

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 217th
MEETING**

Monday, 5 December 1960,
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

<i>Agenda item 23:</i>	
<i>Question of an increase in the membership of the Security Council and of the Economic and Social Council (continued).</i>	191

Chairman: Mr. Carlet R. AUGUSTE (Haiti).

AGENDA ITEM 23

Question of an increase in the membership of the Security Council and of the Economic and Social Council (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5, A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3, A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1) (continued)

1. Mr. ABOUBACRINE (Mali) observed that it was generally recognized that the transformation of the United Nations resulting from the admission of new Members called for an increase in the membership of the Security Council and of the Economic and Social Council. Opinion was divided only on how that end should be achieved. The draft resolutions that had been submitted were aimed at amending the Charter. Any amendment of the Charter required ratification by two-thirds of the Member States, including the five permanent members of the Security Council. Experience showed that the equal rights contemplated in Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter did not represent a mathematical truth. In view of the position taken by the Soviet Union, the only possible solution was an equitable redistribution of the existing seats. The African and Asian countries appealed to the Latin American and other States for which they had a great deal of respect and sympathy to understand that the African and Asian countries could not continue to be excluded from the seats to which they were entitled.

2. Mr. SORHEGUI (Cuba) pointed out that his delegation would support the idea of expanding the Councils, were it not that United States imperialism proposed to bring about that increase in membership in total disregard of the fact that the People's Republic of China was not represented in the United Nations. Thus, despite the good faith of the sponsors of the draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5, A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3 and A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1) the Cuban delegation would abstain in the vote on them. Cuba regretted that United States imperialism was dividing the nations of the world and depriving 600 million Chinese of their rights. There was no question of a conflict between Africa and Latin America. All the under-developed countries, working towards peace and progress, should unite against the imperialism of the United States and its colonialist allies who were enslaving and exploiting them. He recalled that

the Declaration of Havana had proclaimed that all the peoples of the world were brothers.

3. Mr. BEELEY (United Kingdom) remarked that while every delegation could, of course, vote as it wished in the election of members to the Councils, it was the practice for the seats to be distributed among the various geographical groups in a way calculated to ensure orderly elections. The arrangements for elections to the two Councils were out of date, owing to the increase in the number of Member States and the changes in the proportionate size of the different groups. New arrangements were therefore necessary. It was generally agreed that the only satisfactory solution was an increase in the membership of the Councils which required the amendment of the Charter. Thus, there was no dispute, with regard to substance, on the usefulness of the two original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3). It was obvious, however, that if they were adopted, they could not be immediately implemented. In the interval before the next session, co-operation between the various groups would make it possible to work out interim arrangements, provided that there was an atmosphere of trust. In order to promote such co-operation, he appealed to the African and Asian countries to take a clear stand in favour of an increase in the membership of the Councils, that was to say, in favour of the original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3). If those draft resolutions were rejected, the adoption of the only adequate long-term solution might be put off indefinitely. On the other hand, once the principle of amending the Charter was accepted, new arrangements on the distribution of seats might be agreed upon. The United Kingdom delegation would vote in favour of the original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3). For the reasons given, it would vote against the amendments (A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1).

4. U ON SEIN (Burma) noted that all delegations were aware that the African and Asian countries were under-represented in the two Councils and that the membership of those organs should be increased. The five permanent members of the Security Council also acknowledged that the newly admitted States were justified in demanding participation in the work of the two organs. Amendments to the Charter and their ratification raised the question of the representation of China. The USSR representative had made a categorical statement on that subject which eliminated any possibility of giving effect to the two original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3). In the circumstances, the only solution was to redistribute the existing seats as proposed in the amendments (A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1) and Burma would vote for those amendments. If they were rejected, it would vote for the draft resolutions (A/SPC/

L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3) despite the serious differences of opinion which they evoked.

5. He appealed for support of the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1), which Burma had co-sponsored. In its present form, it represented a realistic attempt to break the deadlock. The amendments to change the structure of the United Nations which had been submitted in connexion with that draft resolution by the USSR representative required careful thought and should constitute a separate item of the agenda.

