



Friday, 12 November 1954,
at 10.30 a.m.

New York

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 21:	
Admission of new Members to the United Nations (continued):	
(a) Report of the Committee of Good Offices;	
(b) Admission of Laos and Cambodia.....	113

Chairman: Mr. Thor THORS (Iceland).

AGENDA ITEM 21

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

**(a) Report of the Committee of Good Offices
(A/2720, A/AC.76/2, A/AC.76/3, A/AC.76/4,
A/AC.76/5, A/AC.76/6, A/AC.76/9,
A/AC.76/10, A/AC.76/11, A/AC.76/12, A/
AC.76/14, A/AC.76/L.7/Rev.1, A/AC.76/
L.9/Rev.1, A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1, A/AC.76/
L.13, A/AC.76/L.14);**

**(b) Admission of Laos and Cambodia (A/2709
and Add.1, A/AC.76/L.4)**

1. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union draft resolution providing for the simultaneous admission of fourteen States (A/AC.76/L.7/Rev.1) was consistent with the principle of universality and with the Charter of the United Nations. The list contained in the draft included States that the Western Powers desired to admit to the United Nations as well as States whose admission they had formally opposed. Some representatives had said, with reference to that draft, that the admission of some States should not be made contingent upon the admission of others. The Soviet Union draft resolution made no such condition; it merely recommended that the United Nations should treat the fourteen applicant States on a fair and equal footing. Expressly in order to meet the desires of the Western Powers, the Soviet Union had agreed to include in its draft certain countries whose admission they had advocated. The Soviet Union draft resolution would enable the United Nations to end its present abnormal situation.

2. However, in view of the statements regarding the Soviet Union draft resolution made by certain representatives during the general debate, his delegation was prepared to offer a compromise solution in the form of a draft resolution proposing only the admission of Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, Finland and Italy, with which the Allied and Associated Powers had signed peace treaties and whose admission to the United Nations they had committed themselves to support. If that compromise solution was acceptable to the other members of the Committee, his delegation would submit a draft for their consideration.

3. His delegation was always prepared to make fresh efforts to find the best means of achieving co-operation and mutual understanding. It therefore agreed that the Committee of Good Offices should continue in existence, and supported the draft resolution on the subject submitted by Argentina, Cuba, El Salvador and India (A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1).

4. The draft resolution in document A/AC.76/L.9/Rev.1 stated that Austria, Ceylon, Finland, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Libya, Nepal and Portugal satisfied the requirements of Article 4 and should therefore be admitted to the United Nations. His delegation was unable to support that draft, because to present the question in that way was to favour certain countries and discriminate against others.

5. As his delegation had previously pointed out (20th meeting) it believed that any decision on the draft resolution submitted by Australia, Pakistan and Thailand on the admission of Laos and Cambodia (A/AC.76/L.4) should be postponed pending the permanent settlement of the political situation in Indo-China in accordance with the Final Act of the Geneva Conference. He would therefore vote against that draft.

6. Mr. CROSTHWAITE (United Kingdom) recalled that in the general debate his delegation had advocated (18th meeting) continuing the Committee of Good Offices. As that was also the central feature of the draft resolution in document A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1 he would vote for that draft.

7. He had some doubt, however, with regard to its paragraphs 3 and 5. The Security Council could, of course, at any time invoke Article 28, paragraph 2 of the Charter. He did not believe that the present circumstances were propitious for a solution of the problem of the admission by the Security Council of new Members. A premature meeting of the Security Council would not only serve little useful purpose but might even delay the solution of the problem. For that exact reason it had been proposed that the Committee of Good Offices should be asked to continue its work and to endeavour to create more propitious conditions for the solution of the question.

8. With regard to paragraph 5, he shared the Indian representative's view that it would be unwise to try to impose strict time limits on the Security Council. As the paragraph was not imperative in that respect, however, he would be able to vote for it.

9. His delegation would be glad to see the Committee of Good Offices continued, and he promised Mr. Belaúnde its full co-operation.

10. He would also vote in favour of the draft resolution concerning the admission of Laos and Cambodia (A/AC.76/L.4). The present session of the General Assembly should mark a new stage in the life of those two countries. Despite the difficulties that still lay

before them, the fact remained that their independence and sovereignty had been recognized at the Geneva Conference, and it was to be hoped that the General Assembly would admit them to the United Nations as it had admitted Burma and Indonesia.

