confidence in the work of the United Nations and should feel that the Organization accords them the attention they demand. If we failed to respond to their appeal, we would fail in our duty, we would foster scepticism and resentment and prolong the uncertain and difficult situation in which the Wa-Meru temporarily find themselves.

52. Moreover, the draft resolution which we have placed before the Assembly is basically nothing new to those who have sat in the Fourth Committee. It is not an unfamiliar text that there was no time to study. We are not trying to surprise or impress anyone. On the contrary, every one of the paragraphs is familiar to delegations whose representatives have worked in the Fourth Committee. The first three paragraphs of the preamble are identical with the first three paragraphs of the other text concerning this item. Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the operative part say exactly the same thing, with a slight change in wording, as the second, third and sixth paragraphs of the operative part of Trusteeship Council resolution 468 (XI), which are the most stringent terms of that resolution. Finally, paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of our present draft reproduce all the terms of the amendment submitted in the Fourth Committee to the draft which the Committee finally approved, and that amendment was discussed fully.

53. Thus there is nothing new in this text, and delegations are therefore in a position to measure its scope, meaning and effectiveness with accuracy. It is prompted by the desire to avoid such measures as the Administering Authority felt it necessary to take against the Wa-Meru, to avoid the repetition or continuance of such practices in the Trust Territories. Accordingly, it expressly disapproves of the procedure followed. Secondly, it insists on full and generous compensation for the damage caused to the Wa-Meru and for the losses they suffered, this being, we feel, the most effective and

practical way of giving the Wa-Meru their due and of bringing the Assembly resolution into line with the facts we know about the case. Furthermore, without referring to the immediate return to the Wa-Meru of the lands from which they were expelled—we emphasize that it is impossible at this time to decide whether or not the Administering Authority acted out of considerations of public interest—our draft resolution encourages a serious effort towards satisfactory agreements between the Wa-Meru and the Administering Authority; moreover, it encourages the education and training of the indigenous population in farming and in modern methods of agriculture and animal husbandry, in a constructive and humanitarian desire to widen the opportunities and improve the skills of the indigenous inhabitants. Lastly, according to our proposal, the Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly would keep a careful watch over the various aspects of the problem in order to remain fully informed and to be able to evaluate the effects of the resolution at the next session of the General Assembly and to take appropriate action.

54. I apologize to the Assembly for speaking at such length, and submit for its consideration the proposals dealing with the Wa-Meru; I am sure that we shall benefit the tribe far more by approving the draft resolution to which I have referred (A/L.141) than by approving a text such as that adopted in committee, which is not consistent with the facts as we know them and which pronounces a judgment we consider, to say the least, hasty, on the resolution of so authoritative an organ as the Trusteeship Council. In addition, we wish to emphasize once again that the Assembly cannot and must not remain silent on the case of the Wa-Meru, as it would do if neither of the draft resolutions before it obtained the required majority.

55. In conclusion, I wish to repeat what I said in the Fourth Committee, addressing myself to the Wa-Meru, to the effect that those men should not return home with a lack of faith in the work of the United Nations and a sense of failure because their aspirations were not wholly satisfied. My delegation is much concerned regarding the impression made upon the petitioners, and wishes to repeat that the representatives of the Wa-Meru will themselves recall that, during the period when their lands were under German administration, a mere complaint, any protest against the procedures of the Administration, was immediately punished by the gallows. Today, under United Nations trusteeship, the indigenous inhabitants have had the opportunity to be heard and to voice their grievances and have spoken here with the full and inviolable freedom befitting human beings. They may be certain that the United Nations will continue firmly along the road which has led to this progress, in order to give full effect to its purposes and principles.

56. Mr. LLOYD (United Kingdom): The representative of Uruguay has just spoken upon this matter with, if I may say so, great clarity and great common sense. I agree very much with what he said, and I certainly assure his delegation as well as the others that his closing remarks about the right of these people to come to the United Nations is fully appreciated by my Government.

57. We feel obliged, however, to vote against draft resolution A. We feel that when the Fourth Committee

was considering this matter, various matters of prejudice were introduced. Attempts were made to suggest that there had been racial discrimination and other matters of that sort. Such insinuations, in fact, were quite unfounded. We feel that the Fourth Committee did not give proper weight to the real problem.

58. The real problem is how best to use the land in Tanganyika in the long-term interests of all the inhabitants. In this particular area the Government long ago recognized that there was congestion on the land, that new areas had to be opened up for tribal expansion, with improved agricultural methods, and that opportunities existed for the fruitful use of the poorer agricultural land for meat production by those who possessed the necessary skill and capital.

59. This whole problem was examined by an experienced Commissioner, Judge Wilson, who made certain recommendations in his report involving the redistribution of land. Some land was to be taken, by compulsory expropriation if necessary, from European ownership, including the land held by the Custodian of Enemy Property on behalf of the International Reparations Commission, and such land was to be assigned to African use. A smaller area of land was to be taken from African occupation and made available on lease to farmers, European or otherwise, to be used for purposes and under other conditions prescribed by the Veterinary Department. The object was to produce meat, hides and dairy products in order to improve the diet of the inhabitants and to increase the export revenue of the Territory. As a small part of this large over-all plan, fewer than 3,000 members of the Meru tribe were to be required to move from rather unproductive agricultural land to another area. This other area offered, by the best scientific judgment, both better immediate prospects and greater ultimate opportunity for tribal expansion.

60. I hope that this brief narrative of a matter which was fully expounded by the United Kingdom representative in the Fourth Committee will bring out the principle at issue. It is that in the broader interests of the community, the immediate interests of individuals or groups—or what they believe to be their interests—must sometimes be sacrificed. This is constantly happening in the United Kingdom, land being compulsorily acquired for all sorts of purposes, for housing developments, airfield construction, road development and the like. It is, of course, essential that fair compensation should be paid, and paid promptly. But it is the task of the public authorities to decide what is in the public interests and whether private interests have to be sacrificed. When such a decision has been taken in my country and it has been decided in the public interest that certain private individuals have to be expropriated, then if they resist the process of law, force is used to remove them. In modern times, good administration is impossible without such powers vested in the government. It was this function which the Government of Tanganyika sought to exercise to the best of its judgment and capacity.

61. If I may give an example to show that there is no idea of racial discrimination in a matter of this sort, may I remind the Assembly of how a similar principle has been honoured or exercised in the Gold Coast by African Ministers. There has been great trouble, as

you know, from swollen shoot disease of cocoa, and that was a serious threat to the economy of the Gold Coast. The only remedy was to destroy the diseased trees, and there an African Administration decided to take forcible measures, if necessary, to enforce the law and see that the diseased trees were cut out, even contrary to the wishes of the farmers concerned.

62. People who accept this principle which, I maintain, is the essence of government, can question, to my mind, only two things; was the compensation adequate, and were the methods used to ensure compliance both fair and humane? I am confident that in this case they were, as was demonstrated by the White Paper of the Tanganyika Government and the unanimous approval of representatives of all races in the Tanganyika legislature. The Government took its decision and carried it out in the conviction that it was in the best interests of the people of the Territory.

63. The draft resolution before the Assembly orders my Government to reverse that decision. That is the only interpretation which can be placed upon it: that we should immediately return the land to its former owners. Of course, we cannot prevent the General Assembly from adopting resolutions, but we are under no obligation to obey them. There is nothing in the Charter or in the conditions under which we took over this task of administration which compels us to do that. But we do not want to be put in that position *vis-à-vis* the Assembly. It is not very dignified for this Assembly to adopt resolutions which the Administering Authority has no intention of carrying out. And similarly, we do not want to be placed in that position in relation to decisions or resolutions of the Assembly. I state quite frankly that we cannot accept this draft resolution, and, if it is adopted, it will not be implemented.

