

**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



AD HOC POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 50th

(CLOSING) MEETING

Friday, 19 December 1952, at 8.15 p.m.

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Admission of new Members: (a) Status of applications still pending: report of the Security Council (A/2208, A/AC.61/L.30, A/AC.61/L.31, A/AC.61/L.32/Rev.2, A/AC.61/L.35/Rev.1 and Corr.1, A/AC.61/L.36, A/AC.61/L.37, A/AC.61/L.38, A/AC.61/L.39, A/AC.61/L.40, A/AC.61/L.41, A/AC.61/L.42/Rev.1, A/AC.61/L.43, A/AC.61/L.44) (<i>concluded</i>)	313
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 hostilities and to seek agreement by negotiation for the establishment of peaceful relations with Israel (A/2185 and Add.1, A/AC.61/L.45) (<i>concluded</i>)	318
Closing remarks	319

Chairman: Mr. Alexis KYROU (Greece).

Admission of new Members: (a) Status of applications still pending: report of the Security Council (A/2208, A/AC.61/L.30, A/AC.61/L.31, A/AC.61/L.32/Rev.2, A/AC.61/L.35/Rev.1 and Corr.1, A/AC.61/L.36, A/AC.61/L.37, A/AC.61/L.38, A/AC.61/L.39, A/AC.61/L.40, A/AC.61/L.41, A/AC.61/L.42/Rev.1, A/AC.61/L.43, A/AC.61/L.44) (*concluded*)

[Item 19]*

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the first part of the Uruguayan amendment (A/AC.61/L.44) had been withdrawn, and that the second part had been taken into account in the revised text of the draft resolution of the five Central-American States (A/AC.61/L.32/Rev.2) with the consent of the sponsors. Further explanations of vote were in order.

2. Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador) recalled that his country had consistently supported the principle of universality of the United Nations. The debates on the subject at the San Francisco Conference had clearly shown that the admission of new Members was to be exclusively a matter for the General Assembly and the text of the Charter reflected that view. While the generous effort of many States to find a way to overcome the obstacles to the admission of qualified applicants was highly meritorious, it would be vain if it disregarded the terms

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

of the Charter. On the other hand, it was to be hoped that a political solution of the problem could be found. In the meantime, Ecuador supported the establishment of a special committee to seek ways of breaking the dead-lock of the admission of new Members and would therefore support the draft resolution of the five Central-American States.

3. Mr. LOURIE (Israel) said that his delegation also continued to support the principle of universality on which the United Nations had been founded. It was impossible to regard the United Nations as fulfilling its purpose of bringing about the pacific settlement of disputes and the social and economic advancement of peoples so long as the Organization barred from membership countries which had made great contributions to civilization, were peace-loving and prepared to respect the Charter. The dead-lock on admissions to membership had resulted from the tension among the great Powers which threatened the very basis of international society. Thus the difficulty was essentially political in character; it stemmed from the prevailing political schism among the great Powers.

4. A debt was owed the Latin-American delegations for their persistent efforts to explore all aspects of the problem. The matter should be considered by the special committee as proposed in the light of all the facts. The proposal to set up such a committee was in fact a procedural one and implied no judgment on the substance of the question and Israel would support it.

5. It would in these circumstances abstain on all other proposals on behalf of individual applicants or group admission. Apart from this, although Israel had voted for the URSS resolution to admit thirteen States at the last Assembly, the omission of Japan in the Polish draft resolution (A/AC.61/L.35/Rev.1) made that list, in Israel's view, incomplete.

6. Mr. VAVRICKA (Czechoslovakia) did not consider the draft resolution of the five Central-American States to be a step towards a solution of the membership problem. On the contrary it was an attempt to derogate from the functions of the Security Council and exert pressure on the Council in violation of the Charter. Moreover, Czechoslovakia declined the offer of membership in the proposed special committee.

