



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 23: The question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of <i>apartheid</i> of the Government of the Union of South Africa.....	401
Reports of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Political Committee and the Fifth Committee	
Agenda item 53: Question of the continuation of the United Nations Tribunal in Libya.....	405
Report of the Sixth Committee	
Agenda item 14: Election of three non-permanent members of the Security Council (<i>continued</i>).....	405

President: Mr. José MAZA (Chile).

AGENDA ITEM 23

The question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of the Union of South Africa

REPORTS OF THE *Ad Hoc* POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/3026) AND THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/3064)

Mr. King (Liberia), *Rapporteur* of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, presented the report of that Committee.

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Before calling upon representatives who wish to explain their votes on the draft resolution presented by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee [A/3026], I wish to draw the attention of representatives to the report on the financial implications of that draft resolution submitted by the Fifth Committee [A/3064].

2. In addition to these two documents, there is an amendment by Costa Rica [A/L.205] to the draft resolution of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

3. Representatives wishing to explain their votes on the draft resolution may deal with the amendment also.

4. Mr. FERNANDEZ DURAN (Costa Rica) (*translated from Spanish*): When the question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of the Union of South Africa was before the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee a few days ago, the Costa Rican delegation clearly explained its position, which I shall take the liberty of recapitulating.

5. First, my delegation wishes to reiterate its view that this item should be retained on the agenda, because it is anxious that this problem, which is a standing affront to human dignity, should be solved as soon as

circumstances permit. Secondly, we consider that as the United Nations Commission on the Racial Situation in the Union of South Africa is not admitted into the country by the Government of the Union, it cannot contribute to the settlement of the problem. Thirdly, we feel that the continuation of the Commission would mean the postponement of the proper consideration of the substantive problem for at least one more year.

6. For these reasons the Costa Rican delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, but will abstain on paragraphs 7, 8, 9 and 10 of the operative part, concerning the continuation of the Commission.

7. In order to reaffirm this position, which Costa Rica shares with several other countries represented in this Assembly, my delegation proposes that a final paragraph should be added to the draft resolution reading as follows [A/L.205]:

"11. *Decides* to continue consideration of this question at its eleventh session."

8. My delegation feels that it is necessary to state expressly the wish of an appreciable majority of Member States that the item should be kept on the General Assembly's agenda until a satisfactory solution has been found.

9. My delegation also considers it desirable not to make discussion of the item at the General Assembly's next session conditional on the presentation of the report of the Commission referred to in the draft resolution.

10. The paragraph which the Costa Rican delegation proposes as the final paragraph of the operative part would also reaffirm the competence of the United Nations to study the problem of the racial situation in the Union of South Africa with a view to finding a satisfactory solution.

11. Mr. LALEAU (Haiti) (*translated from French*): As in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, I shall speak briefly from this rostrum, and I shall try not to go beyond the bounds I have set myself. Arguments invariably lose force when spun out, and few words are needed to indicate any logical standpoint chosen deliberately and honestly.

12. The reason underlying my delegation's support for the draft resolution now under consideration [A/3026] and of which Haiti was one of the sponsors is that it seems to us the only way to proceed steadily towards the solution of this serious and vexatious problem which for four long years has been one of our chief concerns. Any delay, however slight, in setting a date for the grant of justice and equality to those who are denied them and satisfying world public opinion is another blow to the very prestige of the United Nations and places its future in jeopardy.

13. Two or three speakers continued in committee to challenge the competence of the General Assembly in

this matter. But the question is settled, the General Assembly having decided, by a crushing and significant majority, "that governmental policies... which are designed to perpetuate or increase discrimination, are inconsistent with the pledges of the Members under Article 56 of the Charter" [resolution 616 B (VII)]. Nothing could be clearer or more categorical. Those who do not agree have only one course now — to say nothing, to observe a respectful silence reflecting their allegiance to an Organization of which they are a part, whose discipline they have helped to establish, and which unfortunately for them has decided by a two-thirds majority against their point of view. This too is democracy.