64. When I have addressed the General Assembly before on matters relating to Non-Self-Governing Territories, I have sought to suggest that a much better way would be—I know there are strong feelings about these matters—to see whether we could not proceed together, by a process of compromise, to work out something which both sides could accept. I submit that the other draft resolution (A/L.141) is such a proposal which does provide the basis for helpful co-operation.

65. This alternative draft resolution is critical, but constructive. We do not like the criticism, and we do not accept the criticism, but still it is there in the draft resolution and we do recognize the spirit of helpfulness in which it has been conceived. It aims at ample compensation and the restoration of that confidence between the government and the governed without which administration will, in the long run, fail.

66. It will be of interest to the Assembly to know, with reference to paragraph 3 of the operative part of this draft resolution, that the Government of Tanganyika has extended an invitation to the chiefs of the Wa-Meru and the Meru Citizens Union to send representatives to a round-table conference with government officers to consider plans for the development of local government on a more democratic basis amongst the Wa-Meru, and a development plan for the tribal area, for which considerable funds have been voted. I most sincerely hope that the people will respond to this fresh approach and come some way to meet the Government

in its earnest efforts to help them. I hope also that in this they will be encouraged by the Assembly adopting this alternative draft resolution.

67. If the alternative draft resolution is adopted, we shall consider carefully the valuable suggestions contained in paragraph 4, and we shall not vote against the draft. If it is adopted, we hope we shall then be able to make it a basis for a better understanding of this question. We should then be quite willing to come and report to this Assembly again as to what steps have been taken to act upon the suggestions in that draft resolution.

68. Mrs. SKOTTSBERG-AHMAN (Sweden): I should like to explain why the Swedish delegation has decided to vote against the Fourth Committee's proposal on the Meru land problem, and also to explain the reasons which have prompted us, together with six other delegations, to submit an alternative draft [A/L.141] to that contained in the Committee's report.

69. This whole question involves matters of important principle. In a way, it is almost unique. The Assembly has been called upon not to pronounce itself in more or less general terms on the different aspects of the development in Trust Territories, but to recommend concrete action in a very specific case involving a certain group of people in a small, defined area within a Trust Territory, thereby reversing completely the long-range plans of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory as a whole. Furthermore, the Assembly is asked to act as a court of appeal in a matter on which the Trusteeship Council has already pronounced itself.

70. Even without taking any stand as to the merits of this kind of approach, we feel that one would do well in this particular case to think twice before embarking upon such a course. For the questions involved are important, not only from the point of view of principle but also because they present very complex practical problems. This has been made clear by the statements of the Administering Authority, both here this afternoon and earlier in the Committee, and also by the petitioners, the spokesmen of the Meru people.

71. The statements of the parties concerned are almost completely contradictory. We know from the way the voting went in the Committee that a considerable number of delegations shared our feeling that, on the basis of these statements, it was impossible to pass judgment on the conflicting claims. Our opportunities here to study the practical details of a case like this are necessarily limited. But it is quite clear that the right demanded by the Meru people to return to their land is not the only principle involved. There is also the generally accepted principle that sectional or individual interests may have to yield in favour of the greater common good. From the explanations we have heard, it is quite clear to us that the question raised by the Wa-Meru deals with an important matter, but also that it cannot be viewed in isolation, since it is part of a larger scheme for the development of the whole Territory.

72. To suggest, as does the Committee's draft, that the Assembly should support a demand that the lands in dispute should be returned immediately to the Meru tribe, seems to us to imply a claim to a competence which the Assembly does not possess in judging the

merits, or lack of merits, of this larger scheme. For the same reason, we are unable to support the Committee's recommendation that the execution of any plan for the redistribution of land which would entail the eviction of indigenous inhabitants against their will should be suspended. We cannot agree that the hands of the Administering Authority should be tied in advance in such a manner.

73. We do not question that there has been hardship in this case, and we wish to repeat that, in our attitude to the whole problem, there is no lack of sympathy for the Meru people in this respect. It may well be that better methods of achieving the intended result could have been used by the Administering Authority.

74. In order to make this absolutely clear, we have incorporated in our draft resolution, as paragraphs 1 and 2 of the operative part, a passage which underlines the regrets expressed by the Trusteeship Council at the procedure followed by the Administering Authority in evicting by force some of the Meru tribe from their land, and also one which stresses the Council's recommendation to the Administering Authority to be generous in compensating and relieving the Meru families.

75. Our draft resolution then goes on to urge further efforts to reach agreement between the parties. Surely everybody must consider this highly desirable. We have just heard the representative of the Administering Authority tell us that the Government of Tanganyika has invited the chiefs of the Wa-Meru and the Meru Citizens Union to a round-table conference with government officers. This would seem to be a step in just such a direction as we had in mind when preparing our draft resolution.

76. Our further suggestion that part of the area in dispute might be set aside for an experimental farm on which to train the Meru people and other indigenous people in modern cattle-raising methods, is identical with what we proposed at the committee stage. We still think that this is a practical and constructive idea and, as such, preferable to the corresponding paragraph in the Committee's draft resolution, which is couched in more general terms.

77. Finally, our draft resolution proposes that the Trusteeship Council should look further into the matter and report back to the General Assembly on the entire problem, including the measures taken by the Administering Authority on the basis both of this draft resolution and of the one adopted by the Trusteeship Council at its eleventh session. This request makes it clear that we are not satisfied at every point with the way in which the matter has been handled so far, and that we hope that progress can be made along the lines we have indicated.

78. In closing, let me say that our attitude to this whole problem has been governed by a strong feeling that no useful purpose would be served by adopting a resolution which would clearly remain on paper only. Such a resolution could easily do more harm than good. We should like to see the Meru people get something out of their appeal to the United Nations. It is evident that a draft resolution such as that recommended in the Committee's report would have no practical effect. The Administering Authority has said that it could not be guided by it. If that draft resolution were adopted, the Meru people, therefore, would gain none of the

objectives which they are pursuing, and the United Nations itself would stand to lose rather than to gain.

79. We think it appropriate to state our fear that such a loss would become apparent not least in the very area to which the resolution applied. It certainly would not increase the standing of the United Nations in the eyes of those who would have sought its help in vain. On the other hand, the statement just made by the representative of the United Kingdom seems to hold out a reasonable hope that the alternative proposals, which we have set forth, could lead to practical results, and that should be the main concern of this General Assembly.

80. Mr. TAJIBNAPIS (Indonesia): I wish to explain the vote of my delegation on the two draft resolutions before us, one in the Committee's report (A/2342), and the other proposed jointly by seven Powers (A/L.141). Since the issues raised by these two draft resolutions are very clear indeed, my remarks will be very brief.

81. The events which have occasioned the two draft resolutions are as follows. Some 3,000 Meru tribesmen were removed by force from their lands by the Administering Authority of the Trust Territory of Tanganyika. In the process of these evictions, their houses were burned down, their property destroyed and they suffered heavy losses in cattle, sheep, goats and so on. Lives were lost, and twenty persons were arrested and imprisoned. In the meantime, the land which was taken away from the Wa-Meru has been allocated to thirteen white European settlers.

82. It is very difficult for my delegation to conclude from this fact that these lands were alienated for purposes of public utility, as has been said by one of the co-sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution.

83. As a result of the submission of this draft resolution by the seven Powers (A/L.141), the General Assembly has before it two alternatives. The first is to request the Administering Authority to return the alienated lands to the Wa-Meru and to compensate them fully for all property and other losses resulting from their forcible eviction, and to recommend to the Administering Authority the training of the Wa-Meru in modern methods of cattle ranching and agriculture as a further measure of alleviating their hardships. The second alternative is to ask the Administering Authority to compensate the Wa-Meru for their losses and to request the Trusteeship Council to invite the Administering Authority to consider the possibility of establishing an experimental farm for training the Wa-Meru and other indigenous people in modern cattle-raising methods. In other words, the General Assembly should make a choice between, on the one hand, asserting the principle that no indigenous inhabitants of Trust Territories can be removed, without their prior collective consent, from the land which they themselves have settled and, on the other hand, accepting the accomplished fact of the forcible removal of the Wa-Meru and, in so doing, setting a dangerous precedent.