11. Mr. HOPPENOT (France) first replied to certain assertions made by the Soviet Union, Polish and Indian representatives.

12. The Polish representative had said (23rd meeting) that the signatories to the peace treaties concluded in 1946 with the former enemy Powers were obliged to support the admission of those States to the United Nations, and that by refusing to do so the Allied and Associated Powers had failed in their commitments.

13. He read paragraph 5 of the preamble of the peace treaties concluded with those five countries, which stated: "... thereby enabling the Allied and Associated Powers to support... 's application...". The word "enabling" was by no means equivalent to the word "binding", and the signatories of the peace treaties were therefore free to act as they saw fit in the matter.

14. Other speakers, including the Indian representative, had either insinuated or openly stated that Laos, Cambodia and Viet-Nam did not yet possess international status, and had drawn attention to the negotiations at present being conducted in Paris between France and those three countries. They had said that the three countries would not be sovereign and independent until those negotiations had resulted in a treaty.

15. That interpretation was incorrect. The purpose of the negotiations in Paris was not to achieve the independence of those three countries. The negotiations were between four equally sovereign States and were concerned only with the particulars of their economic and cultural relations. The matters dealt with included the regulation of navigation on the Mekong River, the new status of the port of Saigon, and the distribution between Cambodia and Viet-Nam of the privileges that France had relinquished in that port.

16. The Polish representative had also said that the Geneva agreements recognizing the independence and sovereignty of those three States would not have effect until Cambodia and Laos had held free elections. It should be recalled, however, that those two countries had not entered into any bilateral commitment of that kind, that the Geneva Conference had merely "taken note" of their intention to hold such elections. In any case elections were a domestic concern of those countries which in no way affected their right to be admitted to the United Nations.

17. For those reasons he would vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/AC.76/L.4.

18. He found the draft resolution in document A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1 perfectly reasonable and consistent with the Charter and with the procedure to which France had always adhered. However, if a vote were taken by parts, he would abstain from voting on operative paragraph 3. Recourse to Article 28, paragraph 2 appeared to be rather out of proportion to the problem.

19. He would vote in favour of the draft resolution in A/AC.76/L.9/Rev.1, for France had always desired the admission of the States listed in it. His delegation would also vote in favour of the United States amendment concerning the admission of Korea and Viet-Nam (A/AC.76/L.13). He considered that Viet-Nam had

the same right to be admitted as Laos and Cambodia, and that its admission would assist it in its task of economic and social development.

20. He would have been glad to vote for the Soviet Union draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.7/Rev.1) if it had ended after listing the fourteen States. Its last phrase, which called for "the simultaneous admission" of those States, precluded him from voting in its favour, because such a provision was contrary to the Charter.

21. He was unable to support the Indian-Indonesian draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.14) because, if that text were adopted, the *Ad Hoc* Committee would not be able to express its views to the Security Council on the various applicants. It was essential that both the Security Council and the Committee of Good Offices should be informed of the views of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and the General Assembly on the subject.

22. Mr. DURÓN (Honduras) reaffirmed his delegation's strong conviction that political reasons and considerations of justice alike urged the admission of all candidates satisfying the requirements. He thought that the draft resolutions before the Committee could provide a satisfactory solution to the problem.

23. His delegation would vote for the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1. It had always defended the principle of the universality of the United Nations, and hoped that all points of view could be reconciled on a basis of respect for that principle. The Committee of Good Offices should continue, and perhaps would now have time to make some progress.

24. He would vote for any draft resolution conforming to the spirit of the Charter and just to all the States applying for membership.

25. Mr. BENITES VINUEZA (Ecuador) said that he would vote for the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1 because it was based on the principle of the universality of the United Nations, so ably defended by the representatives of Argentina and Cuba in the general debate. He would vote especially for paragraph 1, because he shared the views of the sponsors of the draft resolution on the work of the Committee of Good Offices.

26. He had some doubts on paragraph 2 and would ask that it be voted on in parts. He thought that a vote should first be taken on that part which ended with the words "for further consideration", and then another vote on the phrase "and positive recommendations".

27. The adjective "positive" was redundant, as a recommendation could not be other than positive. Under the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, if the Council did not make a recommendation the Assembly might send back the application to the Council for further consideration. The second part of paragraph 2 might give the impression that the General Assembly was demanding that the Council should make recommendations on the applications; the Assembly obviously could not do that.