7. Mr. BARRINGTON (Burma) appreciated the motives of the sponsors of the draft resolution of the five Central-American States, but doubted that further study of the admissions question by a special committee could unearth any new factor leading to a solution. The proposed membership of the special committee in no way influenced that view. A solution could be reached only through a restoration of mutual confidence among the great Powers and there did not seem to be any such prospect in the immediate future. Until those Powers achieved an effective compromise, a number of qualified applicants with a great potential contribution to the work of the United Nations would be kept out of the Organization for an indefinite period.

8. Although he was not entirely happy regarding its content or wording, he would support the Polish draft resolution because it constituted the most effective immediate step towards the ideal of universality and because Burma considered the States enumerated to be individually qualified for admission. His delegation believed that those States were no less peace-loving than the existing Members of the Organization and just as able and willing to carry out their obligations. The omission of Japan from the draft resolution would not alter its position, inasmuch as it could rectify that omission by voting for the United States draft resolution on Japan (A/AC.61/L.37) in the conviction that the absence of Japan, like the absence of the People's Republic of China, created an unreal atmosphere for the discussion of Far East problems. For the same general reasons, Burma would vote for the two draft resolutions on the admission of Libya (A/AC.61/L.42/Rev.1) and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (A/AC.61/L.43). On the other hand, it would withhold its favourable vote from the three draft resolutions dealing with Vietnam (A/AC.61/L.38), Cambodia (A/AC.61/L.39) and Laos (A/AC.61/L.40) because it did not recognize them as sovereign States.

9. Mr. JONES (Liberia) reiterated his country's belief in the universality of the United Nations as a means to strengthen world peace and in the admission of free and independent States provided they qualified under the Charter. Liberia would vote for the proposals dealing with individual States, but would not support the Polish draft resolution.

10. Mr. ORDONNEAU (France) recalling that France's position had been clearly defined in the Security Council and in the General Assembly on several occasions, paid a tribute to the efforts of the Latin-American delegations to find a solution in the spirit of

their great juridical tradition. He would vote for the draft resolution of the five Central-American States and against the Polish proposal. The latter was incomplete, France was opposed to the admission of some of the States listed, and was not prepared to sacrifice the Charter to a bargain or deal. He would also vote for the drafts dealing with Japan, Libya and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, and obviously would support those relating to the three States of Indochina, which he wished to see placed in the same situation as the other applicant countries which had benefited by analogous resolutions.

11. Mr. SHAW (Australia) said he would also vote for the revised draft resolution of the five Central-American States because, while it was too optimistic to expect the proposed special committee to break the prevailing dead-lock, the comprehensive study it was to undertake would be useful. He was gratified that the revised text had incorporated amendments presented by Uruguay (A/AC.61/L.44) and the Scandinavian States (A/AC.61/L.41) and that the terms of reference of the special committee would be as broad as possible, thus enabling it to study all ideas on the problem, regardless of where they had been expressed.

12. Australia would vote against the Polish draft resolution because it left unsolved the admission of certain States with justified claims to membership. It would vote for the draft resolutions dealing with individual applicants because it considered them qualified.

13. Mr. DAVIN (New Zealand) said he would support the draft resolution of the five Central-American States. If it was adopted, New Zealand would have the opportunity of expressing its views fully as a member of the special committee. Until then, it reserved its position on the Peruvian draft resolution (A/AC.61/L.30) and the draft resolution of the four Central-American States (A/AC.61/L.31). He doubted that they could break the current dead-lock without straining the Charter to the breaking point, but they merited further consideration. Failure to admit qualified applicants could not justify any departure from the Charter; nor could the danger to the future of the United Nations inherent in exclusion of those States justify a hasty and unjust decision.