6. Mr. EKRA (Ivory Coast) said that the wishes of the African-Asian group were being blocked by the Soviet position and that its members would probably remain outside the Councils so long as there was no increase in the membership of those bodies. On the other hand, the amendments represented a transitional solution which unfortunately ran counter to the determination of the Western States not to alter the arrangements agreed upon among the older Members. The arguments which had been adduced were not convincing and in some instances showed a lack of regard for the African-Asian countries. For example, to pretend that those countries were too young to occupy seats on the Councils was equivalent to denying them any capacity for undertaking international obligations and even—and why not?—for self-government. On that account, appeals to patience and to the observance of established custom and order were vitiated by a paternalism no longer appropriate, nor in any case acceptable to nations born under the sign of the anti-colonialist struggle. That was why such nations considered that their admission to the United Nations gave them a complete right to a seat on all its organs.

7. The Ivory Coast had joined in good faith the sponsors of the draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3) trusting in their declarations of good will. Although its confidence had been abused, it would honour its signature by voting for those two draft resolutions, even though the amendments (A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1) which they would otherwise have supported, were rejected.

8. Mr. WODAK (Austria) regretted that the Committee was so clearly divided, but hoped that, after the vote, the co-operation among the members would not continue to suffer. In the interest of the United Nations, the membership of the two Councils should be increased. Considerations unrelated to the issue were, however, preventing the adoption of that solution, which alone was satisfactory. The Austrian delegation would vote in favour of the original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3) but could not support the amendments (A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1). It would join in the efforts to arrive at arrangements satisfactory to the new countries before the next session of the General Assembly.

9. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) pointed out that with the increase in the number of Member States from fifty-one to ninety-nine, an increase in the size of the Economic and Social Council and of the Security Council became an urgent necessity. To achieve that objective it was essential to amend the Charter in accordance with the procedure established in Article 108: those amendments must be adopted by a

two-thirds majority of Member States and must be ratified by the same majority, which must include all the permanent members of the Security Council.

10. In that connexion, Mr. Garcia Robles recalled the ideas he had put forward at the fourteenth session at the 132nd meeting of the Special Political Committee, which, he averred, were still as pertinent now as then. Unfortunately the situation in the present year seemed to reflect no change on that subject in the position of the great Powers, since one of the permanent members of the Security Council continued to oppose any amendment of the Charter until the question of the representation of another permanent member had been decided, and because the remaining permanent members had, in turn, opposed even the inclusion of the question of such representation in the agenda of the General Assembly.

11. The admission of seventeen new Members at the current session lent even greater urgency to an increase in the membership of the Councils. With regard to the Economic and Social Council, a strong majority thought the moment had come to adopt the first of the measures adumbrated in Article 108 of the Charter. The Mexican delegation would vote in favour of the original draft resolution (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5). Because of the lack of unanimity among the permanent members of the Security Council, the adoption of the draft resolution could at the present time only be regarded as an expression of hope. Such an adoption would not prejudice the rights conferred on permanent members by Article 108, but would perhaps permit of an abbreviation in the long procedure of ratification. The ratification of all the permanent members of the Security Council could only be obtained by means of negotiation amongst them, although the other States might also exercise a useful influence. That was the reason why the Mexican delegation would vote in favour of the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1), but, on the other hand, it regretted it would be unable to vote in favour of the other original draft resolution (A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3). The question of an increase in the membership of the Security Council should be given special attention, the amendment of Articles 23 and 27 of the Charter, in particular, giving rise to very delicate problems.

12. With regard to the redistribution of seats, which could only be a temporary measure, he considered that the opinions on that question were at present so wide apart that it would be dangerous to the harmony of relations among Member States to press for a decision at the current session. Consequently, the Mexican delegation would vote against both the amendments (A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1).

13. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) stated that he did not wish to insist on the compromise solution he had suggested at the previous meeting, as it had not received unanimous agreement from the Committee members.

14. Mr. HSUEH (China) said that he would like to point out again that the original two draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5) and (A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3) corresponded to the wishes of the majority of the Committee. On the other hand, the special committee that was proposed in the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1) would serve no useful purpose and might even result in hardening the

attitude of the delegations which were against the idea of amending the Charter in order to increase the membership of the two Councils. Not content with having already introduced a totally extraneous element into the debate, the Soviet delegation had just laid down new conditions by relating that draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1) to its own ideas on the transformation of the Secretariat and of the two Councils. His delegation would therefore vote against that draft resolution if it was put to the vote.