28. He also asked for a separate vote on paragraph 3. The representatives of France and the United Kingdom had already criticized the reference made in it to Article 28, paragraph 2 of the Charter. The Security Council consisted of representatives of States which were obliged to defend the official policies of their countries. The replacement of the permanent representative of any country on the Council by its Minister of Foreign Affairs would make no difference to the out-

come of a debate. He would abstain from voting on that paragraph.

29. His delegation would also vote for paragraph 4, and for paragraph 5 which contained the words "if possible", thereby making clear that the Committee was merely expressing a hope.

30. The draft resolution contained in document A/AC.76/L.14 was reasonable because, if it were decided to send back all the pending applications to the Security Council, the Committee need not take a decision on all of them. He would vote for that draft resolution, on the understanding that the communication to the Security Council of all the draft resolutions mentioned in it did not signify the Committee's approval of the ideas on which those draft resolutions were based. If, however, it were not adopted, the Committee should vote on all the other draft resolutions separately.

31. The draft resolution contained in document A/AC.76/L.4 was inspired by praiseworthy motives; but his delegation was in favour of the suggestion that all the applications should be sent back to the Security Council and saw no reason why Laos and Cambodia should be treated differently. There were certainly special reasons for the admission of Laos and Cambodia, but the same was true of the admission of Libya.

32. He would have voted for the USSR draft resolution if it had not proposed the "simultaneous" admission of the States to which it referred, which was obviously contrary to the Charter. In that connexion it must be noted that among the fourteen countries listed there appeared the names of Finland, Italy, Portugal, Ireland, Austria, Ceylon, Nepal, and Libya, all of which had obtained more than seven votes in the Security Council. If the USSR was proposing that their applications should again be considered by the Security Council, it must be intending to vote for them.

33. Mr. BARRINGTON (Burma) said that the problem of the admission of new Members was essentially political and therefore demanded a political solution. There would have to be negotiations between the two sides, assisted by the Committee of Good Offices. The General Assembly would not solve the problem by adopting simple declaratory resolutions by a majority. Such resolutions would in fact retard the solution, as they would make both sides harden their positions.

34. Burma hoped that the States listed in the draft resolutions would be admitted to the United Nations at the earliest possible date. The United Nations needed them as much as they needed it. They were all qualified for admission. Ties of sentiment, however, turned his thought to the States of Asia, particularly to Laos and Cambodia, whose admission he desired because it would seal their recognition as sovereign States. He also thought of countries such as Japan, Ceylon, Nepal, the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan, and Libya. Asia would not be fully represented in the United Nations until all those States were Members.

35. For those reasons his delegation heartily welcomed the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1, which represented a most realistic approach and would doubtless help the United Nations to find a solution to the problem. He did not think that anything should be done to hamper the work of the Committee of Good Offices. It would therefore be unreasonable to adopt the other draft resolutions referring to the admission of various groups of countries. He

would accordingly vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.76/L.14, referring all the draft resolutions to the Security Council. He appealed to the sponsors of those resolutions not to insist that they should be put to the vote.

36. If the draft resolutions were nevertheless put to the vote, his delegation, faithful to the principle of the universality of the United Nations, would vote for all of them.

37. He regretted his inability to support the United States amendment relating to the admission of the Republic of Korea and Viet-Nam. Their Governments represented only a part of the territory of those countries, and it would therefore be premature to admit them to the United Nations.

38. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) said that in the view of his Government, which firmly believed in the universality of the United Nations, all States which fulfilled the requirements of Article 4 of the Charter should be admitted and there should be no discrimination on ideological grounds. His delegation would therefore vote for the USSR draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.7/Rev.1) since it proposed the admission of the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan and Libya and would enable the peoples' democracies, whose admission was just as desirable as that of countries such as Nepal and Italy, to sit in the United Nations.

39. As his delegation thought that the Committee of Good Offices should continue its work, it welcomed the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1. That text had the advantage of stating the principle of universality and of suggesting that the Security Council should consider the views of the members of the Committee.

40. His delegation would also support the Indian-Indonesian draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.14), for if it were desired that the Committee of Good Offices should continue its work in a calm atmosphere, it would be better not to vote on the other draft resolutions.

41. Mr. PASTRANA (Colombia) wished to explain that in the opinion of his delegation the General Assembly was responsible for the final decision on the admission of new Members, and none of the other principal organs of the United Nations could limit the Assembly's powers in that respect. Just as the Security Council had, when in doubt, extended its competence, so the General Assembly could, acting alone, decide its own competence in respect of the admission of new Members, which it had not so far done.