14. Of the twenty applicants barred from admission, the great majority were qualified. Some had a long history of civilization and culture and had participated effectively in international affairs. Others were States which had only recently attained self-government and independence by peaceful evolution. Ceylon was a notable example. There were no political, moral or legal grounds on which they should be kept out of the United Nations. Surely if Member States upheld the Charter principles concerning States which had not attained their independence, it followed logically that they should consecrate that independence, once attained, by the seal of admission to membership. It was therefore strange to find the USSR, which championed the cause of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in their struggle towards independence, refusing to allow States which had recently emerged from the status of colonies to take the final step for integration in the community of nations. To maintain, as did the Polish draft resolution, that applications should not be considered individually, but should be made part of a "package" deal

which omitted many qualified applicants was an affront to the dignity and standing of the States concerned. New Zealand could not support any proposal which infringed Article 4 of the Charter or which made the admission of some States conditional on the admission of others. It would therefore vote against the Polish draft resolution. It strongly disapproved of the USSR's abuse of its powers under the Charter; such action would inevitably be harmful to world peace and to international co-operation.

15. New Zealand would vote for the draft resolutions regarding individual applicant States in line with past practice when applications had been left pending as a result of dead-lock in the Security Council.

16. Mr. FERRER VIEYRA (Argentina) said that his country favoured admission of all States fulfilling the minimum requirements of the Charter. Moreover, non-member States whose actions violated international law and were not compatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter would, it was felt, adjust their conduct accordingly upon admission to membership. The Organization would have greater control over the policies and practices of all States once they were Members, and thus be in a better position to promote world peace and to avoid becoming a mere political alliance.

17. Argentina would vote for the draft resolutions dealing with individual applicants, as well as for the Polish draft resolution. It was especially concerned for the admission of Italy, Portugal, Ireland, and Austria. It would not be deterred from supporting the Polish draft resolution by the recommendation for simultaneous admission. The General Assembly was always free to consider applications individually and independently, regardless of the procedure followed respecting them in the Security Council.

18. Mr. CASSIERS (Belgium) said he would support the draft resolution of the five Central-American States and explain his delegation's position on the substance of the problem in his capacity as a member of the proposed special committee.

19. Mr. SCHELTEMA (Netherlands) said he would also vote for the draft resolution of the five Central-American States as a constructive measure and his delegation would be glad to serve on the proposed special committee.

20. Consistent with the Netherlands' position and voting record in the Security Council, it would reject the Polish draft resolution on the grounds that it was incomplete and contravened the Charter and the opinions of the International Court. It would support the draft resolutions favouring Japan and the other individual applicants because those States fulfilled the Charter requirements.

21. Mr. BORBERG (Denmark) said he would vote for the establishment of a special committee to make a thorough study of the entire problem of admission to membership and for the favourable recommendations respecting Japan, the three States of Indochina and the two Arab States, in the interests of universality of the United Nations. He would abstain in the vote on the Polish draft resolution and vote for deletion of the word "simultaneous" in a separate vote. The Polish draft resolution failed to take account of several new

applicant States and to place them on an equal footing with the fourteen States it listed. It should be studied by the special committee.

22. Mr. CASTILLO ARRIOLA (Guatemala) said that his delegation, as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution of the five Central-American States, would obviously support it. He would abstain in the vote on individual applicants, because he felt that judgment should be withheld on them until the proposed special committee had reached its conclusions and they had been discussed in the General Assembly. Finally, he would vote against the Polish draft resolution because the Charter required that all applications should be considered individually on their merits. The earlier Peruvian draft resolution and the draft resolution of the four Central-American States did not offer a solution, but warranted consideration by the special committee.

23. Mr. LONDONO PALACIOS (Colombia) said he would vote for the draft resolution of the five Central-American States and for those dealing with individual applicants. He would vote against the Polish draft resolution because his delegation considered that individual applications should be considered on their merits and that the admission of some applicants should not be made conditional on the admission of others.

24. Mr. LASKEY (United Kingdom) would vote in favour of the draft resolution of the five Central-American States and of the separate proposals dealing with individual applicant States.