15. With regard to the amendments (A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1), these, while reflecting a justifiable demand with which his delegation fully sympathized, would have the effect of penalizing certain States for the attitude taken by another State. The present membership of the two Councils raised a serious problem. Failing an increase in their membership, there was at present no way of ensuring the legitimate representation of one group of States without depriving another group whose co-operation was equally valuable. Since it had hoped that the consultations would result in a compromise text, his delegation, to its great regret, could not vote for the amendments in their present form.

16. Mr. JHA (India) repeated his main objection to the original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3), namely, that they aimed at amending the Charter without observing the fundamental principle of unanimity among the great Powers. The Charter itself, however, had only seen the light of day as a result of the efforts made to harmonize the different points of view. The Soviet Union had now clearly shown that it would never accept the necessary amendments so long as the People's Republic of China did not occupy its due place in the United Nations. As the sponsors of those draft resolutions were aware of that attitude, the action which they had taken was completely unrealistic. The representative of the Ivory Coast, a co-sponsor of those draft resolutions, had himself just pointed out certain defects in them in a very frank speech.

17. Those drafts had not, moreover, been drawn up on the basis of thorough prior consultations which might have brought the various points of view closer together. It was an illusion to suppose that, on such an important question, Member States would allow one group of countries to impose its will on them. In particular, no one had queried why it would be desirable to increase the number of seats on the Security Council to thirteen only.

18. Even if the two original draft resolutions were adopted, that decision would have no practical result. If no important change took place for two or three years, the amendments would not be ratified and the members would be back where they started. Precious time would thus have been lost by attempting, at any price, to force through the adoption of measures that were doomed to failure. If the People's Republic of China was admitted to the United Nations before the end of that period, its natural self-respect as a sovereign State would certainly prevent it from acquiescing in a resolution which had been adopted without its participation. The People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union would certainly ask for the whole question to be reconsidered.

19. His delegation could not therefore support the two original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.

1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3) in their present form. The amendments (A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1) undoubtedly made some improvements. Although the Part A referred to in those amendments had not seemed very satisfactory to a number of delegations, Part B was the fruit of a sincere effort to harmonize two principles and to provide for an immediate redistribution of the seats on the two Councils. His delegation would accordingly vote for Part B.

20. The five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1) had been somewhat neglected during the debate. In the spirit of resolution 1404 (XIV), however, it represented an attempt to find a solution, and it opened the way for informal talks within the framework of the General Assembly. Despite the difficulties which might be encountered, it might perhaps enable a settlement to be reached even before the end of the fifteenth session. It was that draft resolution, therefore, which was assuredly the most deeply imbued with a spirit of conciliation. As to the amendments in that draft proposed by the Soviet Union, they touched on wider problems which the General Assembly would no doubt have to examine one day. In any case, the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1) did not impose a solution on anyone but rather left sufficient latitude for all points of view to be expressed before the proposed special committee.

21. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) stated that, contrary to what one representative had maintained at the previous meeting, the countries of Asia and Africa had no intention of appropriating seats which belonged to another group of States. The countries of Africa and Asia knew very well what valuable assistance the struggle of the colonial peoples for freedom had received from the United Nations. They were hoping that that same sympathy would be shown to the new States with regard to giving them a place in the important organs of the United Nations. The equitable representation to which they were entitled could be obtained in two ways which were complementary and not contradictory: by increasing the membership of the Councils and by redistributing the existing seats. The former operation required amendments to the Charter which were unfortunately not feasible at the present time. Hence, for the current year, redistribution offered the only possible solution. During recent negotiations, however, the European and Latin American groups of States had adopted a negative attitude on that point in spite of the spirit of co-operation which had been shown by the countries of Africa and Asia. That same spirit of harmony and the desire of the African and Asian States to avoid any division between them on such a vital question had induced them to submit their amendments. As certain delegations had spoken categorically against those amendments, the new States saw all hope of achieving their legitimate aspirations vanishing. Those circumstances were strengthening still further their will to remain united.

22. His delegation would vote in favour of the amendments (A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1) of which, in both cases, it was a co-sponsor. Its vote on the two original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3) would depend on the outcome of those amendments. His delegation would also be guided by its conviction that the contemplated increase, particularly for the

Security Council, was purely symbolic and hence insufficient.