84. With due respect to the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution, I must point out to them in all friendliness that neither paragraph 1 nor paragraph 3 of the operative part of their draft resolution removes

this principal deficiency in their original draft, which was rejected by the Fourth Committee. In the circumstances, the choice which the General Assembly must make should not be difficult. My delegation will vote for the draft resolution approved by the Fourth Committee and against the seven-Power draft resolution.

85. Mr. PIGNON (France): I shall ask the President's permission to present in a single statement my delegation's observations concerning the various texts submitted to the General Assembly by the Fourth Committee. I shall be as brief as possible.

86. As regards the first draft resolution, concerning the Meru tribe of Tanganyika, I would repeat what I said in the Fourth Committee, namely, that leaving aside the particular circumstances of this case, the General Assembly cannot on this occasion lay down general principles which would, in future, limit the prerogatives that any government must retain, in the public interest. In giving its endorsement to this text, the General Assembly would be assuming a heavy responsibility; and I must ask my colleagues to give the matter further thought before embarking upon a course which would lead to the negation of all progress.

87. At the stage we have now reached there is only one wise course, which is to adopt the draft resolution just submitted, after careful thought and preparation, by the delegations of Canada and six other States. This proposal, so eloquently introduced by the representatives of Uruguay and Sweden, represents the quickest and most practical way of reaching a satisfactory settlement of the problems of the Meru people, who certainly deserve our active sympathy, expressed in concrete and effective form.

88. I come now to draft resolution D approved by the Fourth Committee after hearing the petitioners from the Cameroons under French administration. To save the Assembly's time at this final stage of our work, I shall dispense with detailed comment on this proposal and confine myself to a few essential remarks.

89. I must state that the French delegation deliberately refrained from speaking on the substance of the questions raised in a debate which we have always considered out of place, useless and harmful. We are therefore reserving the detailed information, which we could furnish here and now concerning the petitioners' allegations, for submission to the Trusteeship Council, since it alone is competent to deal with such problems, which, moreover, are regularly dealt with as one of its annual activities. We have also refrained from announcing the essential provisions of the bill which is being prepared by the French Government to establish new political institutions in the Cameroons and develop those which already exist. It is obvious that my delegation could not agree to having this bill discussed in the Fourth Committee, in the presence of the petitioners and perhaps, even, with their participation. Both the petitioners heard by the Fourth Committee are men of great intelligence; but they represent only a small fraction of public opinion in their country—to be exact, the opinion of their respective parties, and there are many other parties in the Cameroons, where political consciousness is rapidly awakening. My delegation therefore refused to take part in a debate initiated on so biased and questionable a basis.

90. I must also state that the allegations of the petitioners, who came before the Fourth Committee in order to air their pre-election disputes and prepare the ground for future elections, do not justify a special report by the Trusteeship Council. We shall therefore vote against this proposal.

91. I have one further observation. I would ask the members of the General Assembly to give some thought to the encouragement and support they have given the representatives of an extremist party, which will not hesitate to utilize the welcome it received in the United Nations to further its propaganda in the Cameroons and elsewhere in Africa. The preparation of a special report by the Trusteeship Council after a hearing had been granted to the petitioner representing the *Union des populations du Cameroun*—a party whose sympathies and affiliations are well known—would constitute strong support for the propaganda disseminated by that party.

92. The remarks I have just made apply in part, and *mutatis mutandis*, to the hearing of petitioners from Somaliland under Italian administration. In that case, too, I fear that the encouragement given Mr. Issa may have an effect directly contrary to our objective, which is the rapid development, in an atmosphere of trust and harmony, of the institutions of that country, which the General Assembly has undertaken to lead to independence within eight years. In any event, draft resolution E is unjust, both to the Trusteeship Council and to the Administering Authority. For these reasons my delegation cannot support it.

93. Mr. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) (*translated from French*): I wish to ask that a roll-call vote be taken on draft resolution E.

94. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) (*translated from Spanish*): The Guatemalan delegation wishes to state its position on this most delicate and important case of the tribal lands of the Wa-Meru in the Trust Territory of Tanganyika under United Kingdom administration. Throughout the debate on this problem in the Fourth Committee efforts have been made to complicate it unnecessarily.

95. The matter is in itself simple, upon which the United Nations cannot keep silence. Under the pretext of a general plan of land redistribution in a Trust Territory, 3,000 indigenous inhabitants of the Meru tribe were attacked and evicted by force from lands which they had held for many years, lands which had been seized by the Germans and had later been purchased by the Wa-Meru during the present British Administration. Further, on the occasion of this violent dispossession, a number of persons lost their lives, and nearly all the indigenous inhabitants evicted lost their houses, which were set on fire, and almost all their property, as well as their livestock, which was killed or scattered.

96. During the debate in the Fourth Committee, certain delegations, including that of Guatemala, sought to have a practical resolution passed in connexion with this situation of fact. My delegation did not wish the matter to be complicated by considerations concerning the general plan or concerning the right of any country or government to expropriate land in the public interest.

97. Furthermore, even though the representative of the Administering Authority has pointed out and explained—and my delegation believes that the statement is quite true—that in this matter there was no idea of discrimination or racial segregation, the result is disquieting, because although that may not have been the intention of the Administering Authority, the fact is that the lands which were taken from the indigenous inhabitants were afterwards handed over to thirteen Europeans. This, even if there was no intention on the part of the Administering Authority to that effect, may give the impression that a policy of discrimination and racial segregation is being pursued in a Trust Territory.

98. With regard to the question of public interest and the right of expropriation, my delegation understands that the draft resolution approved by the Fourth Committee does not prejudice that right. Expropriation must be carried out in due legal form; the Administering Authority, in conformity with its own laws, can at any moment proceed to expropriate property, even in the case of the persons under discussion, provided it follows the relevant legal procedure, but it cannot be admitted in any democratic country that, under the pretext of an act of expropriation, the Executive can dispossess the holders of the lands concerned without any intervention or warrant from a competent authority which can decide on the merits of the dispossession and order that it should be carried out.

99. That is what happened in the case of the Wa-Meru. The delegations which, in committee, supported the draft resolution now before the Assembly, did not do so in denial of the right of expropriation or of the possible value of any development plan in the Trust Territory. The draft resolution is designed merely to restore a state of affairs which was violently upset. It accordingly invites the Administering Authority to return to the indigenous inhabitants the lands from which they were expelled, with the implied reservation that it may continue the legal process of expropriation by lawful means even in respect of the same lands, if that is necessary for the Territory's economic development.

100. For these reasons, the Guatemalan delegation will not swerve from its position on the draft resolution of the Fourth Committee, and will vote against the draft resolution (A/L.141) submitted by seven delegations.

101. This draft resolution was rejected by the Fourth Committee by 31 votes to 17, because it merely repeated a resolution of the Trusteeship Council which, in our opinion, did not deal with the problem in itself; that draft confines itself, as did the Council, not, indeed, to applauding, but merely to regretting the action of the Administering Authority, without suggesting anything stronger than compensation, but never the restitution of the lands, that is, the restoration of the *status quo*.

102. We believe, therefore, that even if draft resolution A does not obtain the majority necessary for its adoption by the Assembly, it would be better to have no resolution on this matter, because that would at least leave the field open for later action. If a resolution on the lines of that proposed by the seven Powers were adopted, it would only endorse an act which the

United Nations could never approve, for it implies a serious violation of human rights.

103. Reference has also been made here to the protection of peoples of the Trust Territories, and all delegations have expressed, as they did in the Fourth Committee, the most lively sympathy for the Wa-Meru, but the protection of the United Nations for those peoples cannot be confined to expressions of sympathy; there must also be some action which will reveal to those peoples that the international Organization is really concerned to protect them, takes an interest in their progress and in preventing all types of abuse and violence on the part of the Administering Authority.