25. He recalled that at the sixth session of the General Assembly in Paris the USSR had sponsored a draft resolution (A/C.1/703) similar to that tabled by Poland at the present session. There were, however, significant differences in the wording of the two texts. The USSR's proposal, while asking the Security Council to reconsider the applications of a certain number of States, had not specified that it must make a favourable recommendation on them all or vote on all the applications together in the Council. It had not attempted to bind the hands of the Council or to violate the Charter or the International Court's opinion of 1948. It did have notable defects, however, in particular, the exclusion of the Republic of Korea from the list of applicants. On the other hand, the USSR delegation had stated clearly in Paris that any delegation voting for its resolution in the General Assembly would have to vote in favour of all the applicants in the Security Council. That point of view had been unacceptable to the United Kingdom because it felt that some of the applicants mentioned in the draft resolution did not fulfil the qualifications for membership. The United Kingdom had not voted against the resolution, however, because it was not clear regarding the precise meaning of the words used. The wording of the Polish draft resolution before the Committee removed all its doubts. Obviously, any delegation supporting the Polish draft resolution must be prepared to vote favourably on all fourteen States in the Security Council, or to trade the admission of some against the admission of others. The United Kingdom could not accept either procedure.

26. Moreover, acceptance of the Polish proposal would bind the hands of the Security Council and give it precise instructions. In addition, it excluded the Re-

public of Korea, Japan and the three States of Indochina whose applications the United Kingdom supported. Even if the word "simultaneous" were deleted, the implications of the Polish text rendered it contrary to the Charter and to the opinion of the International Court. The United Kingdom would vote against it.

27. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) said that his delegation had given notice, during the general debate, of its support of the draft resolution submitted by the five Central-American States, and had suggested that all the other proposals should be referred to the proposed special committee. Since only the Peruvian draft resolution and that of the four Central-American States (A/AC.61/L.31), together with the Argentine amendment (A/AC.61/L.36) to the latter resolution, were to be referred to that committee, he wished to explain his delegation's position in regard to the other draft resolutions before the Committee.

28. His delegation would, of course, support the draft resolution of the five Central-American States. It would also vote in favour of the Polish draft resolution on the clear understanding that the admission of the fourteen States listed therein did not imply, as the word "simultaneous" would suggest, that the admission of any one of those applicants would be legally dependent on the admission of the others. His delegation would vote for the deletion of "simultaneous" when that word was dealt with by the separate vote requested by the representative of Egypt (49th meeting). The word "all" in the draft resolution rendered the word "simultaneous" redundant. His delegation had from the beginning supported the principle of universality, as well as the principle that each State applying for admission to the United Nations should fulfil the requirements set forth in the Charter. For some time now an entirely subjective and inflexible adherence to those principles, without regard to the present world political climate, had resulted in the continued exclusion from the United Nations of States whose presence would be beneficial to the Organization and indeed necessary. The purpose of universal membership in the United Nations should therefore be advanced, so far as that was possible within the framework of the rule of unanimity in the Security Council.

29. His Government had taken that position for the following considerations: first, that a vote in favour of the admission of any applicant did not necessarily imply approval of its political or economic system; secondly, that the State should be deemed to be peace-loving unless its actions clearly constituted a threat to or a breach of the peace, or an act of aggression; thirdly, that the statement by a State that it was able and willing to carry out the obligations contained in the Charter should be accepted, as a general rule, in good faith; fourthly, that the narrow idea classifying States as good or bad, for admission or exclusion from the United Nations, was nullified by the fact that such a classification would apply also to the States which were already Members. The admission of as many States as possible, regardless of their worthiness or unworthiness, would in the end be to the Organization's advantage.

30. Finally, there was a precedent in the United Nations for the admission of two or more applicants at the same time. The so-called "package proposal" embodied in the Polish draft resolution should not therefore be regarded *per se* as objectionable. His delegation

would vote for the Polish draft resolution and also for the resolutions submitted by the Arab States concerning the admission of Libya and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. It would however abstain from voting on the draft resolution recommending the admission of Japan because of the outstanding differences which still existed between the Philippines and that country and on those recommending the admission of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia pending clarification of his Government's policy in regard to the political status of those countries.