23. His delegation would vote in favour of the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1) if it was put to the vote. Since the tendency of that draft was to preserve the solidarity of the African and Asian countries, it had the advantage of not prejudging the issue and of leaving the question as it stood until the sixteenth session of the General Assembly. It was to be hoped that the international situation would then enable those countries to be granted equitable representation in all important United Nations organs.

24. Mr. SMITH (Canada) deplored the fact that, after several weeks of discussion, the members of the Committee were even further apart from an understanding than they had been at the beginning. He also regretted the acrimonious language which had been used and the attempts to set one continent against another. His delegation was animated solely by a desire to give satisfactory representation to the countries of Asia and Africa, and it thought that that could best be done through an increase in the membership of the Councils. The steps taken ought, moreover, to benefit not only the States which had been recently admitted to the United Nations, but also those who would enter it later.

25. It was a pity that a completely extraneous question, that of the representation of China, had been introduced into the debate. Indeed, if the arguments advanced by the Soviet Union were accepted, the validity of all the resolutions adopted since 1945 might be open to question. The representative of India, on the other hand, had said that there had not been enough consultation. After three weeks of intensive negotiation to which the question had given rise, it might be wondered whether he had not been speaking with his tongue in his cheek.

26. As, in his delegation's view, the long-term advantages were the only ones that counted, it would vote against the amendments, which it regarded as having little practical value. The redistribution of seats, which were already too few, would merely complicate the problem for the future and replace one injustice by another. On the other hand, his delegation would support the original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3). It had been said that those draft resolutions were useless because of the attitude of the USSR; if that was so, the new States ought perhaps, logically, to have asked that country to assist them in obtaining just representation. Canada would vote against the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1), since it gave the permanent members of the Security Council alone a responsibility which should fall on all Member States.

27. Mr. TETTAMANTI (Argentina) categorically rejected the accusation that the sponsors of the two original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3) had wanted to intensify the cold war. The very number of the countries from all continents which had sponsored those drafts was the best proof that the reproach was baseless. Besides, countries such as Morocco and Indonesia, which did not, for example, share Argentina's attitude on the representation of China, had agreed during the general discussion that that question had nothing in common with the intentions which had been manifested in the present case.

28. There was not, in reality, any technical reason why the membership of the two Councils should not be increased, and that was the only solution capable of ensuring equitable representation for all parties. As to the figure of thirteen members proposed for the Security Council, that idea had been submitted as early as 1956 by the representative of El Salvador.^{1/} The figure of twenty-four seats proposed for the Economic and Social Council had been accepted by the Council itself in its resolution 690 B (XVI), which had allocated that same number of seats to several of its Commissions. Contrary, therefore, to what the representative of India had stated, the question had been under close examination for quite a long time. There was, in fact, no other obstacle than the political problem which had been raised by the Soviet Union.

29. An attempt had been made to break the deadlock by redistributing the existing seats. It had been argued that, by virtue of the principle *res inter alios acta*, the agreements which had been reached on the distribution of seats would not be binding on the new Member States. Those States, however, had been admitted to the United Nations, not only because they fulfilled the conditions laid down in Article 4 and had declared themselves ready to accept the written obligations of the Charter, but also because they had been regarded as willing to accept the traditions, the rules of the game, so to speak, of the Organization. He hoped that those considerations would influence the voting of the representatives in question.

30. The negotiations which had taken place in the last few days had unfortunately failed because, for political reasons, certain groups of countries did not want the Charter to be amended. The introduction of cold-war elements into the debate could not be blamed on the membership of the two Councils.

31. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan) said that his country was a co-sponsor of the two original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3). Far from forcing a solution upon anyone, those draft resolutions were simply in the nature of an appeal to the Soviet Union in the hope that within the next two or three years it might be able to ratify the necessary amendments. The policy advocated in those draft resolutions was admittedly not an ideal one but it was preferable to the proposals contained in the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1). Were the latter adopted, there would in fact be the danger of another veto if the proposed committee met with no more success than had hitherto been achieved in obtaining agreement to an increase in the membership of the two Councils from the Soviet Union, which was determined to oppose such a measure so long as Communist China had not been admitted to the United Nations. Moreover, the Soviet Union had stated that it could only accept the five-Power draft resolution with certain amendments to ensure equal representation of the socialist, neutralist and western States in the proposed special committee. The Soviet delegation also wanted the preamble of the draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1) to be amended to indicate the necessity for a consequential change in the structure of the Secretariat. That would amount to the creation of a "fait accompli". His delegation could not in the present context accept those Soviet Union proposals, which had first been put forward in connexion with

^{1/} See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eleventh Session, Plenary Meetings*, 620th meeting, para. 56.

general and complete disarmament and were foreign to the matter under discussion. Such changes might call for consideration at a later stage but the proposed committee would not be qualified to negotiate with the great Powers on the subject. Nevertheless, if the original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3) were not adopted, his delegation would be prepared to vote for the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1), with the reservations stated and on condition that aside from the permanent members of the Security Council the composition of the proposed special committee faithfully reflected the geographical composition of the Organization.