14. Our anxiety that the United Nations Commission on the Racial Situation in the Union of South Africa should continue the work it has undertaken and carried on with a disinterestedness, patience and courage to which we have all of us at one time or another paid a well-deserved tribute, is not born of the belief that it is the ideal solution; it is simply the unmistakable token of our determination not to dismiss from our minds the still unsolved problem, but, on the contrary, to work for a solution which, without in any way hurting the dignity of a sovereign State represented here among us, will safeguard the world peace which it is our duty to maintain, and afford protection for human beings, whose rights we can never see unnecessarily or unjustly violated without betraying our fundamental principles. If anyone can produce a better and more effective solution than extending the Commission's terms of reference, we will endorse it at once.

15. This is the mood and the purpose of the draft resolution. Highly dignified in presentation, and accurate yet very courteous in its wording, it offers the United Nations a chance to dispose of an issue whose settlement would help to establish a policy of solidarity among a friendly people. At the same time, it would help to allay the concern of the world, which has its eyes on us constantly and would censure us if we did not speed up the day of salvation for millions of our fellow-men unnecessarily condemned to vegetate in obscurity and to grope in the darkness. It could very well happen that one day these millions, worn out by endless suffering, might pin their last hopes of freedom on an attractive doctrine which held out before their tear-dimmed eyes the mirage of a paradise where, in times of tension and toil as in times of relaxation and leisure, man thinks of his fellow-man in a spirit of solidarity and love.

16. In my statement before the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, I ventured to point out to the Government of the Union of South Africa, to which we obstinately hold out the hand of friendship — and will continue to do so until it is grasped — that history is watching us, weighing, taking note, judging; and often there is no appeal against it.

17. A few minutes after I had spoken, Mr. Rodríguez Fabregat, the representative of Uruguay, in words which came from the bottom of his heart and went straight to our own hearts, called to witness the conscience of mankind which lauds acts of self-sacrifice and extols noble deeds with the same incorruptible impartiality as it brings to the condemnation of justice disguised as sound discipline and to the disclosure of wickedness masking its tortured features under the reassuring and disarming mask of justice and law.

18. In conclusion, let me try to go still further and appeal to the Union of South Africa to remember those few words — so humbly human that at the time when they were spoken they could only have been uttered by a God — which after two thousand years are still as fresh as the dew, and still resound in the hearts of all who aspire to the noble name of man: "Love ye one another." Let the minority in power in the Union of South Africa take these words to heart. If it does, it will no doubt mean giving up a number of paltry privileges, and perhaps its self-respect will suffer in a minor way. But in compensation it will attain that real greatness, a greatness which, as the poet said, binds not but loosens. Thus it will attain that peace of mind which the philosopher of the *Prolegomena* could compare only to the splendour of a starry night.

19. Mr. MENON (India): My delegation intervenes in this debate at this stage of explanations of vote not in order actually to explain its vote or to enter into the merits of the question. I request representatives to refer to paragraph 10 of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee to the Assembly [A/3026]. That paragraph refers to the withdrawal of the South African delegation and the permanent representative to the United Nations from the present session of the General Assembly. I speak in order to express, on behalf of my delegation and my Government, our extreme regret at the absence of the South African delegation and the decision of the South African Government to withdraw from this session of the Assembly.

20. Everyone is aware of my delegation's attitude towards its opponents on any issues that arise in the Assembly. Our opposition is not directed towards the country or the delegation, or towards any aspect of the thoughts of the country or delegation: rather, our opposition relates to those issues which affect what we regard as the fundamental principles of the Charter.

21. Since the South African delegation is not here, it would be improper for me to make any references to what the South African representative said when he and his colleagues withdraw from the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. I do, however, want to assure the General Assembly — if any assurance is necessary — that my Government and people have at no time followed, in connexion with affairs concerning the Union of South Africa, what the South African delegation was pleased to characterize, to my regret, as a vendetta. Had it been a vendetta, I fear that we should not have been able to carry with us, year after year, the great majority of the Assembly in votes on this and other questions.

22. As I said last year, in questions concerning racial discrimination in the Union of South Africa we have year after year carried resolutions by considerable majorities; that is, the vast majority of the Members of the General Assembly have shared our convictions and given us their political support. But there is one vote which we still do not have: the vote of the Union of South Africa. That is my Government's attitude. We believe that, hard as this question may appear, irreconcilable as the attitudes towards it may be, the time will come when a solution will be found — provided that, in the pursuit of the question, we do not introduce hatred and that, to use the terms of the Bandung declaration, we do not ourselves, in trying to resolve the problem, become the victims of it. That is the attitude which my Government and my people take in dealing with the South African question.