42. He did not quite agree with the view that the question was a political one, calling for a political solution. If, out of prudence and a desire to avoid disputes, the General Assembly accepted a political solution, it would not thereby be laying aside the power to settle the question by a juridical decision. That power was a weapon in the hands of the small countries, and the Colombian delegation for one was firmly resolved to defend it. Colombia might in a conciliatory spirit be prepared to accept a compromise solution, but nonetheless retained the hope that the Assembly would eventually find a juridical solution to the problem.

43. Mr. Pastrana had not, as the USSR representative had accused him of doing, suggested that simultaneous admission would constitute a violation of the Charter. He had, however, pointed out that it was unlawful to prescribe any conditions for admission other than those laid down in the Charter. He would

accordingly vote against the USSR draft resolution, which would make the admission of one State dependent upon that of another. That condition had been one of the reasons for the present deadlock.

44. He was happy to note that an agreement had been reached between the sponsors of the original draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.10) and the Indian delegation, as the proposals of both had contained elements conducive to the solution of the problem. He would have preferred the words in operative paragraph 1 of the original joint draft resolution, as they implied that the Assembly wished to reserve its right to adopt decisions later if the Security Council persisted in its negative attitude. He would, however, vote for the new joint draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1), on the understanding that the Assembly's request to the Security Council to report to it expressed not only a desire for information but also the intention of fulfilling its obligations under the Charter. His delegation supported the first paragraph of the preamble without reservations, since it stated the principle of the universality of the United Nations and reaffirmed the necessity and adequacy of the provisions of the Charter. Indeed, it was on those two grounds that paragraph 2 of the operative part asked the Security Council for positive recommendations. He did not share the doubts voiced by some representatives concerning paragraph 3; he hoped that it might produce valuable results. He also supported paragraph 4: the outstanding qualities of the members of the Committee of Good Offices and the experience which they had acquired should enable the Committee to discharge its task.

45. The draft resolution contained in document A/AC.76/L.9/Rev.1 seemed superfluous, as it merely listed certain countries and stated the principles also set forth in document A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1. His delegation would accordingly abstain from voting on that text. On the other hand, it would vote for the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.76/L.4, as there was much evidence that the case of Laos and of Cambodia called for separate examination. The admission of those countries to the United Nations would be a logical consequence of the Geneva agreements. His support for that draft resolution did not mean that Colombia had changed its attitude towards the other candidates for admission. For that reason he could not support without reserve the draft resolution submitted by India and Indonesia (A/AC.76/L.14), which seemed to imply approval of the draft resolutions listed in it; his delegation was doubtful of the merits of some of them.

46. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America) supported draft resolution A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1. He hoped that the Committee of Good Offices would achieve progress, and thanked its members for having agreed to continue their efforts. However, he wished to express a reservation in regard to paragraph 3 of the operative part, which seemed to imply that the representatives of States which were members of the Security Council would be in a better position to solve the problem at one of the periodic meetings provided for in Article 28, paragraph 2 of the Charter than would the representatives of the same States at a regular meeting. In his opinion, such an assumption was unwarranted, and he would therefore abstain in its vote on that paragraph.

47. His delegation had already indicated that it would vote for the Indian-Indonesian draft resolution (A/

AC.76/L.4). It would also vote for draft resolution A/AC.76/L.9/Rev.1, under the terms of which the General Assembly would reaffirm that the States listed were qualified for admission; it had submitted an amendment (A/AC.76/L.13) to that resolution, proposing the addition to the list of two countries, namely, the Republic of Korea and Viet-Nam, whose eligibility for admission had also been recognized in the past. His delegation would vote against the USSR draft resolution, which still excluded five States which the General Assembly had found to be fully qualified for admission and included five others which were not qualified and which had never received majority support either in the Security Council or in the General Assembly. In conclusion, he reserved his right to comment on the draft resolution of India and Indonesia (A/AC.76/L.14).