32. His delegation had also wished to associate itself with the sponsors of the two amendments (A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1), since it considered that the Asian and African countries were justified in desiring an immediate redistribution of the existing seats until such time as the necessary amendments to the Charter could be ratified. His delegation regretted that the Latin American and European delegations had not found those texts acceptable and that the talks between the three groups had not led to a compromise satisfactory to all. It was to be hoped, however, that the disagreement on that point would not create any permanent ill-feeling between regional groups. Such antagonism could only serve to delay a solution, which was urgently required.

33. Mr. ENCKELL (Finland) said he thought that the principle of the sovereign equality of all Members proclaimed in the Charter was essential to the sound functioning of the Organization in conformity with a spirit of justice. By virtue of that principle all Member States should be eligible, by rule and in fact, for election to membership of the principal organs; there was therefore no justification for any distinction between founder Members and new Members. It was clearly a matter of urgency to increase the number of seats in the Councils, and the claims of the new Member States on that point were fully justified. The smooth running of the Organization was, moreover, already being hampered by the existing lack of balance between the number of Member States and the composition of the United Nations organs. Two series of measures were necessary, one to enlarge the membership of those organs and another to distribute the existing seats equitably. His delegation was, however, well aware of the obstacles in the way, due partly to the procedure laid down for the amendment of the Charter and partly to the position already adopted by many delegations with regard to the future elections. Certain delegations had already committed themselves in that respect. His delegation would be guided by those considerations in voting on the draft resolutions before the Committee.

34. Mr. DOSUMU-JOHNSON (Liberia) said that he had entertained high hopes of the success of the debate but was now convinced that the great Powers had no intention of granting any representation to the African States, which they were only using as pawns on the chess-board of international politics. The argument that the African States had belonged to the United Nations for too short a time had been used against them. That in itself demonstrated the ignorance of certain representatives about the circumstances in which the United Nations had been founded,

since Liberia and Ethiopia were among the founder Members. In the circumstances his delegation no longer wished to figure among the sponsors of the original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3). It believed that redistribution of seats was the only satisfactory solution for the African States, which would not accept any detraction from their prestige or a refusal to give them the seats to which they were entitled. Liberia would therefore vote in favour of the two amendments (A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1). It could not, however, support the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1), which, in spite of its sponsors' good intentions, would not overcome Soviet opposition and which he feared would have no chance of being put into effect.

35. Mr. WACHUKU (Nigeria) thought that some of the arguments put forward were based on feelings rather than on facts. As the representative of Liberia had just pointed out, the African Members were not all so new, since Liberia and Ethiopia were founder Members. With regard to the draft resolutions he found that the figures proposed in the two original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3) for the increase in the membership of the Councils were quite arbitrary. He wondered how the sponsors had arrived at those figures, whether they had allowed for a further increase in the number of Member States and why the African States had not been consulted. The amendments on the other hand afforded an opportunity for discussions which would enable satisfactory figures to be established, and they retained that part of those draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3) on which there was general agreement. It had been said that even if those draft resolutions were adopted ratification would be impossible so long as the Government of the People's Republic of China was not represented or the structure of the Secretariat had not been changed, and so on. In those circumstances would those draft resolutions merely be consigned to the archives? The most useful amendment was the one contained in Part B, since the seats belonged to all States and if they were distributed equitably all regions would have at least one seat. The African States wanted all Members of the United Nations without exception to be able to participate effectively in its work; they wanted to be represented on the executive organs and to see the principle of equality triumph. It had been said that traditions must be respected, but there were bad traditions that it was better to change. The great Powers should think less of their greatness and agree to the new States taking part in the adoption of economic, social and political decisions; otherwise the presence of the African-Asian countries would be meaningless.