31. Mr. TJONDRONEGORO (Indonesia) said that his delegation would vote for the Polish draft resolution because of its belief in the principle of universality, and because it considered that the fourteen States listed in that draft met the requirements of Article 4 of the Charter, which should be interpreted broadly.

32. In spite of the fact that there were still justifiable sentiments against Japan in his country, his delegation would vote in favour of the United States draft resolution. Although his delegation would be supporting the applications of Libya and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan by voting for the Polish draft resolution, it would nevertheless support the two joint draft resolutions recommending their admission.

33. His delegation would abstain on the French draft resolutions proposing the admission of the three associate States, Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam as it doubted whether those countries could be regarded as fully established States.

34. Finally, his vote on the draft resolution submitted by the five Central-American States, proposing the creation of a special committee, would depend on the outcome of the voting on the draft resolutions he had mentioned. His delegation believed that no solution of the present dead-lock could be found unless the great Powers showed a spirit of compromise, conciliation and goodwill.

35. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland) explained that in spite of the various changes in amendments which had been made to the draft resolution submitted by the five Central-American States, his delegation would be obliged to vote against it.

36. As the Government of Japan was still in a state of war with his country and with its important neighbours, the USSR and the People's Republic of China, and was, moreover, still an occupied country which was being used as a base for United States aggression, his delegation would vote against the United States draft resolution. The same applied to the three French proposals recommending the admission of the puppet States of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos which did not possess the fundamental qualities of States.

37. As Libya and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan were among the States listed in his draft resolution, there would be no need for him to vote for the two joint draft resolutions recommending their admission which had been submitted by the Arab States. His delegation would accordingly vote against them.

38. The CHAIRMAN announced that he would put the various draft resolutions before the Committee to the vote in the order of their submission.

39. As the Peruvian representative had stated (42nd and 48th meetings) that he considered that his draft

resolution (A/AC.61/L.30) formed part of the documentation to be transmitted to the special committee which would be established if the draft resolution of the five Central-American States were carried, no vote would be taken on that draft or on the draft resolution submitted by the four Central-American States (A/AC.61/L.31), and the Argentine amendment thereto (A/AC.61/L.36), in view of the request of the representative of El Salvador (42nd meeting) that the joint draft should be referred to the proposed special committee.

40. The first draft resolution to be voted upon would therefore be the draft submitted by the five Central-American States (A/AC.61/L.32/Rev.2) on which the representative of El Salvador had asked for a roll-call vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

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

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

Abstaining: India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Bolivia, Burma.

The resolution was adopted by 45 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions.

41. Mr. COHEN (United States of America) said that his delegation would vote against the Polish draft resolution as it prejudged the question of admission, whether it called for the "simultaneous" admission or simply for admission. Although most of the States listed in the Polish draft qualified for membership, that could not have been said about all the fourteen States. The Polish draft would have the Committee express by implication what it had not been prepared to state explicitly, i.e., that all those States qualified.

42. His delegation further objected to the proposal because it grouped together a partial list of applicants. It included some and excluded others on the basis of no stated standard.

43. Further, while it was deeply sympathetic with the principle of universality, his delegation favoured universality based on principles and not on "deals".

44. Lastly, since it had been decided to set up a special committee to study the problem of the admission of new Members, it would serve no useful purpose to adopt the Polish draft resolution, which obviously did not provide a satisfactory standard of general applicability. It was his delegation's hope that the studies of the special committee would enable the General Assembly to agree on objective principles which would make for greater universality.

45. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the word "simultaneous" contained in the Polish draft resolution (A/AC.61/L.35/Rev.1).

The Committee decided by 12 votes to 8, with 37 abstentions, to delete the word "simultaneous" from the draft resolution.

46. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland) said that in submitting its resolution his delegation had been aware of the unpleasant history in the question of the admission of new Members to the United Nations. It well knew what efforts had been made to admit certain States while discriminating against others. It had, therefore, been anxious, in submitting its draft resolution, to include every possible safeguard against a repetition of that practice. It considered the word "simultaneous" to be an additional and important safeguard toward that end.