48. Mr. HAMDANI (Pakistan) supported draft resolution A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1. Paragraph 3 of the operative part of that draft suggested recourse to an important procedure which had not hitherto been tried. His delegation's support of that draft resolution did not in any way affect its position in regard to the draft on Laos and Cambodia (A/AC.76/L.4), which was of a declaratory nature and took into account recent developments which had strengthened the case of these countries for admission. The adoption of the latter draft resolution would not imply any lack of interest on the part of the General Assembly in the applications of other States; had that been the case, Pakistan would not have agreed to become one of its sponsors. Its rejection would give the impression that the Committee did not attach due importance to the Geneva agreements and that it was departing from the stand the General Assembly had taken in the past. For that reason, he would urge the Committee not to adopt the draft resolution of India and Indonesia (A/AC.76/L.14).

49. In conformity with its firm belief in the universality of the United Nations, his delegation would vote for draft resolution A/AC.76/L.9/Rev.1, and the amendment to it (A/AC.76/L.13). It would also vote for the USSR draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.7/Rev.1), but would abstain in the separate vote on the word "simultaneous", which appeared in that text and which was contrary to the spirit and letter of the Charter.

50. Mr. RIBAS (Cuba) said he would vote for the United States amendment (A/AC.76/L.13). So far as the USSR draft resolution was concerned, his delegation had always opposed the procedure of simultaneous admission, even in 1946, when it had represented a genuine political compromise. Recalling the terms of the advisory opinion given by the International Court of Justice on 28 May 1948¹ and of General Assembly resolution 197 (III) which had been based on that opinion, he pointed out that simultaneous admission as proposed by the USSR was contrary to the letter and the spirit of the Charter and also to the Court's opinion, which had been endorsed by the General Assembly. The Cuban delegation would therefore vote against the USSR draft resolution. It would vote for the draft resolution relating to the admission of Laos and Cambodia. It reserved the right to speak on the draft resolution of India and Indonesia at a later stage.

51. Mr. PERRY (New Zealand) said he would vote for the new joint draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.11/

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

Rev.1). His delegation felt that the Committee of Good Offices should continue its work and that the Security Council, in its further consideration of individual applications should have before it a full record of the *Ad Hoc* Committee's discussions. His delegation interpreted paragraphs 3 and 5 of the operative part to mean that the action to be taken was left to the Security Council's discretion. It assumed that members of the Council would first consult one another informally on the desirability of invoking Article 28, paragraph 2 and on the possibility of reporting to the Assembly within a period of a few weeks.

52. After the Committee had voted on the four-Power draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1), his delegation might wish to explain its position on the other proposal and amendments. As it had already indicated, it would vote for the draft resolution relating to the admission of Laos and Cambodia; it held that there was no conflict between draft resolution A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1 and the proposal relating to Laos and Cambodia and that there was no reason why the General Assembly should not express its views on the eligibility of those two countries. Thirty-eight members of the General Assembly and ten members of the Security Council had voted for their admission in 1952. Respect for their sovereignty and independence had been affirmed in the Geneva Declaration, and there were special reasons why the Assembly should express an opinion on their applications for admission at the current session.

53. Mr. ORTEGA (Chile) drew attention to the observation made by the Committee of Good Offices that all possibilities of reaching an understanding had not been exhausted and that there was some hope of harmonizing the different views. His delegation had welcomed that assertion; it was prepared to co-operate in any endeavour which might lead to a solution without departing from the principles of the Charter. It was in that spirit that it would vote for the four-Power draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1); even if the suggested methods of reaching an understanding did not prove successful, the further effort would serve a useful purpose in that it would emphasize the need for the review of the Charter which was to take place in 1955. In that event, the only course remaining open would be to adopt the juridical approval, which would permit the Assembly to follow the democratic procedure of majority decision and thus to vote once and for all on each application.

54. However, his delegation would abstain on the second part of paragraph 2 and on paragraph 3 of the operative part. On the other hand, it would vote for the draft resolutions contained in documents A/AC.76/L.9/Rev.1 and A/AC.76/L.4. It would abstain on the United States amendment (A/AC.76/L.13), which might further complicate the search for a solution and which marked a departure from the conciliatory trend reflected in the draft resolution to which it related. It would vote against the USSR draft resolution, since the proposal for simultaneous admission was inconsistent with the Charter. It would also vote against the draft resolution of India and Indonesia (A/AC.76/L.14), as its adoption would imply the acceptance of certain ideas which were not shared by the Chilean delegation, ideas which inspired such proposals as those in documents A/AC.76/L.7/Rev.1 and A/AC.76/L.13.