36. The CHAIRMAN reminded members that the substantive debate was concluded and that they were merely explaining their votes.

37. Mr. WACHUKU (Nigeria) pointed out that part A of the amendments (A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1) introduced certain improvements in the original draft resolutions. Part B expressed the views of forty-five African-Asian States which not only sought an increase in the membership of the Councils but wished to be able to participate effectively in the work of those organs forthwith. As

for the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1), there was no guarantee that even if it was adopted it could be put into effect; his delegation would not vote against it, however, if the amended draft resolutions were rejected.

38. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia), referring to the statements made by the representative of Argentina, said that Indonesia had not withdrawn its opposition and that its appeal to the Soviet Union still stood. Indonesia was one of the sponsors of the amendments (A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1), for which it would vote. Its position regarding the original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3), would depend upon the fate of those amendments. Undoubtedly, the issue under discussion was primarily a struggle between the "haves", who wished to preserve their privileges, and the "have nots", who sought justice. It had been said that care should be taken not to hamper the efficient functioning of United Nations organs, but if a deadlock was reached, who was to be held responsible—those who sought an equitable solution or those who opposed it? The African-Asian States did not wish to be unfair to the European and Latin American States; they were merely asking them to enter into a new gentleman's agreement to which all might be parties.

39. Mr. JHA (India) said that his delegation always respected other people's points of view even if it did not agree with them. He was therefore sorry that the representative of Canada seemed to think he had been speaking with his tongue in his cheek. He had never attempted to deny that the question had been under consideration for a long time; he had merely drawn attention to the lengthy procedure involved whenever a constitution had to be amended.

40. Mr. HOOD (Australia) agreed with the representative of Canada that the members of the Committee had had every opportunity to consider the question during the three years it had been on the agenda. The reasons for increasing the number of members of the Security Council from eleven to thirteen, for instance, had already been expounded at length. The first essential was to consider the problem in the light of the interests of the United Nations. In that respect, the original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3) were quite satisfactory and the fact that they were unlikely to be applied was no reason for rejecting them. The amendments to those draft resolutions on the other hand, did not specify the measures to be taken and were therefore quite unrealistic. In the circumstances, he would vote against those texts, although he regretted that the attempts to reconcile the conflicting views of the various groups had been unsuccessful.

41. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) expressed regret that the various delegations had not been able to reach agreement in the Committee. In the existing circumstances none of the proposals before the Committee could lead to a constructive solution. That was particularly true of the original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3) even if amended. It might perhaps be better to abandon any attempt at adopting a solution at the fifteenth session and to refrain from voting on the texts submitted. Perhaps the Chairman, who enjoyed

everyone's confidence, might draft a summary of the discussions reflecting the wish of all members to arrive at a generally acceptable solution, which depended entirely on the permanent members of the Security Council. The Committee could thus, without bringing any pressure to bear on the permanent members of the Security Council, make known to them the wishes of all the other Member States.

42. If that suggestion did not meet with the Committee's approval, the Afghan delegation would vote against Part A of the amendments (A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1), but would abstain from voting on the proposal to replace the words "three years" by the words "two years". It would vote for the last part of the amendments, which would become Part B of the original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3). However, the Afghan delegation would not be able to vote for the existing operative paragraphs 1 to 3 of those draft resolutions because, since they necessitated amending the Charter, they could not at the present time lead to a positive solution.

43. If the Soviet Union delegation formally submitted the amendments it had referred to, the Afghan delegation would be unable to support them. It would, however, vote in favour of the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1), which in its present form could not give rise to any objections.

44. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) said that the forty-eight sovereign States which had joined the United Nations since 1945 should be given due representation on its principal organs. The idea of redistributing the existing seats in the two Councils was not intended to deprive certain countries of their rights but merely to ensure fair representation for all. Such representation should be in keeping with the spirit of the 1947 gentleman's agreement but not with its letter, which was now outdated. The fact that consultations had taken place before the various draft resolutions had been prepared showed that the tradition of collective efforts had not been abandoned.

45. The original draft resolutions had been prompted by good intentions but gave rise to serious reservations. They were not sufficiently practical and made no mention of the necessary redistribution of the existing seats. Moreover, there had been insufficient time to determine exactly how many seats would have to be added to the Security Council in particular. That problem required further consideration. The amendments to those draft resolutions if adopted, would go some way to meeting those objections. After the adoption of the amendments, however, agreement would still have to be reached on the manner in which the seats were to be redistributed.