23. As regards the particular item before the Assembly, the South African delegation has made a statement which concerns not us so much as the General Assembly as a whole. In withdrawing from the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, the South African representative said this:

“The authority of chance majorities and the building up of spurious case law, not on legal grounds but mainly on the basis of political expediency and sentiment, cannot, in my delegation’s opinion, emasculate the conditions under which membership was originally accepted.

“South Africa has therefore not found any reason, on this legal aspect, to vary in any respect the position which it has always maintained. As I have said in my initial statement to this Committee, our position remains unchanged, our arguments still stand, and they are still valid. We have therefore cast our vote accordingly.”¹

24. I wish to say here and now that we both understand and respect the South African position that the General Assembly has no jurisdiction in this question and is, in fact, barred under Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter from considering it. We hold the other view, namely, that really no infringement of Article 2, paragraph 7, is involved and, furthermore, that the Assembly has the latitude and the obligation, in accordance with the principles enunciated in other Articles of the Charter, to study a matter of this kind, which concerns a fundamental violation of human rights and therefore falls in the same category as other general offences against humanity in various parts of the world.

25. As I said in another context, my delegation recognizes not only the right but the obligation of delegations or individuals to act in accordance with the dictates of their conscience. If a Government or a delegation thinks that its national policies require that certain action should be taken, we respect that position. But we do not accept the view that it is either right or proper for any Government to use that position in order to bring pressure upon the Assembly.

26. We regret the absence of the South African delegation, and we hope that it will return to its place among us in the Assembly. But we submit that the aforementioned statement by the South African representative really amounts to questioning decisions which the Assembly has taken year after year. These have been considered decisions, and they have not been taken by chance majorities. In fact, the statement is a challenge to the Assembly itself. Furthermore, we cannot accept the view that the absence of the Union of South Africa should be regarded as a matter for anything other than regret.

27. That is our position. We wish to emphasize that we feel neither animosity nor hostility toward the Union of South Africa and its Government, and we are certainly not pursuing a vendetta against the Union of South Africa.

28. Mr. BROHI (Pakistan): The attitude of the delegation of Pakistan on this question is very well known. In a detailed statement that the representative of Pakistan made in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, he indicated in sufficient detail the circumstances in

which we felt constrained to support the draft resolution which ultimately came to be accepted. If I have taken the floor at all, it is with a view merely to dealing with one point which arose in the later stages of the debate in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

29. As is well known, a representative who normally should have represented his country in that Committee refused to participate in its proceedings on grounds that are also very well known, and of course the debate did proceed in his absence. But towards the end of that debate, when the vote was about to be taken on the draft resolution itself, he came in to register his vote and proceeded to supplement this by a long statement. During the course of that statement, he happened to refer to what he called the questionable tone and content of the statement that had been made by the representative of Pakistan.

30. At that stage it was too late, and procedurally not possible, for us to explain our position with regard to those remarks, and it is only in an attempt to set the record straight so far as the proceedings of the General Assembly are concerned that I feel called upon to make a very short statement now.

31. I should like to remind the representatives who sat with us in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee of the way in which we addressed ourselves to the task of assisting that Committee to reach a correct conclusion with regard to the position as it obtains in the affairs that now prevail in the Union of South Africa, and this is what we said (I shall read a few paragraphs which represent the introductory remarks that we had to make in order that our position should be rendered plain to the Committee):

“In 1953, when the present item was considered by this Committee, the spokesman of the delegation of Pakistan prefaced his remarks with the statement that he was speaking less in anger than in sorrow. I think that the validity of that attitude, so far as my delegation is concerned, has not undergone any marked or radical change since that time. In fact, if anything, our sense of sorrow is somewhat greater today because we are participating in this Committee’s deliberations in the absence of the representative of the Union of South Africa. I have no doubt that everyone will agree that this fact places greater responsibility upon those who take part in the debate, if only because anything that they say on the subject must remain unrebutted. It would have been infinitely better if the representative of the Union of South Africa had condescended to sit in this Committee and to reply to any suggestions offered by other representatives.

“Hence I repeat that our sense of sorrow is, if anything, somewhat greater than in the past, because the Government primarily concerned in rectifying the situation which is being discussed here is not present to enter a rebuttal.