55. Mr. MACIEL (Brazil) thought that although the problem of the admission of new Members could only

be settled at the political level, its solution should nevertheless be in conformity with Article 4 of the Charter.

56. His delegation would support the joint draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1); it would, however, abstain on paragraph 3 of the operative part, if that were put to the vote separately, since it saw no point in making the proposed suggestion to the Security Council. The suggestion might have the opposite effect from that desired.

57. For the reasons so cogently stated by the representative of Australia (25th meeting), his delegation would vote for draft resolution A/AC.76/L.4, and would also vote for draft resolution A/AC.76/L.9/Rev.1, which supplemented the former proposal.

58. It would have been prepared to vote for the USSR draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.7/Rev.1), had it not included the word "simultaneous". If the connotation of the word had been merely chronological, his delegation would have seen no objection to it, but the sponsors of the draft resolution appeared to give it a political interpretation which the Brazilian delegation could not accept.

59. Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa) supported draft resolution A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1. However, if it was put to the vote paragraph by paragraph, he would abstain on paragraph 3, which could not at present be applied and therefore seemed to serve no useful purpose. Furthermore, since his delegation thought it inadvisable to fix a time-limit for the submission of a report by the Committee of Good Offices, it would therefore also abstain in the vote on paragraph 5.

60. His delegation would vote against the draft resolution submitted by India and Indonesia (A/AC.76/L.14). Its inclusion of a reference to the draft resolution relating to the admission of Laos and Cambodia (A/AC.76/L.4) presupposed that that proposal would not be put to the vote. His delegation considered it necessary, however, that the Committee should vote on that draft resolution, first because the admission of Cambodia and Laos was of special importance in the present circumstances and secondly because the question constituted a separate agenda item. Moreover, since paragraph 2 of the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1 provided that the Assembly should send back the pending applications to the Security Council, together with the full records of the discussions, separate reference to the Council of the draft resolution submitted on that question was unnecessary.

61. Mr. PALAMAS (Greece) welcomed the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1, which was obviously submitted in a spirit of conciliation; he particularly appreciated the first paragraph of the preamble, which affirmed the principle of the universality of the United Nations.

62. His delegation also welcomed the operative part, and in particular paragraph 4, which requested the Committee of Good Offices to continue its efforts. As had been pointed out, Peru would be a member of the Security Council in 1955. No one would, therefore, be better situated than Mr. Belaúnde, the Peruvian representative, to act as a link between the Security Council and the Committee of Good Offices of which he was Chairman.

63. His delegation had already explained (21st meeting) why it considered the admission of Cambodia and

Laos to be of special importance. It therefore unreservedly supported the draft resolution concerning the admission of those two countries (A/AC.76/L.4). By adopting that draft resolution, the Assembly would be giving its moral support to the peoples of those countries which had just attained their independence and would be setting an encouraging precedent for the peoples of other countries which were still waiting for their freedom. If, therefore, the Committee decided to postpone a decision on the other draft resolutions submitted to it, it should at least express forthwith its desire to see Cambodia and Laos admitted to membership in the United Nations.

64. Mr. VAVRICKA (Czechoslovakia) recalled that his delegation had always opposed any discrimination, favourable or unfavourable, in regard to States applying for admission and that it had constantly stressed the responsibilities of the Security Council in the matter of the admission of new Members.

65. He would vote for the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union (A/AC.76/L.7/Rev.1). The fourteen States listed in that draft resolution fulfilled the requirements prescribed in Article 4 of the Charter. The Soviet draft therefore constituted the best and most equitable solution to the problem of the admission of new Members.

66. The draft resolution contained in document A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1 was a realistic attempt to escape from the present deadlock. Moreover, that draft recognized the principle laid down in the Charter — a principle to which his country was particularly attached — of the Security Council's primary responsibility in the matter of the admission of new Members. His delegation would therefore vote for that draft resolution.

67. Where the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.76/L.4 was concerned, the Polish and Indian representatives had indicated that consideration of the question of the admission of Laos and Cambodia would be contrary to the spirit and to the letter of the Geneva agreements and would not facilitate a general settlement of the question of Indo-China. His delegation would therefore vote against that draft resolution.

68. The draft resolution contained in document A/AC.76/L.9/Rev.1 was an example of certain countries' discrimination between applicant States, a discrimination which his country opposed. His delegation would accordingly vote against that proposal.

69. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) wished to make a few comments on the reservations, which the Ecuadorean representative had expressed in regard to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1, in requesting a separate vote on the words "and positive recommendations".