47. Although the Committee had just decided to delete the word "simultaneous" from his delegation's draft resolution, the text was still clear and unequivocal. His delegation therefore considered that the purpose of its proposal had not been changed and that it still contained sufficient safeguards against abuse or false interpretations.

48. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the deletion of the word "simultaneous" from the Polish draft resolution somewhat weakened the proposal. His delegation would nevertheless vote in favour of that proposal. The Polish draft resolution requested the General Assembly to recommend the admission of all the States listed therein, and, as that resolution required the Security Council to reconsider all the applications mentioned, his delegation would support it.

49. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Polish draft resolution (A/AC.61/L.35/Rev.1) as amended.

The Polish draft resolution was rejected by 28 votes to 20, with 11 abstentions.

50. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United States draft resolution (A/AC.61/L.37), concerning the admission of Japan.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

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

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

Abstaining: Guatemala, Haiti, Israel, Philippines, Sweden, Bolivia.

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

51. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the French draft resolution (A/AC.61/L.38), concerning the admission of Vietnam.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq.

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

Abstaining: Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Union of South Africa, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Burma, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Israel.

The draft resolution was adopted by 38 votes to 5, with 16 abstentions.

52. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the French draft resolution (A/AC.61/L.39), concerning the admission of Cambodia.

The draft resolution was adopted by 38 votes to 5, with 16 abstentions.

53. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the French draft resolution (A/AC.61/L.40) concerning the admission of Laos.

The draft resolution was adopted by 38 votes to 5, with 16 abstentions.

54. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that his delegation was in favour of the admission of Libya and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, as evidenced by its support of the Polish draft resolution in which those two countries were listed. As, however, it did not consider it appropriate to vote for their admission separately it would vote against both of the draft resolutions relating to the admission of the two States.

55. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the joint draft resolution (A/AC.61/L.42/Rev.1) submitted by the six Arab States concerning the admission of Libya.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

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

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

Abstaining: Sweden, Bolivia, Guatemala, Haiti, Israel.

The draft resolution was adopted by 49 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.

56. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution (A/AC.61/L.43) submitted by the six Arab States on the application of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

The joint draft resolution was adopted by 49 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.

57. Mr. JOHNSON (Bolivia) said that although his delegation had always upheld the principle of universality in so far as membership in the United Nations was concerned, it had nevertheless abstained from voting on each and every one of the draft resolutions which had been submitted to the Committee.

58. The protracted and repeated arguments on the question of the admission of new Members had shown that although the principle of universality had not been denied, the political interests of the great Powers since the end of the Second World War had frustrated any desire to apply that principle. Almost a third of the countries of the world were not represented in the United Nations, in spite of the fact that they met the requirements of the Charter, and none of the drafts which had just been voted upon offered any real solution of the problem.

59. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) said, in explaining his delegation's vote, that he had voted in favour of the two resolutions submitted jointly by the Arab States and for the Polish draft resolution because he believed that the admission of Libya and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan would be beneficial to the United Nations.

60. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) said that his delegation, which had consistently supported the principle of universality as applied to the admission of new Members, had voted for the resolution submitted by the five Central-American States because it seemed to offer the only solution of the problem. A number of resolutions had been adopted on that subject in the past but none of them had proved useful. The draft resolution now to be laid before the General Assembly was therefore right in following the only possible course by establishing a special committee to study the problem. His delegation did not feel that the procedure which had been adopted to determine the membership of the proposed committee was of the best. In spite of that, it had voted for the draft resolution because it believed that it offered a new hope of finding a solution to the problem through a more careful and complete study of the question.

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 hostilities and to seek agreement by negotiation for the establishment of peaceful relations with Israel (A/2185 and Add.1, A/AC.61/L.45) (concluded)

[Item 68]*

61. The CHAIRMAN read a letter which he had received from the leader of the Israel delegation (A/

AC.61/L.45) to the effect that his delegation did not insist that item 68 should be considered. In view of that communication, the Chairman proposed that the Committee should adopt the following proposed draft resolution:

"The General Assembly.

