



Wednesday, 7 December 1955,
 at 3.15 p.m.

New York

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 21:	
Admission of new Members to the United Nations: reports of the Security Council and of the Committee of Good Offices (<i>concluded</i>).....	149

Chairman: Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand).

AGENDA ITEM 21

Admission of new Members to the United Nations: reports of the Security Council and of the Committee of Good Offices (A/2973, A/AC.80/L.3/Rev.1) (*concluded*)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the permanent observer of Japan to the United Nations acting upon instructions from the Foreign Minister of his country had requested him to call attention to a *note verbale*, dated 7 December 1955, sent by the Secretariat to all delegations concerning a resolution adopted by the Japanese House of Representatives on 6 December concerning the admission of new Members to the United Nations.

2. Mr. ORDONNEAU (France) said that his delegation had consistently supported the principle of universality, on which the Charter was implicitly based. There were, however, other very explicit rules set forth in the Charter which it would be wrong to sacrifice to that principle.

3. France desired the admission of most of the States which had submitted applications. With some of them, like Laos, Cambodia, Viet-Nam and Italy, it had legal or sentimental ties. As it did not seem to be appropriate at the present stage to express an opinion on the merits of the individual applicant States, the French delegation would refrain from making any comments on that subject. It could not, however, accept without reservation certain formulas which seemed to depart from the principles of the Charter. It would therefore vote for the Cuban amendment (A/AC.80/L.7 and Corr.1). As the Security Council was to reconsider the applications, the French delegation would state its position in the Council and in the subsequent discussions in the General Assembly.

4. Mr. MARTIN (Canada) said that he had explained his delegation's position clearly when introducing (25th meeting) the twenty-eight Power draft resolution (A/AC.80/L.3, Rev.1). It was a matter of gratification that the draft had elicited such a wide response, and an indication that, in the opinion of the majority, the deadlock must be broken. The discussions, which had been objective and courteous, had been helpful.

5. In his previous statement, he had made it clear that his delegation's support of the admission of the eighteen new Members did not mean that it approved of certain

régimes which were in its judgement undemocratic and pursuing dangerous policies. However, their admission to the United Nations might well have a beneficial effect in that respect. What was important at the present stage was not to express approval of any particular system of Government but to ensure the future greatness of the United Nations. The Committee was concerned with the expression of its desire to impress upon the Security Council the need for resolving the membership issue. He was sure that when the time came to vote all the members of the Committee would have those considerations in mind. The situation was serious, and, if the recent efforts failed, the result would be disastrous. Considerations of self-interest should not prevent the adoption of a resolution favoured by most Members of the Organization.

6. He assured the Cuban representative that the views he had expressed had been given careful consideration during the preparation of the twenty-eight Power draft resolution. However, because it believed that the greater majority by which the draft resolution was adopted the greater would be the force of the Assembly's appeal, the Canadian delegation was unable to accept the Cuban amendment and hoped that the Cuban representative would not press it to a vote.

7. For similar reasons, the Canadian delegation could not support the Soviet amendment (A/AC.80/L.5), which was, it believed, superfluous and, far from strengthening the draft resolution, would weaken it.

8. He was confident that the appeal to the Security Council would not pass unheeded and that the Assembly would perform its duty in the matter. There was no question of contravening the Charter or of abandoning the high principles it proclaimed; there was rather a desire to see the United Nations strengthened in order to meet effectively the formidable tasks which faced it.

9. Mr. DE LA COLINA (Mexico) expressed gratification at the progress made at the present session toward the solution of the thorny problem of the admission of new Members. In that connexion, he paid a tribute to the Peruvian representative for his untiring efforts to find a solution, and to the Canadian representative and the sponsors of the twenty-eight Power draft resolution.