104. I think it would be very serious for the United Nations if these indigenous inhabitants, after coming all the way from Africa to plead their case before the Assembly, returned to their homes—as I expect they already have—and said: "The United Nations has protected us; the United Nations is going to return us our lands", and then had to be told that such resolutions required a two-thirds majority for adoption by the Assembly, that they needed a kind of ratification by the Assembly, and that that ratification was not forthcoming. These peoples, whose culture has not yet reached the general level of other countries, will never understand matters of procedure and will be stricken to the heart and terribly disappointed if the United Nations, which had once said "yes" to them, should then say "no". These peoples will feel in their hearts that the United Nations not only does not wish to protect them, but has deceived them.

105. Mr. JESSUP (United States of America): The position of the United States delegation as regards the two draft resolutions before the General Assembly is very clear.

106. In the Fourth Committee, various amendments were submitted to the draft resolution which appears as draft resolution A in the Committee's report. We voted for those amendments. Since they were not adopted, we voted against the draft resolution.

107. The seven-Power draft resolution now before the General Assembly (A/L.141) retains the general approach and spirit of those amendments which we supported in committee. Three of the sponsors of that draft resolution have already explained its purpose and the results which it would have. We agree with the point of view inspiring those statements. The representative of Sweden, in particular, called attention to paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. We share the view that paragraph 4 is illustrative of the constructive approach which has been adopted by the sponsors. We believe that, in the light of the statements made this afternoon by the representative of the Administering Authority, the General Assembly can expect useful results from the suggestion contained in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. We shall therefore vote in favour of that draft resolution.

108. We admit that there are certain acceptable parts of the draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee. We are, however, confronted by a choice between two draft resolutions. Our choice is clear: we prefer the seven-Power draft resolution and shall, as I have said, vote in favour of it. We also agree with the statement made by the representative of Uruguay, to

the effect that it is very desirable that the General Assembly should adopt some resolution on this subject. It is therefore our hope that the seven-Power draft resolution will be adopted.

109. The PRESIDENT: The draft resolutions on the item now before the General Assembly relate to the operation of the Trusteeship System. Pursuant to rule 84 of the rules of procedure, therefore, they require a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting.

110. I now put to the vote draft resolution A, contained in the report of the Fourth Committee (A/2342). A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Poland, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

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

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

Abstaining: Thailand, Venezuela, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Panama, Paraguay, Peru.

The result of the vote was 28 in favour, 20 against, and 10 abstentions.

The draft resolution was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

111. The PRESIDENT: We come now to the alternative draft resolution on this subject (A/L.141).

112. A separate roll-call vote has been requested first on paragraph 2 of the operative part of this draft.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Yemen, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Greece, Iceland, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Sweden, Thailand, Union of South Africa, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria.

Abstaining: Argentina, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Czechoslovakia, India, Peru, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela.

The result of the vote was 27 in favour, 19 against, and 12 abstentions.

The paragraph was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

113. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the draft resolution [A/L.141] as a whole, as amended. A roll-call has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Cuba, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Cuba, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Sweden, Thailand, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Colombia.

Against: Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia.

Abstaining: Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, Peru, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Costa Rica.

The result of the vote was 21 in favour, 21 against, with 16 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

114. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on draft resolution B, contained in the report of the Fourth Committee (A/2342).

The result of the vote was 36 in favour, 1 against, and 19 abstentions.

The draft resolution was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

115. The PRESIDENT: A vote will be taken on draft resolution C.

The result of the vote was 46 in favour, none against, and 5 abstentions.

The draft resolution was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

116. The PRESIDENT: In connexion with draft resolution D, a separate vote has been requested in respect of the word "special", at the end of paragraph 2 of the operative part.

The result of the vote was 28 in favour, 17 against, and 15 abstentions.

The word "special" was deleted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

117. The PRESIDENT: A vote will now be taken on draft resolution D as a whole.

The result of the vote was 48 in favour, 1 against, and 6 abstentions.

The draft resolution was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

118. The PRESIDENT: A roll-call vote has been requested on draft resolution E.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Mexico, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Liberia.

Against: Belgium.

Abstaining: Peru, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Australia, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, France, Luxembourg.

The result of the vote was 46 in favour, 1 against, and 11 abstentions.

The draft resolution was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

119. Mr. RIEMENS (Netherlands): It is a matter of great regret to the Netherlands delegations—which voted against draft resolution A proposed by the Committee and in favour of the draft resolution which it had co-sponsored (A/L.141)—that the later draft resolution was not adopted after the rejection of draft resolution A. It was to be foreseen that draft resolution A would not obtain the required two-thirds majority since, in the Committee itself, it did not succeed in so doing. It was therefore up to those delegations which could not win their entire point to decide whether the case of the Wa-Meru would not be better served by giving them something than by giving them nothing at all. It is not because of wounded pride as a sponsor of the joint draft resolution, but because the work of the General Assembly in this respect has yielded no result whatever, that we feel concerned, and we wish it to be recorded as our view that the responsibility for this unfortunate course of events rests on that minority which, because of its extreme point of view, made the adoption of a compromise impossible, to the detriment of the Wa-Meru who took the trouble, at considerable expense, to come all the way to present their petition to the General Assembly, on which petition no action has been taken by the General Assembly.

Complaint of violation by Arab States of their obligations under the Charter, United Nations resolutions and specific provisions of the general armistice agreements concluded with Israel, requiring them to desist from policies and practices of hostility and to seek agreement by negotiation for the establishment of peaceful relations with Israel: report of the Ad Hoc Political Committee (A/2340)

[Agenda item 68]

120. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution contained in the report.

The draft resolution was adopted by 37 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

Admission of new Members: report of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee (A/2341 and Corr.1)

[Agenda item 19]

121. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has before it the report of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee (A/2341 and Corr.1). Before proceeding to explanations of vote and the vote itself on this matter, I should like to announce, in respect of the special committee whose appointment is recommended in paragraph 1 of the operative part of draft resolution A, that the Indian delegation has expressed a desire to be relieved from serving on that committee. Therefore, with the consent of the General Assembly, when we come to the vote on that draft resolution, the name of India as a member of that committee will be omitted.

122. Mr. SANDLER (Sweden): At an early stage in the deliberations on this item in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, my delegation reaffirmed, as it had done at previous sessions of the General Assembly, its support for a generous application of the principle of universality of membership. In fact, we have previously voted in favour of the admission of nearly all the applicants, although not, of course, of North Korea.

123. Nevertheless, in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, we abstained on all the votes on draft resolutions dealing with one or more particular applicants. We did so, and we shall do so again here in the General Assembly, because we believe that voting upon individual applicants in the present circumstances could neither solve the question of membership, nor would it be likely to facilitate the search by the special committee for a solution in the future. My delegation considers it the better course of action to give the special committee full power of discussion without prejudging the matter by voting at this stage on specific applicants. This view was not held by the majority of the Committee. The vote taken on the application of particular States resulted, as could be foreseen, in a differentiation of the applicants into two categories, one having obtained a majority and the other failing to obtain a majority. The Swedish delegation continues to believe that this procedure, at the very moment when the whole membership question is being referred to a committee for study, will prejudice an objective study by that special committee.

124. For this reason, and for no other, the Swedish delegation will again abstain without any exception from all votes on the admission of particular applicants. In the future, as in the past, the Swedish delegation will cast its vote in favour of the real universality of our Organization.

125. Mr. COHEN (United States of America): I should like to explain briefly the votes which the United States will cast on the draft resolutions before us.

126. It is clear from the debates which took place in the Committee that all of us regard the membership problem as the outstanding organizational and constitutional problem now before the United Nations. The future growth and vitality of the United Nations depends upon its solution. So long as all these nations qualified for membership are not here among us, the United Nations cannot achieve its maximum effectiveness. New blood would bring fresh energy and enthu-

siasm, as well as collective strength and wisdom, to our discussions.