"Takes note of the communication dated 19 December 1952 from the representative of Israel to the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Political Committee stating that the debate on item 67 in that Committee had dealt fully with most aspects of this question, and that the Israel delegation did not insist on the consideration of item 68 of the General Assembly agenda".

The draft resolution was adopted by 47 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

Closing remarks

62. The CHAIRMAN, announcing that the Committee had completed its agenda, said the high level maintained, except for a few uneasy moments, in the debates on subjects which were in many cases of an explosive nature had been achieved thanks to the spirit of co-operation and the sense of statesmanship and responsibility of Committee members. He felt that, as loyal Members of the United Nations, all members of the Committee had worked hard to strengthen the foundations upon which the Organization rested, in the conviction that it was the best service which they could, in the long run, render to each of their governments and all Member States. He concluded by expressing his gratitude to the representatives of the Assistant Secretary-General, the Secretary of the Committee and the members of the secretariat responsible for servicing the meetings.

63. Mr. RIBAS (Cuba) thanked the Chairman on behalf of his delegation for the admirable way in which he had presided over the Committee's meetings. His experience, tact and profound knowledge of procedure had been a determining factor in the development of the Committee's work. His successful conduct of that work came as no surprise to representatives who had known Mr. Kyrö for some years. He also expressed his appreciation and gratitude for the work of the Rapporteur, Mr. Salazar, and paid a tribute to the work of the secretariat.

64. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) expressed his delegation's support for the tribute just paid to the Chairman by the representative of Cuba. He wished to second the tribute which had been paid to the Rapporteur, to the representatives of the Assistant Secretary-General, the Secretary of the Committee and the members of the secretariat servicing the Committee. He felt, however, that the chief praise must go to the Chairman, whose efforts had enabled the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee to complete its work rapidly and successfully and who possessed wisdom, tact and an unusual knowledge of the rules of procedure coupled with extreme prudence in applying those rules. Knowledge, however, was not enough unless it was accompanied by goodwill and honesty, qualities of which the Chairman was a living example. The Chairman's sense of humour had also been of assistance in maintaining goodwill in debates. On behalf of the Peruvian delegation he expressed

gratitude for the work which the Chairman had done and the hope that the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee would continue its tradition of solving difficult problems in an atmosphere of harmony and understanding.

65. Mr. BERNARDES (Brazil) associated himself with the tributes paid to the Chairman by the previous speakers. The Chairman had dealt in a masterful way with the very explosive items of the agenda, and by helping to create an atmosphere of goodwill and co-operation and by expediting the work of the Committee to the satisfaction of all members had rendered a great service. He extended the heart-felt congratulations of the Brazilian delegation to the Chairman, and expressed also his gratitude and congratulations to the Rapporteur.

66. Mr. LOURIE (Israel) felt that his delegation had helped to keep the Chairman fully occupied during parts of the session, and wished to express deep appreciation of the patience, fairness, firmness and poise with which he had conducted proceedings. He also expressed gratitude to the Rapporteur and members of the secretariat who had assisted the Committee in its work.

67. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) associated himself with the tributes paid to the Chairman, whose good-humoured recognition always encouraged him in his interventions in the Committee. The Chairman had done much to assist the Committee in carrying out its task fruitfully. He added a word of appreciation for the members of the secretariat, in particular the interpreters.

68. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) thanked the Chairman for the brilliant way in which he had conducted the work of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. He felt that the Chairman had created a very propitious atmosphere for consideration of the complex problems on the Committee's agenda. He had been particularly impressed by the fact that the Chairman had very rarely used the rules to limit representatives in the expression of their views, although the Committee had been pressed for time. He associated himself with the Chairman's tribute to the secretariat.