10. Although the countries it was proposed to admit were not all equally qualified to participate in the work of the United Nations, Mexico could not, in view of the importance of the question and the concessions made by various countries, do otherwise than support the draft resolution. Mexico had been a consistent supporter of the principle of universality. At the San Francisco Conference and later in both the Security Council and the General Assembly, it had always advocated the admission of applicant States. At the present time, it believed that every effort must be made to improve international relations. Lastly, it was convinced that the draft resolution represented the only formula, con-

sistent with the Charter which would, in the present situation, enable the United Nations to secure the participation of countries which could make a useful contribution to the Organization's work.

11. The Mexican delegation would therefore vote for the joint draft resolution, but would be unable to support the proposed amendments, which would destroy the delicate balance that had been achieved in the wording of the draft resolution.

12. Mr. NISOT (Belgium) said his delegation would vote for the Cuban amendment (A/AC.80/L.7 and Corr.1) which was intended to ensure that the twenty-eight Power draft resolution emphasized the need for respecting Article 4 of the Charter and the advisability of acting in accordance with the principles set forth in the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice.¹ The Belgian delegation considered that in view of the turn the discussion had taken, the amendment was necessary.

13. The serious assertions to the contrary that had been made in the Committee obliged the Belgian delegation to state that it continued for its part to believe that international treaties should be scrupulously respected. It considered that that principle had particular weight in the case of a treaty like the Charter and that, as the Court had stated in its advisory opinion and as most Members of the United Nations had subsequently repeatedly affirmed, the admission of new Members *en bloc* would constitute a violation of Article 4 of the Charter. It had been clear from the discussion that the intention prevailing in the Committee was to bring about a kind of "package deal" or compromise whereby the eighteen applicants would be admitted to the United Nations *en bloc*, without regard to their merits.

14. The Belgian delegation considered that a resolution resulting from such discussions should be supplemented by the Cuban amendment, which explicitly drew attention to the constitutional requirements. Such a reminder, far from being superfluous, was essential. If the amendment was not adopted, the Belgian delegation would be obliged to abstain when the joint draft was put to the vote.

15. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom) observed that the Committee had had a serious and responsible debate on a question which vitally affected the future of the United Nations. He was sure that all the Committee's members, and especially those who represented their countries in the Security Council, were alive to the responsibility that rested upon them.

16. His delegation shared the general desire to see the dead-lock broken and would vote for the twenty-eight Power draft resolution. It was his understanding that the Soviet delegation would not press its amendment. With regard to the Cuban amendment, while he agreed that the United Nations should respect Article 4 of the Charter and be guided by the advisory opinion of the International Court, he did not see that it was necessary to spell that out in the draft resolution. He was inclined to think that the amendment might be based on a misunderstanding of the relations between the two United Nations organs concerned. The General Assembly took a decision only on the recommendation of the Security Council, and the Security Council, in making its recommendations, must have regard to the provisions of the Charter and the opinion of the Inter-

national Court. At the present stage the Assembly was merely expressing the general desire to see the dead-lock broken. In doing so, it was seeking to help the Security Council in its consideration of the problem. It was not attempting to tell the Security Council how it should act. Moreover, the draft resolution itself was not in conflict with Article 4 of the Charter or with the rulings of the International Court. For those reasons, his delegation would be unable to support the Cuban amendment.

17. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) said that, as he had already stated, his delegation would vote for the joint draft resolution and would therefore be unable to support the Cuban amendment. While Article 4 of the Charter must be respected, the amendment seemed to him superfluous.

18. He felt that the Spanish text of the first paragraph of the joint draft resolution could be improved. Having consulted several Spanish-speaking delegations, who agreed with him, he suggested a possible text.

19. The CHAIRMAN said that the Spanish text would be revised in accordance with the Salvadorian representative's suggestions.

20. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was gratified that the sponsors of the twenty-eight Power draft resolution had amended their original text and specified the number of countries whose admission would be recommended and whose identity could not be open to any doubt. His delegation would have preferred to name all the countries in question in the draft resolution, and had drafted its amendment with that consideration in mind.

21. The revised text of the draft resolution was, however, much more specific in that respect than the original text, and his delegation, which was anxious that the draft should be adopted by as large a majority as possible, would therefore not press its amendment. In those circumstances, the Cuban representative's amendment (A/AC.80, L.8) to the USSR amendment would automatically lapse.