127. The debate in the Committee convinced my Government that the draft resolution submitted by several Central-American States, calling for the creation of a special committee for the study of the problem of membership, offered the most constructive method of work. Such a committee will be able to make an objective and careful exploration and analysis of the membership problem.

128. In this connexion, we recall the work of the sub-committee set up by the Interim Committee [A/578] to study the problem of voting in the Security Council. The results of that study were, in the opinion of most delegations, highly useful. The results of the efforts of a similar group on the membership problem should be of equal, possibly greater, utility to the United Nations. We sincerely hope that the work of that committee will help the United Nations to progress towards the goal of universality of membership.

129. During the course of the discussion in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, many suggestions were made with a view to ending the membership dead-lock. My delegation was particularly impressed by the serious thought and study our friends from Latin America have given to the membership problem. We listened with great interest especially to the representative of El Salvador, Mr. Urquía, and to Mr. Belaúnde, of Peru. While a number of the suggested solutions they offered seemed to my Government to raise grave constitutional issues, the special committee undoubtedly will wish to study them with care to determine whether they offer a feasible method for moving towards fuller recognition and implementation of the principle of universality.

130. My delegation will have to vote against the Polish draft resolution [A/L.142], which was defeated in committee. The Polish draft calls for a "package deal" admitting fourteen States. This draft resolution, in our opinion, prejudices the question of admission, and this is true whether the text of the proposal calls for simultaneous admission or simply for admission. The Polish draft resolution would have the General Assembly express by implication what we have not been willing to express explicitly, that all the States listed in the draft are qualified. It would equate certain States which have not been found qualified, that is, Albania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania and Outer Mongolia, with such peace-loving nations as Italy, Austria and Ceylon.

131. We are firm supporters of universality of membership, but universality should be based upon principles and not upon deals. The Polish proposal is based upon a deal, not upon a principle. It includes some applicants, and excludes others, on the basis of no stated standard. It includes some, but not all, applications which have received endorsement by a majority of the Security Council, and it includes other applications which have not received such endorsement. It provides the United Nations with no clear and defined criteria by which to judge the pending applications not included in the partial list contained in the Polish draft resolution or to judge future applications. We favour no deals which leave some existing and all future applications to the whim of future deals rather than to

disposition on the basis of stated principles and standards.

132. It may possibly be urged, with great reason, that the principles governing admissibility should be more liberal than those we now apply. But those principles upon which we agree, whether they be more or less liberal, should be of universal application, so that they may be applied to all future as well as to existing applicants.

133. Finally, a word of explanation of our vote endorsing the membership applications of Japan, the three associated States of Indo-China, Jordan and Libya.

134. This will be the first time that the General Assembly is able to pass on the application of Japan. The Japanese Government filed its application for membership in June of this year. It would already have had a favourable recommendation from the Security Council were it not for the veto cast by the Soviet Union representative in the Security Council [602nd meeting] last September. In the view of my Government and in the view of the overwhelming majority of representatives in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, Japan is qualified for membership. It seems to us, therefore, that it is only fair for the Assembly to put itself on record in this sense. Such action will provide Japan with further stimulus to continue the positive contributions it is already making to the specialized agencies of the United Nations of which it is already a member. It will encourage the Japanese people to continue on the path of peaceful advancement.

135. For similar reasons, we have endorsed the membership applications of the three associated States of Indo-China and will vote for them.

136. Finally, we shall vote to support the membership applications of Jordan and Libya. The Assembly has already found these two States qualified for membership. We shall be glad to express our endorsement of their qualifications for membership.

137. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland) (*translated from Russian*): In view of the importance which the Polish delegation attaches to the question of the admission of new Members, we consider it necessary to explain our point of view and our vote on this question.

138. Although the question has already been discussed for several years by the General Assembly, no positive solution, unfortunately, has yet been found. This year too it is impossible to solve the problem, owing to the stubborn and erroneous position adopted by the United States and a number of other States which support its aggressive policy. As in the past, a policy of unwarranted discrimination is being applied against the peoples' democracies, which have taken the path of socialism and free, sovereign, development.

139. The United States again rejects the applications of Albania, the Mongolian People's Republic, Romania, Bulgaria and Hungary, and does not scruple to employ slanders and falsehoods, unjustified accusations and impotent threats such as those we have just heard once again from the United States representative. On the other hand, attempts are once again being made to push into the United Nations only certain selected and particularly trustworthy States which, being dependent on the United States, are already members of the aggressive blocs in Western Europe and Asia, or will

become so in the very near future. To this end all sorts of manoeuvres, even patent violations of the United Nations Charter, illegal recourse to the International Court of Justice and incorrect interpretations of its opinions, are being resorted to at this session, as in previous years. As in the past, the voices of a well-known group of South-American and Central-American States are once more being raised in this American concert against the most important provisions of the Charter and against the fundamental principle of the unanimity of the great Powers.

140. However, all these attempts invariably come to grief thanks to the staunch and just position of the USSR, which uses its rights to prevent discrimination against certain States and the granting of special privileges to others, and which is steadily and consistently striving to bring into the United Nations all States which seek admission, regardless of their social or economic structure or political inclinations.

141. At this as at previous sessions, a number of draft resolutions, which the Polish delegation considers unfounded, have been submitted on the question of the admission of new Members.

142. In this connexion, I have to state that the Polish delegation will vote against the draft resolution submitted in the Committee by five Central-American delegations, which is now before the Assembly [A/2341, draft resolution A]. We consider it wrong to establish a new committee to study this question; such a committee would be superfluous and would only serve to delay any decision. There is nothing to be studied: the provisions of the Charter and the results of the discussion of the question in the Security Council and the General Assembly are perfectly clear. A constructive solution of this problem can be achieved only through an affirmative recommendation by the Security Council, with the concurring votes of all the great Powers, and a General Assembly decision adopted by a two-thirds majority.

143. We also object to the draft resolution on Japan submitted in committee by the United States and now before the Assembly [A/2341, draft resolution B]. In defiance of the wishes of the Japanese people and on the orders of its masters, the Japanese Government concluded a separate peace treaty and violated the armistice conditions. Japan is a base for aggressive United States forces, which are pursuing a policy of aggression in Korea and waging criminal bacteriological warfare from Japanese soil. For these reasons the Polish delegation categorically opposes the consideration of Japan's application at the present juncture.

144. The applications of the three puppet States of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, submitted by their colonizers, the French, do not merit serious consideration and need not be discussed.

145. On the other hand, I should like to make it clear that although the Polish delegation will vote against the proposals submitted in committee by the Arab States for the admission of Jordan and Libya [A/2341, draft resolutions F and G], that does not mean that we are against their admission to the United Nations. On the contrary—and I should like to stress this point—they are included, with twelve other countries, in the Polish draft resolution [A/L.142]. We consider, however, that it would be wrong and unjust to adopt a

special resolution on these States while passing over the other requests for admission.

146. The Polish delegation, therefore, considers that the only correct and fair decision which could at last achieve a positive solution of the problem of the admission of new Members, and would help to strengthen the United Nations and to diminish international tension, would be the admission of all the fourteen States concerned, as proposed in the Polish draft resolution.

147. Mr. LOURIE (Israel) : My delegation explained its position on the various draft resolutions before us in the discussions which took place in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. I wish here merely to emphasize that for the reasons very clearly given this afternoon by the representative of Sweden, my delegation, having supported the establishment of a committee to study the problem further and to make recommendations to the next session of the General Assembly, will abstain from voting on the substantive draft resolutions before us dealing with the candidacy of individual countries. Such an abstention must in no wise be regarded as a judgment by my country on the merits of those applications or as a refusal to endorse the admission to membership of any of the countries named in those draft resolutions. On the contrary, Israel maintains full diplomatic relations with several of the countries whose names have been submitted for membership, including Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, Italy, Japan and Romania, and Israel remains consistent in its support of the principle of universality of membership of our Organization by all qualified nations.