70. The construction which the Ecuadorean representative had placed on the word "recommendations" did not run counter to the intentions of the draft resolution's sponsors. It was a fact, however, that a recommendation could be negative or positive. The Security Council and the General Assembly had adopted negative recommendations in the past, as, for example, when they had called upon States to refrain from certain acts. Furthermore, where recommendations by the Security Council to the General Assembly on the applications for admission of candidate States were concerned, the Advisory Commission of Jurists at the San

Francisco Conference had expressed the view² that the Assembly was free to accept or reject a negative recommendation by the Security Council. The intention of the joint draft resolution's sponsors was to ask the Security Council to make not negative, but positive recommendations, and it was for that reason that they had felt it necessary to specify that fact in the paragraph in question. Under resolution 506 A (VI), moreover, the permanent members of the Security Council were requested to confer with one another with a view to assisting the Council to come to positive recommendations to the General Assembly in regard to the pending applications for membership. The expression "positive recommendations" did not in any way affect the General Assembly's powers of decision.

71. Mr. BENITES VINUEZA (Ecuador) thanked the Argentine representative for the explanations he had given.

72. He still thought, however, that a recommendation was, by definition, positive, at least according to the interpretation of the Spanish word *recomendación* given in the dictionary of the Spanish Academy. Either the Security Council made a positive recommendation or it made no recommendation at all. In the latter case it submitted to the General Assembly a special report which, under rule 138 of the rules of procedure, was given full consideration by the Assembly. Moreover, the General Assembly had no power to require the Security Council to make positive recommendations. The Ecuadorean delegation therefore maintained its position on the final phrase in question. In the interests of harmony his delegation would not press for a separate vote on paragraph 2 of the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1, but it wished its position to be recorded in the summary record of the meeting.

73. Mr. HUDICOURT (Haiti), wishing to dispel the Ecuadorean representative's doubts, pointed out that, under Article 10 of the Charter, the General Assembly could make recommendations to the Security Council on any matters within the scope of the Charter, which implied that those recommendations could be either positive or negative.

74. Mr. ORTEGA (Chile) asked for a separate vote on the last phrase in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1, as he shared the Ecuadorean representative's doubts regarding that provision.

75. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote in parts the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1.

The preamble was adopted by 59 votes to none.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 56 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The first part of paragraph 2, up to and including the words "for further consideration", was adopted by 56 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The remainder of paragraph 2 was adopted by 55 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 2, as a whole, was adopted by 56 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 41 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 59 votes to none.

² See *United Nations Conference on International Organization*, II/1/39.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 56 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

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

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 59 votes to none.

77. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, as the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.76/L.11/Rev.1 had been adopted, he did not insist on a vote on the Soviet draft resolution contained in document A/AC.76/L.7/Rev.1. He wished, however, to express his delegation's thanks to the delegations which had supported its proposal.

78. Mr. LALL (India) thought that it would be preferable for the Committee not to vote on the other draft resolutions at the present meeting. The Indian and Indonesian delegations had submitted a draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.14) which should be put to the vote first in view of its procedural nature. He personally would like to make a statement on the matter, and other delegations would no doubt wish to comment on it; some of them had already reserved the right to do so. In view of the lateness of the hour, it seemed desirable to adjourn the meeting.

79. Mr. HOPPENOT (France) saw no reason why the Indian and Indonesian draft resolution, which had been submitted last, should have priority over the other

proposals before the Committee. The Committee should be consulted on that point.

80. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) thought there could be no doubt whatever that the Indian and Indonesian draft resolution could receive priority in the matter of voting. Rule 132 of the rules of procedure allowed the Committee to adopt a procedure differing from the standard procedure prescribed in that rule. That was, therefore, a question that had to be settled first of all. If the draft was adopted the Committee would have completed that agenda item. If it was rejected, the Committee could then take a decision on the desirability of adjourning the meeting.

81. Sir Percy SPENDER (Australia) supported the Argentine representative's view.

82. Mr. HUDICOURT (Haiti) was in favour of adjournment. He himself would like to make a statement in support of the draft resolution; it was probable that other delegations would also like to speak, and the hour was late.

83. Mr. LALL (India), supported by Mr. TAKIED-DINE (Lebanon), formally moved the adjournment of the meeting.

The motion was adopted by 41 votes to 8, with 6 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.