“I should like to make one further general remark before I turn to my observations on the substance of the question.

“The Government of the Union of South Africa is a friendly Government. We respect its sovereign status. If what the General Assembly is now seeking to do could be construed, even remotely, as implying some kind of intervention within the meaning of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, my delegation would be the last to have anything to do with the

¹ This statement was made at the 12th meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, on 9 November 1955, and appears *in extenso* only in the typed verbatim record. The official record of the meeting is published in summary form.

consideration of the subject matter of the present controversy.

"Hence, with all the care and caution of which we are capable, we should like to state the case as we see it. And if we err at all, we shall err on the side of understatement. I hope and pray that I shall remain faithful to this rule of restriction which must govern a debate of this character, when the Government principally involved has seen fit not to seat its representative at this table."²

32. With all this self-imposed restraint, a statement was made. And, curiously enough, the representative of the Union of South Africa had very unkind observations to make, and he regretted the tone and the content of the statement that had been made by the representative of Pakistan.

33. I have read that statement a second time, and I adhere to every word we said there, with the one added rider that no one gifted with an impartial mind will be able, on reading this statement, to find, directly or indirectly, any single questionable judgement that could conceivably have been passed on a subject of such burning and human importance.

34. I do not wish to enter further into this field because it would be completely extraneous to the scope of the present debate. I do say, however, that the representative of the Union of South Africa was in anger, and since he was in anger one can understand the statement he made. But the fact that he was in anger is no reason why we should be provoked into entering contrary statements.

35. This is by way of an explanation with regard to the remarks that happened to be made in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee when this matter came to be voted upon.

36. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): In accordance with the rules of procedure, I shall first put to the vote the amendment submitted by Costa Rica [A/L.205] to the draft resolution proposed by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee [A/3026].

37. The United Kingdom representative has asked for a separate vote on paragraphs 7, 8, 9 and 10 of the operative part of the draft resolution.

38. A two-thirds majority will be required in respect of all the voting on this item.

39. I shall now put to the vote the amendment submitted by Costa Rica [A/L.205].

The result of the vote was 27 in favour and 15 against, with 15 abstentions.

The amendment was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

40. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I call upon the representative of the United States on a point of order.

41. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): The United States delegation requests that the draft resolution, both the preamble and the operative part, be voted on paragraph by paragraph.

42. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall therefore proceed to vote, paragraph by paragraph, on the draft resolution submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee [A/3026].

² This statement was made at the 9th meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, on 4 November 1955, and appears *in extenso* only in the typed verbatim record. The official record of the meeting is published in summary form.

The result of the vote on the first paragraph of the preamble was 41 in favour and 6 against, with 9 abstentions.

The paragraph was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

The result of the vote on the second paragraph of the preamble was 46 in favour and 4 against, with 6 abstentions.

The paragraph was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

The result of the vote on the third paragraph of the preamble was 45 in favour and 6 against, with 5 abstentions.

The paragraph was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

The result of the vote on the fourth paragraph of the preamble was 46 in favour and 4 against, with 6 abstentions.

The paragraph was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

The result of the vote on operative paragraph 1 was 37 in favour and 6 against, with 13 abstentions.

The paragraph was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

The result of the vote on operative paragraph 2 was 34 in favour and 7 against, with 13 abstentions.

The paragraph was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

The result of the vote on operative paragraph 3 was 34 in favour and 9 against, with 12 abstentions.

The paragraph was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

The result of the vote on operative paragraph 4 was 42 in favour and 7 against, with 8 abstentions.

The paragraph was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

The result of the vote on operative paragraph 5 was 43 in favour and 5 against, with 10 abstentions.

The paragraph was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

The result of the vote on operative paragraph 6 was 39 in favour and 6 against, with 14 abstentions.

The paragraph was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

43. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Indian delegation has asked for a roll-call vote on paragraph 7 of the operative part.

A vote was taken by roll call.

The Byelorussian SSR, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Burma.

Against: Canada, Cuba, Denmark, France, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Australia, Belgium, Brazil.

Abstaining: China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Honduras, Iceland, Sweden, Turkey, Argentina.

The result of the vote was 33 in favour and 17 against, with 9 abstentions.