22. Mr. CARBONELL (Colombia) said that his delegation had welcomed the opportunity to become a sponsor of the joint draft resolution because it had, since the foundation of the United Nations, consistently upheld the principle of universality. The adoption by the Security Council of the recommendations contained in the draft resolution would mark the acceptance of that principle. His country would be happy to see countries like Spain, Italy, Portugal and others seated in the United Nations. He congratulated Mr. Martin, and also the Committee of Good Offices and its Chairman, on the efforts they had made and the skill they had displayed in seeking a solution.

23. His delegation would have to abstain if a vote was taken on the Cuban amendment. In the first place, it felt that Article 4 of the Charter should be interpreted in accordance with a resolution adopted by the Latin American countries at the Ninth International Conference of American States, held at Bogotá in 1948, in which it was stated, in particular, that the maintenance of diplomatic relations with a government did not imply acceptance of that government's internal policies. Secondly, his delegation had never approved the opinion of the International Court of Justice — which was, it should be noted, not binding.

24. Mr. NUNEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba) regretted that he could not withdraw his delegation's amendment

¹ *Admission of a State to the United Nations (Charter, Art. 4), Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1948, p. 57.*

(A/AC.80/L.7 and Corr.1). However, in the course of the discussion, he had formed the impression that there was a tendency to depart from the provisions of Article 4 of the Charter and from the opinion of the International Court and accordingly thought it important that the Committee should take a clear stand. He would therefore request that a roll-call vote should be taken on his amendment. The Soviet amendment having been withdrawn, the Cuban amendment (A/AC.80/L.8) to it could not be put to the vote. He felt, however, that the applications of the Republic of Korea and the Republic of Viet-Nam should be considered, and had prepared and considered the possibility of submitting a separate text on the subject.

25. He requested that operative paragraph 2 of the joint draft resolution should be put to the vote in two parts, the Committee voting first on the first part of that paragraph, up to the words "for membership", and then on the last part of the sentence.

26. In order to make his delegation's position clear, he repeated what he had said in his statement on 2 December (27th meeting). His delegation was prepared to vote in favour of Italy, Spain, Portugal, Finland, Nepal, Ireland, Ceylon, Libya, Jordan, Japan, Austria, Laos and Cambodia, but would not vote in favour of a draft resolution promoting the admission of the applicants *en bloc*, a procedure inconsistent with Article 4 and the opinion of the International Court. When, therefore, his delegation voted against the joint draft resolution, it would be because it refused to vote in favour of the five Communist totalitarian States included among the eighteen candidate countries, and not because it was opposed to the admission of the other countries. When the question had been considered by the Security Council and was again examined by the Assembly, his delegation would restate the reasons which prevented it from supporting the admission of those five States.

27. Mr. JOHNSON (Bolivia) said that nobody denied that the principle of the universality of the United Nations was implicit in the Charter and that all Member States should make every effort to see that principle applied.

28. Nevertheless, contrary to logic and elementary reason, the United Nations had admitted only nine countries since its establishment and none since 1950, despite the fact that there were twenty-two applications pending.

29. During the discussions which had taken place on that question, many attempts had been made to interpret the Charter, and Articles 4 and 27 in particular, in a manner which would facilitate the solution of the problem; advice had even been sought from the International Court of Justice. Some delegations, representing the more powerful countries, had affirmed the authority of the Security Council while others, representing the weaker States, had with equal fervour affirmed the powers and competence of the Assembly. All those arguments, however, had proved unavailing and it was now clear to all that the question could not be settled on the basis of either logic or law, but solely through a political compromise.

30. All the efforts made by the Bolivian delegation in trying to find a reasonable solution of the question of admission had been thwarted by that insuperable obstacle. The Bolivian delegation had therefore finally recognized that the only means of settling the problem

was to avoid niceties, to adjust the juridical factors to political realities and to adopt a flexible approach in construing the provisions of Article 4. Recent political developments had shown the wisdom of that reasoning and he was grateful to the Canadian representative for having finally devised the means of settling the problem.

