



**CONTENTS**

Agenda item 21:

Admission of new Members to the United Nations  
(continued):

- (a) Report of the Committee of Good Offices;
- (b) Admission of Laos and Cambodia

Page

105

**Chairman: Mr. Thor THORS (Iceland).**

**AGENDA ITEM 21**

**Admission of new Members to the United Nations  
(continued):**

- (a) **Report of the Committee of Good Offices**  
(A/2720, A/AC.76/2, A/AC.76/3, A/AC.76/4, A/AC.76/5, A/AC.76/6, A/AC.76/9, A/AC.76/10, A/AC.76/11, A/AC.76/12, A/AC.76/14, A/AC.76/L.7/Rev.1, A/AC.76/L.9/Rev.1, A/AC.76/L.11);
- (b) **Admission of Laos and Cambodia (A/2709 and Add.1, A/AC.76/L.4)**

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had concluded the general debate and must now turn its attention to the various draft resolutions which had been submitted. He pointed out that the following draft resolutions remained before the Committee: (1) the joint draft resolution of Australia, Pakistan and Thailand (A/AC.76/L.4); (2) the USSR draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.7/Rev.1); (3) the joint draft resolution submitted by Argentina, Cuba, El Salvador and India (A/AC.76/L.11), replacing the draft resolutions submitted earlier by India and by Argentina, Cuba and El Salvador; and (4) the joint draft resolution of Argentina, Cuba and El Salvador (A/AC.76/L.9/Rev.1), which had previously been before the Committee in the form of an amendment to the draft resolution submitted by Australia, Pakistan and Thailand.

2. Mr. MENON (India), speaking on a point of order, said that while it had been agreed to discuss sub-items (a) and (b) together during the general debate, the discussion should now be addressed to the draft resolutions submitted under sub-item (a), which related to the more general aspect of the problem. In his view the new joint draft submitted by Argentine, Cuba, El Salvador and India (A/AC.76/L.11), which dealt with the general problem, should be put to the vote first.

3. Mr. McNICOL (Australia) pointed out that under rule 132 of the rules of procedure the joint draft of Australia, Thailand and Pakistan (A/AC.76/L.4), which had been submitted as early as 22 August 1954, before the item concerning the admission of new Members had been divided into sub-items (a) and (b), should normally be voted on first. As a conciliatory gesture, however, he formally moved that all the draft resolutions should be discussed concurrently, and that the voting priority should be decided at a later stage.

4. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) and Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa) supported that proposal.

5. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) was prepared, as a compromise solution, to accept the Australian suggestion that all the proposals should be discussed together, but endorsed the Indian request that the voting priority should be settled immediately. A vote should first be taken on proposals of a general nature, such as the joint draft submitted by Argentina, Cuba, El Salvador and India. The second group to be voted on would consist of the specific proposals declaring the Assembly to be in favour of the admission of certain States. To that extent, the order of voting would be a departure from rule 132. However, as rule 132 provided, the Committee would be free to decide, after the vote on each proposal, whether to vote on the following proposal.

6. Mr. TAKIEDDINE (Lebanon), Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. PLAZA (Venezuela) supported the position adopted by India and Argentina.

7. Mr. PERRY (New Zealand) supported the Australian proposal that there should be a general debate on all resolutions, leaving the priority of voting to be determined later. It was difficult to decide the voting priority before the debate which would clarify the interrelation of the different resolutions, some of which had just been circulated. Later, some resolutions might very well be amended and an order of priority determined now might no longer be appropriate when the Committee came to the vote.

8. Mr. HAKIM (Syria) pointed out that the joint draft resolution contained in document A/AC.76/L.11 logically should be voted upon first because, if it was carried, there would be no need for a vote on the remaining proposals.

9. Mr. HUDICOURT (Haiti) supported that view. In a similar situation during the eighth session, the Committee had decided (12th meeting), after adopting the draft resolution creating the Committee of Good Offices, that the remaining draft resolution would not be put to the vote. Moreover, the vote on the three proposals for an Assembly declaration in favour of admitting specific States would be redundant, since all those applicants had already been the subject of past Assembly resolutions.

10. Mr. MENON (India) formally moved, under rule 132, that the four-Power draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.11) should be voted on first.

11. Mr. ORDONNEAU (France) observed that the discussion was actually one of substance, rather than of procedure. India's insistence on voting priority for the joint Latin American-Indian draft was clearly intended to preclude action on the three proposals dealing with specific applicant States. As the problem

was substantive, no hasty decision should be taken. Moreover, under rule 121, the Committee was entitled to more time for study of the latest proposal (A/AC.76/L.11). Accordingly, he moved the adjournment of the meeting.

*The motion was adopted by 27 votes to 11, with 14 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 4 p.m.