46. If no other text was adopted, the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.51/Rev.1) would be acceptable. As for the composition of the special committee for which provision was made in that draft, its membership should comprise representatives of all the geographical groups in the Organization in addition to the permanent members of the Security Council.

47. Mr. SMITH (Canada) said that he was sorry if his remarks had offended the representative of India and assured him that he had merely wished to emphasize that the matter under discussion had already been debated at length.

48. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to vote on the drafts before it.

49. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) asked for a separate vote on the third amendment in document A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1, whereby the words "three years" would be replaced by the words "two years", in operative sub-paragraph 1 (d).

50. Mr. JHA (India) asked for a separate vote on each of the amendments in document A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1.

51. Mr. SEIDENFADEN (Denmark) asked for a separate vote on the word "immediate" and the phrase "to be effective at this session" in the last amendment in document A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1.

52. In reply to Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) and Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic), the CHAIRMAN explained that the representative of Afghanistan had made only a suggestion and not a formal proposal.

53. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) pointed out that since the Chairman had announced the beginning of voting, rule 129 of the rules of procedure would preclude the submission of any formal proposal at that stage.

54. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) asked the Chairman if he might be allowed to submit a formal proposal as a special concession.

55. The CHAIRMAN said that he was sorry he could not grant that request in view of the formal provisions of the rules of procedure. He announced that he would put to a separate vote the various amendments proposed in document A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1 and invited the members of the Committee to vote first on the words "Part A".

The amendment was adopted by 45 votes to 26, with 21 abstentions.

56. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second amendment which consisted in replacing, in the preambular paragraph beginning with the word Considering in draft resolution A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 the last part of the sentence from it is desirable by the words "it is essential to ensure the equitable redistribution of existing seats and to increase the membership of the Council".

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Guinea, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Austria, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Dahomey, Denmark, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Gabon, Ghana.

Against: Honduras, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala.

Abstaining: Haiti, Hungary, Israel, Norway, Poland, Romania, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia.

The amendment was adopted by 48 votes to 32, with 16 abstentions.

57. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment to replace the words "three years" by the words "two years" in operative paragraph 1 (d) of draft resolution A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5.

The amendment was adopted by 51 votes to 9, with 29 abstentions.

58. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment to add the words "Part B" after operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5.

The amendment was adopted by 44 votes to 26, with 23 abstentions.

59. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the word "immediate" in the text proposed for addition as part B to draft resolution A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania.

Against: Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia.

Abstaining: Cuba, Cyprus, Israel, Thailand.

The amendment was adopted by 49 votes to 43, with 4 abstentions.

60. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the words "to be effective at this session" in the text proposed for addition, as part B, to draft resolution A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan,

Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad.

Against: Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica.

Abstaining: Cyprus, Israel, Thailand, Cuba.

The amendment was adopted by 49 votes to 43, with 4 abstentions.

61. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the text, as a whole, proposed for addition, as part B, to draft resolution A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5.

The amendment was adopted by 37 votes to 35, with 20 abstentions.

62. Mr. PLAJA (Italy) asked that the preamble, as amended, and the operative part of part A of draft resolution A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 be voted upon separately.

63. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the preamble to draft resolution A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 as modified by the amendments that the Committee had adopted.

The preamble to the draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 47 votes to 41, with 5 abstentions.

64. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the operative part of part A of draft resolution A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5, as amended.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroun, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France,

Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast.

Against: Luxembourg, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, India, Iraq.

Abstaining: Cuba.

The operative part of part A of the draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 76 votes to 19, with 1 abstention.

65. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 as a whole, as amended.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Yemen, Yugoslavia, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Chad, Cyprus, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta.

Against: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Austria, Ceylon, China, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Norway, Sweden, Turkey, United States of America.

The draft resolution, as a whole, as amended, was rejected by 41 votes to 38, with 17 abstentions.

66. Mr. BEELEY (United Kingdom) pointed out that the General Assembly was waiting until the Committee had voted on all the texts submitted to it before proceeding to elect the members of the Security Council and of the Economic and Social Council. As there were now reliable indications of the majority trend in the Committee, the Assembly should be able to proceed without further delay to elect the members of those two organs.

The meeting rose at 8.40 p.m.