69. Mr. SEVILLA SACASA (Nicaragua) said that, when the Committee had elected Mr. Kyrö as its Chairman, it had expected him to perform his task brilliantly, with intelligence, honour and truth. That expectation had been fully justified, and he wished to thank the Chairman and to congratulate him on his work. He also thanked the Rapporteur and the secretariat of the Committee.

70. Mr. C. LIU (China) felt that the Committee's record, of which the Chairman had said the Committee might be proud, was nothing less than the Chairman's personal achievement. His patience, integrity and good humour had inspired the members of the Committee with a spirit of conciliation and co-operation which had enabled members to deal with the most delicate and difficult situations. The expression of his delegation's gratitude to the Chairman, and also to the Rapporteur and secretariat, was no mere casual formality.

71. Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa) associated his delegation with the views expressed by previous speakers. He, too, felt that the high level and tone of the debates in the Committee had been largely due to the Chairman's tact and the manner in which he had conducted the Committee's work.

72. Mr. COHEN (United States of America) said that he would like to join with the Chairman in thanking the officers of the Committee, the Rapporteur, the Vice-Chairman, representatives of the Secretary-General and the secretariat. He also wished to join other Committee members in paying tribute to the efficiency with which the Chairman had conducted the work of the Committee. His tact, patience, skill and sense of fairness and perspective had exceeded even the high expectations which the United States delegation had had as a result of its long acquaintance with Mr. Kyrrou. He had great pleasure in joining with all representatives who had expressed their appreciation and gratitude to him.

73. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) associated himself with previous speakers in paying tribute to the qualities of patience, integrity and objectivity which the Chairman had revealed in his work in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and in other United Nations bodies on which he had served.

74. Mr. BÖRBERG (Denmark) said that, although he had not taken part personally in the work of the Committee until that day, he had observed it and wished to express his agreement with all the praise which had been bestowed on the Chairman that evening. The Chairman had great intelligence, much tact and profound knowledge, as well as a sense of humour.

75. Mr. ESENBEL (Turkey) said that the Chairman had set a brilliant example of statesmanship and leadership in the Committee's debates. The valuable work which the Committee had done was due in great part to the Chairman. He added an expression of appreciation for the Rapporteur, the Assistant Secretary-General, and the Committee Secretary.

76. Mr. DEJANY (Saudi Arabia) expressed deep gratitude for the manner in which the Chairman had conducted debates, a source of particular gratification to his delegation since the Committee had discussed a very difficult problem with which it was deeply concerned and the Chairman had been most generous, kind and fair. In conclusion, he associated himself with all speakers who had paid tribute to the Vice-Chairman, the

Rapporteur, the Assistant Secretary-General and the Secretary of the Committee.

77. Mr. LONDONO PALACIOS (Colombia) associated his delegation whole-heartedly with all the tributes and expressions of gratitude which had been expressed to the officers of the Committee.

78. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) said that he was speaking on behalf of the Central-American delegations, and in particular of his own delegation, in expressing support for the tribute of gratitude which had been paid to the Chairman, and appreciation of all the advantages which the Committee had enjoyed from the Chairman's conduct of its work.

79. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that his silence hitherto should be interpreted as a tacit participation in the expression of well-merited appreciation for the Chairman and other officers of the Committee.

80. Mr. ALGHOUSSEIN (Yemen) said that it had always been his delegation's policy to refrain from taking part in discussions when it felt that there were others more capable of expressing its feelings. At the risk of redundancy, however, he felt impelled to express his appreciation for the work of the Chairman and the members of the secretariat who had worked with him.

81. Mr. ORDONNEAU (France) associated himself with the tributes paid to the Chairman by other representatives.

82. Mr. GOROSTIZA (Mexico) asked the Chairman's permission for representatives who had not been able to express their gratitude in words to do so by applause.

83. The CHAIRMAN thanked all representatives who expressed their gratitude for his conduct of the work of the Committee, and, on behalf of the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur, he thanked them for their tributes to those officers. He thought that the generosity of the words spoken was a further sign of the spirit of co-operation to which he had already referred.

The meeting rose at 10.45 p.m.