148. The PRESIDENT : Before calling on the next speaker, I wish to inform the Assembly that the delegation of Czechoslovakia has asked me to announce that it does not desire to serve on the committee referred to in paragraph 1 of the operative part of draft resolution A. Thus, when we come to vote on that draft resolution, we should omit the names of Czechoslovakia as well as India.

149. General ROMULO (Philippines) : The Philippine delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A recommended by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. We believe that the creation of a special committee to study the question of membership between sessions of the General Assembly can do no harm and may conceivably contribute to the clarification of issues outside the troubled and contentious atmosphere of the closing days of this part of the present session.

150. The Philippine delegation will abstain from voting on draft resolutions B, C, D and E, concerning the applications of Japan, Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, respectively. Our abstention on the recommendation regarding Japan is based on the consideration that there are serious questions subsisting between Japan and my country, relating to the Japanese peace treaty, which do not permit my delegation to favour Japan's admission at the present time. We shall also abstain from voting on the recommendations regarding Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos pending clarification of the political status of these countries, now under study by my Government.

151. The Philippine delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions F and G, recommending the admission of Libya and Jordan, respectively, in reiteration

of positions previously taken in the Assembly regarding these countries.

152. As regards the draft resolution proposed by Poland [*A/L.142*], my delegation requests that a separate vote should be taken on the word "simultaneous" in that text. The word is used in a sense which is unacceptable to my delegation. If the word is deleted, my delegation will vote in favour of that draft resolution.

153. In supporting this draft resolution, the Philippine delegation takes the view that the time has come when we must seriously consider how the principle of universality of membership in the United Nations can be advanced within the framework of the Charter and in the context of the present international situation. While we continue to have the highest respect for those who maintain a rigidly juridical or moral attitude towards this problem, we are becoming increasingly concerned over the continued exclusion from our Organization of States like Ceylon, Libya, Jordan, Nepal, Italy, Ireland, Austria and Portugal, whose absence from our midst is more to the detriment of the United Nations than it is to theirs.

154. It is hardly necessary to say that our support of the Polish draft resolution by no means implies approval of the political or economic systems of the States therein enumerated. We take the view that a State should be deemed to be peace-loving within the meaning of this term in Article 4 of the Charter so long as it is not actually engaged in a breach of the peace or an act of aggression. Moreover, a State's declaration that it is willing and able to carry out its obligations under the Charter should, as a general rule, be accepted *prima facie* instead of being submitted to the test of subjective judgment. The Polish proposal has been described as a "package" proposal. It should be remembered that there is a precedent for the admission of two or more States at the same time, and therefore the present proposal cannot be objected to on that ground.

155. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (*translated from Spanish*) : The delegation of El Salvador wishes briefly to explain its votes on the various draft resolutions submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee in its report [*A/2341 and Corr.1*] to the General Assembly.

156. We shall deal first with draft resolution A, a draft originally submitted by five Central-American countries—Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua—and modified by certain extremely valuable amendments proposed, on the one hand, by the delegations of Sweden, Denmark and Norway, and, on the other, by the delegations of Chile and Cuba, and including an extremely valuable suggestion made at the last moment by the delegation of Uruguay. I should like to express the profound gratitude of my delegation for the extremely flattering comments made a few moments ago by the representative of the United States.

157. Actually the delegation of El Salvador, together with those of the other four Central-American countries, wished, once again, to pursue their untiring efforts to find a way of settling the grave problem of the admission of new Members to the United Nations. For that reason, four Central-American countries submitted to the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee a substantive draft

resolution which pointed the way to a settlement. But at the same time, as the session was already far advanced and as the problems arising out of the draft submitted by El Salvador and the other Central-American States, and also out of the draft submitted by Peru, required very careful study before a solution likely to be regarded as satisfactory could be reached, the delegations of the five Central-American States decided to submit the draft which was eventually approved by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and which incorporated the amendments I have mentioned.

158. This draft provides for the establishment of a special committee consisting of twenty-two States Members of the United Nations with instructions to make a study of the question of the admission of new Members and to examine the proposals and suggestions made in the Assembly and its Committees, or any which may be submitted to the special committee itself. The special committee will, of course, conduct its study in the light of the United Nations Charter, the discussions in the General Assembly and its committees and the discussions in the Security Council, concerning this problem of the admission of new Members; it must also bear in mind the two advisory opinions given by the International Court of Justice¹ at the request of the Assembly [*resolutions 113 B (II) and 296 J (IV)*] and the other antecedents of the problem which have arisen in the seven years the United Nations has been in existence; and of course it must also bear in mind the principles of international law.

159. As I have said, and as is clear from paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft, the committee is to consist of twenty-two Member States, but the President has told us that two of these countries, India and Czechoslovakia, have expressed a desire to be replaced or not to serve on the committee. The Central-American delegations, as the principal sponsors of the draft, could nominate two countries as substitutes for these two, but we think that it is now too late to embark on a study on the States which could replace India and Czechoslovakia, taking into account the principle of geographical distribution. We therefore prefer to ask the President to put the draft to the vote, omitting the names of the two countries which have expressed a desire not to serve on the committee. Furthermore, the Central-American delegations are pleased to be able to say that, both in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and in private conversation they have heard enthusiastic appreciation from many, perhaps all, the delegations nominated for membership of the special committee, who expressed to us their eagerness to serve on that committee. As the committee is already large, consisting of twenty members, we do not think it necessary or desirable, in the circumstances, to provide substitution for the two members which do not wish to serve.

160. For the rest, despite comments by a certain delegation with respect to the other drafts submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, concerning particular cases of applications by States, my delegation wishes to state that the establishment of a special committee to study the problem of the admission of new

Members in theory in no way prevents the Assembly from saying whether the States whose applications are pending—Japan, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Libya and Jordan—fulfil the requirements of the Charter. This problem is quite different from the general problem which we wish the special committee to study.

161. We do not in any way wish to contradict the judgment, for which we have great respect, of the Swedish delegation and certain others, which have stated their intention of abstaining from the vote on those draft resolutions, but the Salvadoran delegation will vote for them as it did before in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

162. With regard to the Polish draft resolution, [*A/L.142*], as we also observed in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, we do not think it in any way justifiable to try to overcome the immense difficulties existing in connexion with countries such as Romania, Hungary and the others which obtained only one vote in the Security Council, by seeking to have those countries—which, I repeat, obtained only one vote in the Security Council—admitted by a manoeuvre, by a political deal, which is unwarranted because, in conformity with the provisions of the Charter, each case has to be judged separately on its merits before it can be decided whether the applicant State does or does not fulfil the requirements governing admission to the United Nations.

163. Furthermore, we should like to say that the purpose of the Central-American delegations in submitting their principal draft resolution, a substantive proposal which refers the question to a special committee, was not in any way, as the Soviet delegations have repeatedly alleged, an attempt to by-pass the Charter; on the contrary, it was an attempt to secure the application of the Charter in a truly legal sense, and not on the basis of a purely legalistic and accommodating interpretation which has been in use, but which should now be cast aside in favour of high principles of law that should be applied in dealing with such great problems.

164. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The USSR delegation explained its position fully on this question in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, and considers it sufficient at the present meeting to restate quite briefly its views concerning the vote on the draft resolutions before us.

165. The USSR delegation's position of principle on the question of the admission of new Members remains that which it has long maintained: the USSR favours the simultaneous admission of all States which fully meet the requirements of Article 4 of the United Nations Charter. It therefore fully supports the Polish draft resolution [*A/L.142*] proposing the simultaneous admission of fourteen States to membership in the United Nations.

166. On the other hand, the delegation of the Soviet Union is opposed to the policy of favouritism towards some countries and discrimination against others pursued by the United States, since what this policy means is that the United States wants the admission of States to the United Nations to depend, not on their compliance with the requirements of the Charter, but

¹ See *Admission of a State to the United Nations (Charter, Article 4)*, *Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1948*, p. 57; and *Competence of Assembly regarding admission to the United Nations*, *Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 4

on whether the United States Government happens to like or dislike their political systems. Such a policy is in flagrant contradiction with the basic principles of the United Nations, whose membership, as we all know, includes States with different political systems.