31. The twenty-eight Power draft resolution which had followed, provided for the admission of eighteen countries about which no problem of unification arose. Bolivia, faithful to the principle of the universality of the United Nations, would support that draft resolution. It felt that, in present circumstances, the only material consideration was that of statehood, regardless of transitory factors such as, for instance, political systems or forms of government. His delegation was furthermore convinced that the United Nations should reflect every shade of world public opinion; it should be representative not only of every race and culture but also of different political creeds and social and economic systems.

32. It had to be finally recognized that the United Nations could not continue to close its door to representatives of the vast majority of the world's population. In common with all the other Latin American States, Bolivia was convinced that all the countries representing the cultures and interests of Europe, Asia and Africa would bring a useful contribution to the United Nations. Bolivia failed to see how it was possible to exclude from the United Nations Spain, Italy and Portugal, which had contributed so greatly to the culture of the Latin world. Nor could it understand how admission could be refused to Libya, which had obtained its independence through the United Nations. It was also imperative to admit Japan, that great industrial Power exercising an influence throughout the Orient. The Republic of Ireland and the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan, which had been among the first to apply for admission to the United Nations, were also worthy of membership. Laos and Cambodia were equally deserving, as their sovereignty had been recognized in the Final Declaration of the Geneva Conference on Indo-China held in July 1954.

33. All those countries possessed the attributes of statehood. All should therefore be admitted without any discrimination.

34. For those reasons, the Bolivian delegation would vote in favour of the joint draft resolution, whereby the United Nations could finally bury the differences which had hitherto prevented any solution of the problem of the admission of new Members.

35. Mr. MENON (India) said that his delegation had deliberately made no reference to the relative merits of the applicants, or to India's close ties of friendship with some of them, in order to stress the essential aspect of the draft resolution — namely, that the admission of all qualified applicants would strengthen the United Nations and solve a problem that had been troubling the Organization for a long time.

36. With regard to the relations between the General Assembly and the Security Council, he did not consider that the organs of the United Nations had been set up as a system of checks and balances. The various organs of the United Nations had been set up for functional purposes and although their functions might sometimes overlap, they were not intended to be in conflict. In the case of the admission of new Members, the Assembly had to take a decision upon the recommendation of the Security Council. The Assembly could not lay down in

what form the Council's recommendation would be made to it but it could inform the Council of world opinion with which it was more in touch. The Assembly was also entitled to see that all the preliminary steps necessary to enable it to reach a final decision were taken.

37. There was therefore nothing new or improper in the Assembly's present action in considering the question of the admission of new Members. The Assembly had to see to it that the United Nations worked smoothly and had set up a Committee of Good Offices to establish contact with the Security Council. During the ninth session the Assembly had sent resolution 817 (IX) to the Council requesting it to report on the question of the admission of new Members and was still awaiting a reply. The draft resolution under examination was thus perfectly in order; it was also in conformity with Article 10 of the Charter which empowered the Assembly to make recommendations to the Security Council.

38. Turning to the voting procedure to be followed, he objected, in accordance with rule 130 of the rules of procedure, to the Cuban representative's motion that the two parts of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution be voted on separately. Operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution was indivisible. If the first part of the paragraph, which referred to pending applications for membership, were adopted separately, the Assembly would in fact be pronouncing in favour of all pending applications whereas the sponsors of the joint draft had only contemplated the admission of eighteen applicants, as was indicated in the second part of the paragraph. He accordingly requested the Chairman to put the Cuban motion for division to the vote.

39. Mr. NUNEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba), speaking on the point of order raised by the Indian representative, expressed surprise at the latter's stand. In the past, the Assembly had invariably accepted motions for division and the Indian delegation itself had frequently put forward such motions. The Cuban delegation had asked that the parts of the paragraph should be voted on separately in the hope that it would make it unnecessary for it to vote against the joint draft resolution as a whole. The Indian representative's unprecedented action was, to say the least, discourteous towards the Cuban delegation.

40. Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) agreed that requests for the division of proposals had in the past been accepted automatically. Experience had, however, shown that in some cases division completely altered the meaning of a proposal, and the rules of procedure had been amended in 1948 to enable the sponsor of a proposal to object to its division. In the present case, he agreed with the Indian representative that the division of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution requested by the Cuban representative completely altered the meaning of the draft. He would therefore vote against the motion for division.

41. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Cuban representative's motion for division.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Greece, Guatemala, Liberia, Nicaragua.

Against: Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Sal-

vador, Ethiopia, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Australia, Bolivia.

Abstaining: France, Honduras, Israel, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Paraguay, Philippines, Turkey, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Belgium.

The motion was rejected by 38 votes to 8, with 13 abstentions.

42. Mr. KING (Liberia) explained that he had voted for the motion as an act of courtesy towards the Cuban delegation.

43. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) explained that he had voted against the motion for division in accordance with the right conferred upon him under rule 130 of the rules of procedure. The question was one of applying a legal text; it was therefore difficult to be guided by the rules of common courtesy. So far as the substance was concerned, a separate vote on operative paragraph 2 of the joint draft resolution would have completely changed the nature of the draft resolution, the purpose of which was the admission of eighteen countries, not of all the countries whose applications were pending.

44. The CHAIRMAN observed that, as the USSR amendment (A/AC.80/L.5) and the Cuban sub-amendment (A/AC.80/L.8) had been withdrawn by their sponsors, there were only two documents before the Committee, the twenty-eight Power draft resolution (A/AC.80/L.3/Rev.1) and the Cuban amendments (A/AC.80/L.7 and Corr.1).

45. The Chairman put to the vote the Cuban amendment to the first paragraph of the preamble of the draft resolution.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: France, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United States of America, Belgium, China, Cuba.

Against: El Salvador, Ethiopia, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador.

Abstaining: Egypt, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Israel, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Philippines, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Colombia, Dominican Republic.

The amendment was rejected by 38 votes to 7, with 14 abstentions.

46. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first paragraph of the preamble of the joint draft resolution.

The first paragraph was adopted by 48 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

47. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second and third paragraphs of the preamble to the joint draft resolution.

The second and third paragraphs were adopted by 53 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

48. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Cuban amendment to the fourth paragraph of the preamble of the joint draft resolution.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: United States of America, Belgium, China, Cuba, France, Luxembourg, Netherlands.

Against: New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia.

Abstaining: Nicaragua, Paraguay, Philippines, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Israel, Mexico.

The amendment was rejected by 37 votes to 7, with 15 abstentions.

49. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the fourth paragraph of the preamble of the joint draft resolution.

The fourth paragraph was adopted by 53 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

50. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 1 of the joint draft resolution.

Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 51 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

51. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Cuban amendment to operative paragraph 2 of the joint draft resolution.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: United States of America, Belgium, China, Cuba, France, Luxembourg, Netherlands.

Against: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand.

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Israel, Liberia, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Turkey.

The amendment was rejected by 38 votes to 7, with 14 abstentions.

52. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 2 of the joint draft resolution.

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 52 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

53. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Cuban amendment to operative paragraph 3 of the joint draft resolution.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: United States of America, Belgium, China, Cuba, France, Luxembourg, Netherlands.

Against: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand.

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Israel, Liberia, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Philippines, Turkey.

The amendment was rejected by 37 votes to 7, with 15 abstentions.

54. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 3 of the joint draft resolution.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 52 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

55. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the joint draft resolution as a whole.

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, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq.

Against: China, Cuba.

Abstaining: United States of America, Belgium, France, Greece, Israel.

The joint draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 52 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

56. The CHAIRMAN said that he was glad that the draft resolution had received such an overwhelming majority and felt that it was a good augury for its consideration by the General Assembly. The majority would also help to secure favourable consideration of the matter by the Security Council.

57. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) explained that he had voted for the twenty-eight Power draft resolution subject to the reservations that he had already made with regard to the original draft.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.