167. The USSR delegation will therefore vote against the draft resolutions originally submitted by the United States and other delegations, which select only certain countries for admission to the United Nations and which propose this partial solution to the detriment of a general solution of the question of the admission of all States which meet the requirements of Article 4 of the Charter.

168. The USSR delegation wishes to state at the same time that the proposal to set up a committee for the study of the question of the admission of new Members is contrary to the provisions of the Charter, which establishes a definite procedure for the consideration of this question. According to the Charter, as we know, a prior recommendation by the Security Council is required, and this procedure cannot be violated by devices such as the establishment of a committee, as proposed by some delegations. The delegation of the Soviet Union is therefore compelled to vote against draft resolution A. It considers that the establishment of a committee would merely postpone for another year the solution of the question of the admission of new Members, and it cannot agree to such a course. In this connexion the USSR delegation wishes to state that if it is decided to establish the committee, the USSR will be unable to participate in its work, since the very direction of the committee's work would be incompatible with the fundamental provisions of the United Nations Charter.

169. With regard to the recommendations for the admission of certain States made by some of the Arab countries, the delegation of the Soviet Union said in the Committee and repeats here, before the General Assembly, that it considers the admission of such States as Libya and Jordan both possible and necessary; it will therefore vote for the Polish draft resolution, which includes these States in the number of those to be admitted to membership in the United Nations. The delegation of the Soviet Union considers that to take a separate vote on the admission of each of these States would be wrong, and it will therefore vote against the relevant draft resolutions.

170. In connexion with the proposal to delete the word "simultaneous" in the Polish draft resolution, and with the interpretation of that proposal given by the Philippine representative, the USSR delegation insists on the simultaneous admission of all fourteen States to membership in the United Nations. The deletion of the word "simultaneous" would distort the proposal contained in the draft resolution, namely, to admit all fourteen States to membership in the United Nations simultaneously, without discrimination against any one of them. The USSR delegation will therefore be unable to vote for the draft resolution if the word "simultaneous" is deleted, since to eliminate the provision that all fourteen States are to be admitted to the United Nations simultaneously would be to eliminate the guarantee of a fair approach, based on the principles of the Charter, to the question of the admission of all the States enumerated in the Polish draft resolution. For these reasons the USSR delegation

will vote against the Polish draft resolution if it is amended by the deletion of the word "simultaneous".

171. Mr. FERRER VIEYRA (Argentina) (*translated from Spanish*): I should like to explain, on behalf of my delegation, how we shall vote on the item under discussion.

172. The Argentine position in the matter of the admission of new Members is very well known to representatives. Ever since the General Assembly's first session, interpreting the Charter according to the strictest canons of legal interpretation, we have defended in every form the General Assembly's powers and capacity to decide on the question of admission, whether an application has received a favourable or an unfavourable recommendation from the Security Council.

173. We are very glad to note the ever-growing number of countries prepared to recognize that the Assembly has the power which is expressly stated in Article 4, paragraph 2, of the Charter. We are also glad to note that the opposition to the privilege of the veto is steadily gathering strength and, in particular, to note the growth of the view that the veto can be used only in a limited number of cases, and that it can never be used when the Security Council and the General Assembly have equal competence.

174. In our view, the admission of new Members is a problem both of substance and of procedure. It is a problem of substance in that Article 4, paragraph 1, says the applicant State must fulfil certain conditions, and furthermore, in that the United Nations must express its decision on the application. When that substantive requirement—those two elements, one internal and the other external—for admission is fulfilled, the procedural problem arises: how does the Organization form its judgment? Through a recommendation by the Security Council and a decision by the General Assembly.

175. The question of the admission of new Members viewed from this angle, as a procedural problem, may be one of the matters to be studied by the special committee which is to be set up. In that connexion, my delegation supports draft resolution A.

176. My country supports the principle of universality in its broad sense, but that does not mean that we are in favour of automatic universality. Even at the time of the League of Nations, we considered the principle of universality a question of fundamental importance, and we intend to do the same in the United Nations and to maintain the same position. We shall therefore vote in favour of the Polish draft resolution [A/L142] concerning the admission of fourteen States. My delegation does not view with serious concern the objection made to the use of the expression "simultaneous admission" since the Security Council may recommend simultaneous admission if it considers it desirable and, if it does not consider it desirable, may adopt whatever recommendation it considers appropriate.

177. Furthermore, irrespective of the recommendation made by the Security Council, the Assembly has indisputably the power and the right to study each country and each application separately, and decide on it as it sees fit.

178. We shall also vote for all the draft resolutions contained in the report of the Committee [A/2341 and Corr.1] since we believe that States referred to therein are qualified to enter the Organization; the admission of Japan, Italy, Portugal, Ireland and Austria, countries to which Argentina is bound by particular ties of friendship, is of special interest to my country.

179. Mr. SOURDIS (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): Although, when this problem was discussed in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, my delegation had an opportunity to explain its views on the matter in detail, we consider it our duty to take advantage of the opportunity offered by this meeting of the Assembly to explain briefly what our delegation thinks on the question of the admission of new Members.

180. In San Francisco, when the situation became so strained that the great Powers went so far as to threaten that there would be no United Nations unless there was a veto, Colombia, together with Cuba, were the only two countries which refrained from accepting the veto; thus my delegation's position on the veto question has followed what we might call a straight line from 1945, in San Francisco, to this very moment.

181. Colombia believes that there is no reason to apply the veto in connexion with the admission of new Members. Mr. Arce, the former representative of Argentina, in a vigorous and impressively documented book,² has demonstrated conclusively why the veto cannot be applied to the admission of new Members. When representatives were not willing to adopt the wording of Article 4 concerning the recommendation of the Security Council for the admission of new Members, there was prior consultation as to whether that provision implied a lessening of the Assembly's power to rule on the question. The Advisory Committee of Jurists took the view that that Article, or that paragraph, could not at any time be interpreted as restricting the Assembly's legal capacity to admit new Members.

182. The Greek representative requested that that statement by the Advisory Committee of Jurists should be noted in the record,³ and it was so noted; and the United States representative, not content with that, requested that it should be put to the vote. It was put to the vote and was adopted. Thus the authentic interpretation of Article 4 of the Charter, in so far as it relates to the admission of new Members, does not leave room for the slightest doubt that the veto is not applicable in this respect, and it is not applicable because it can in no way be interpreted as violating the Assembly's freedom to decide on the matter.

183. That being the past history of the question, my delegation declares that it will vote for draft resolution A, in which it sees a magnificent effort to solve the problem but, as it said in committee, it considers it as only a preliminary step. This is a matter which should have been decided before. If we really want the United Nations to be universal in character, we cannot continue to postpone such a fundamental problem.

184. My country cannot vote for the Polish draft resolution [A/L.142] but, in saying this, we wish it to be expressly understood that this adverse vote does not mean that it prejudices the qualifications or lack of qualifications of the countries mentioned in the draft. There are conditions of form and conditions of substance which must be fulfilled before a State can become a Member of the United Nations. The conditions of form are perfectly clear: an application must be made, there must be a recommendation by the Security Council and a decision by the Assembly. The conditions of substance are also clear: the applicant must be a State, it must be peace-loving, it must accept the obligations contained in the Charter, and it must be legally able and willing to carry out these obligations. This series of conditions of form and of substance necessitates a definite procedure and real study. They are objective matters which must be studied in each specific case in order to see whether or not a State fulfils the conditions mentioned. And it appears to me that the simultaneous admission which is called for would make it impossible for the Security Council, and even for the Assembly itself, to take a decision because, if admission is to be simultaneous, the study will also have to be simultaneous, and if the Security Council reaches the conclusion that a particular country fulfils the necessary conditions for admission, but that the remainder of the States mentioned in the draft resolution do not, how can such simultaneous admission be effected?

185. For opposite reasons, we shall vote for the draft resolutions which call for the admission of States individually, and we reaffirm our view that the veto should not be applicable in such cases. As Mr. Arce contends, the Security Council must make a recommendation, whatever its conclusions. That means that, if its recommendation is favourable, it must say so to the General Assembly, and if its recommendation is unfavourable, paradoxical as this may sound, it must also inform the Assembly. Indeed, if the Council had the right to remain silent, it would be taking from the General Assembly its power to decide, in the last resort, whether a State might or might not become a Member.

186. The background of the matter being as we have stated, and recognizing as we do that the Assembly is the only body sufficiently competent to take a decision in the matter, we shall vote for draft resolution A and for the other drafts, with the exception of the draft submitted by Poland.

187. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the draft resolutions before us, beginning with draft resolution A (A/2341).

188. As I mentioned some time ago, the names of India and Czechoslovakia should be deleted from paragraph 1 of the operative part, which deals with the composition of the special committee.

189. I recognize the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

190. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The President must have made a slight mistake in speaking of the removal from the list of India and Czechoslovakia. I indicated in my statement that the USSR would not take part either in the work of the committee. Obviously, therefore, its name too must be deleted from the list.

² "Naciones Unidas, Admisión de Nuevos Miembros", Blass, S.A. Tipográfica, Madrid, 1951.

³ See *United Nations Conference on International Organization, Verbatim Minutes of Technical Committees, Committee II/1, 15th meeting, English Vol. 60.*

191. The PRESIDENT: I excluded Czechoslovakia and India from the list. The Soviet Union will also be excluded. Therefore the special committee, as set forth in paragraph 1 of the operative part, will have nineteen members instead of twenty-two as originally provided for.

192. With the deletion from paragraph 1 of the operative part of the three States which I have just mentioned, we shall vote on draft resolution A. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Nicaragua, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand.

Against: Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia.

Abstaining: Pakistan, Afghanistan, Burma, India, Indonesia, Liberia.

The draft resolution was adopted by 48 votes to 5, with 6 abstentions.

193. The PRESIDENT: A vote by roll-call has been requested on draft resolution B, which I now put to the vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Uruguay, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Guatemala, Israel, Philippines, Sweden.

The draft resolution was adopted by 50 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

194. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolutions C, D, E, F and G.

Draft resolution C was adopted by 40 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions.

Draft resolution D was adopted by 38 votes to 5, with 14 abstentions.

Draft resolution E was adopted by 36 votes to 5, with 14 abstentions.

Draft resolution F was adopted by 51 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution G was adopted by 49 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

195. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Poland has asked to make a statement in connexion with the method of voting on the Polish draft resolution (A/L.142). I call on him for such a statement. Any other statement at this stage of the discussion would, of course, be out of order.

196. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland) (*translated from Russian*): Since the request for a separate vote on a particular part of our draft resolution is in effect an amendment aimed at deleting the vital and essential word "simultaneous" from our text, I consider it necessary to say a few brief words of explanation in this connexion.

197. In recent years we have witnessed a number of attempts to interpret decisions of the General Assembly in an incorrect and illegal fashion in order to apply a policy of discrimination against certain States in connexion with the admission of new Members. The purpose of these attempts has been to admit only certain States into the Organization. In these circumstances, it is essential that we should have every guarantee that our resolution will not be used by some delegations to renew their attempts to discriminate against certain States and to push certain other States into the United Nations illegally. Unfortunately, the discussions in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and in this Assembly today, and in particular the statements of some delegations with regard to the Polish draft resolution.

198. The PRESIDENT: I am sorry to interrupt the representative of Poland, but I must inform him that he is now out of order. I thought he was going to make a proposal concerning the method of voting on the Polish draft resolution. He has already explained his vote on the draft resolutions before the General Assembly in connexion with the admission of new Members. Any statement which does not pertain to the method of voting is out of order at this time.

199. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland) (*translated from Russian*): I am entitled to state my delegation's views on the question of a vote on the draft resolution in parts. That is my right under rule 8 of the rules of procedure. I merely wish to say that, in these circumstances, the Polish delegation would be unable to support its own draft resolution if it were modified by the amendment which might result from a vote in parts. If the amendment is adopted, that is, if the word "simultaneous" is deleted from the draft resolution, the Polish delegation will vote against the draft.

200. The PRESIDENT: The vote on the retention in this draft resolution (A/L.142) of the word "simultaneous" before the word "admission". This was not put forward by the delegation of the Philippines as an amendment but as a request for a separate vote on the word "simultaneous". Thus the vote we are about to take is on the proposal to retain the word "simultaneous" in the text of the Polish draft resolution.

The proposal was rejected by 10 votes to 9, with 25 abstentions.

201. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote upon the Polish draft resolution as a whole, as amended.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was rejected by 30 votes to 9, with 10 abstentions.

Measures to limit the duration of regular sessions of the General Assembly: reports of the Sixth Committee (A/2349) and the Fifth Committee (A/2326)

[Agenda item 50]

The President presented the reports of the Sixth Committee (A/2349) and the Fifth Committee (A/2326).

202. Mr. VALLAT (United Kingdom): I shall be very brief, but I should explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A recommended by the Sixth Committee [A/2349].

203. The draft resolution provides for a special committee to study measures to limit the duration of regular sessions of the General Assembly. It is based on an amendment which was introduced late in the deliberations in the Committee. That amendment had the effect of preventing a decision or, indeed, any vote on the changes in the rules of procedure recommended by the Secretary-General in the annex to his report [A/2206]. Those changes were clear and straightforward. It did not seem to my delegation that there was any good reason for refusing to take a decision on them one way or the other. Accordingly, in the Sixth Committee my delegation voted against the proposal to establish a special committee, but a majority favoured adopting that proposal rather than taking an immediate decision.

204. The position here in the Assembly is somewhat different. We have before us now the whole of the Secretary-General's report, together with a report of the Fifth Committee on one part of it and a report of the Sixth Committee on another. My delegation is, of course, willing to consider any proposal on its merits. Draft resolution A will permit the study of the whole problem of the duration of sessions, with the help of all the valuable suggestions made in the Secretary-General's report. It has not been possible in this Assembly to examine the report thoroughly. That will be possible as the result of draft resolution A, if it is adopted. Thus the work initiated by certain delegations at the sixth session, and continued by the Secretary-General's report may be carried forward and brought to fruition. My delegation will, therefore, vote in favour of draft resolution A.

205. The PRESIDENT: I take it that we may now vote on the two draft resolutions, A and B, proposed by the Sixth Committee [A/2349]. A separate vote has been requested on the first paragraph of the preamble of draft resolution A, on which we shall now vote.

The paragraph was adopted by 41 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

206. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on draft resolution A as a whole.

207. I call upon the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

208. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The USSR delegation asked for a separate vote on the preamble to draft resolution A. The President did not understand me quite correctly, since he put only the first paragraph to the vote; I presumed that he had decided to put the second and third paragraphs to the vote separately as well. The intention of my delegation was that there should be a vote on the whole of the preamble to draft resolution A, but since a separate vote has been taken on the first paragraph of the preamble, I would ask the President to put the two remaining paragraphs of the preamble to the vote together.

209. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the request of the representative of the Soviet Union, we shall now vote on the preamble as a whole.

The preamble was adopted by 41 votes to 6, with 3 abstentions.

210. The PRESIDENT: I put draft resolution A as a whole to the vote.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 53 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

211. The PRESIDENT: I put draft resolution B to the vote.

The draft resolution was adopted by 37 votes to 12, with 13 abstentions.

Status of claims for injuries incurred in the service of the United Nations: report of the Sixth Committee (A/2353)

[Agenda item 57]

212. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will vote on the draft resolution contained in the report.

The draft resolution was adopted by 49 votes to 10, with 4 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 7.5 p.m.