The paragraph was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

44. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I now put paragraph 8 of the operative part to the vote.

The result of the vote was 27 in favour and 15 against, with 8 abstentions.

The paragraph was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

45. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): As the United Nations Commission on the Racial Situation in the Union of South Africa has been abolished, there is no need to take a vote on paragraphs 9 and 10 of the operative part, which are *ipso facto* rejected.

46. I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole, as amended in consequence of the votes already taken.

The result of the vote was 41 in favour and 6 against, with 8 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

AGENDA ITEM 53

Question of the continuation of the United Nations Tribunal in Libya

REPORT OF THE SIXTH COMMITTEE (A/3062)

Mr. Tammes (Netherlands), Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee, presented the report of that Committee and then spoke as follows:

47. Mr. TAMMES (Netherlands), Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee: It is with a feeling of special satisfaction that I present the report of the Sixth Committee [A/3062] on the question of the continuation of the United Nations Tribunal in Libya.

48. The task of the Sixth Committee in connexion with this problem was more difficult than two years ago, when the General Assembly was also seized of the item and when both Governments concerned, the Governments of Italy and Libya, favoured the continuation of the Tribunal. This time, in their communications to the Secretary-General and in the interventions of their representatives in the Sixth Committee, they took divergent views. The Government of Italy maintained that the continuation of the Tribunal for at least one year was an indispensable safeguard for the future. The Libyan Government, on the other hand, felt that, in view of the substantial progress achieved in the settlement of questions arising under General Assembly resolution 388 A (V), on the economic and financial provisions relating to Libya, the continuation of the Tribunal was not only no longer justified, but could even be detrimental to the successful conclusion of the negotiations in progress between the two Governments.

49. I am happy, therefore, to report that full agreement has been reached between Italy and Libya on the basis of an offer made on behalf of the Libyan Government that, should a legal dispute arise in the future on matters covered by resolution 388 A (V), that Government

would be ready to submit such a dispute to arbitration by a duly qualified body.

50. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee [A/3062] was approved unanimously in committee. I assume, therefore, that the General Assembly will also wish to adopt the text by a unanimous vote.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 14

Election of three non-permanent members of the Security Council (*continued*) *

51. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Twenty-one ballots have so far been held in an effort to elect a non-permanent member of the Security Council. Today the Assembly will begin the third in a series of three restricted ballots. The election will take place in accordance with rules 94 and 95 of the rules of procedure.

52. As a consequence of the ballots already held, the voting on the present occasion will be limited to the Philippines and Yugoslavia. There is no other eligible candidate in this ballot.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Barrington (Burma) and Mr. Kiselyov (Byelorussian SSR) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	58
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	58
<i>Abstentions:</i>	0
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	58
<i>Required majority:</i>	39
<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
Philippines	30
Yugoslavia	28

53. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The present ballot—the twenty-second—has also proved inconclusive. The Assembly will therefore hold the first of a series of unrestricted ballots. All Members of the United Nations are eligible in this ballot, with the exception of those already represented on the Council, and of Australia and Cuba, since these countries have already been elected and will begin their terms on 1 January 1956.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Barrington (Burma) and Mr. Kiselyov (Byelorussian SSR) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	59
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	59
<i>Abstentions:</i>	0
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	59
<i>Required majority:</i>	40
<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
Philippines	30
Yugoslavia	27
Greece	1
Czechoslovakia	1

54. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): This ballot has also proved inconclusive. We shall therefore hold the second in this series of unrestricted ballots.

* Resumed from the 540th meeting.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Barrington (Burma) and Mr. Kiselyov (Byelorussian SSR) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	59
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	59
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	59
Required majority:	40
Number of votes obtained:	
Philippines	31
Yugoslavia	28

55. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): The twenty-fourth ballot has also led to no result. A third unrestricted ballot will therefore be taken.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Barrington (Burma) and Mr. Kiselyov (Byelorussian SSR) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	59
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	59
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	59
Required majority:	40
Number of votes obtained:	
Philippines	32
Yugoslavia	25
Iceland	1
Sweden	1

56. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): The latest ballot has also proved inconclusive. We shall therefore hold a ballot restricted to the two candidates which obtained the greatest number of votes in the previous ballot, namely, the Philippines and Yugoslavia.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Barrington (Burma) and Mr. Kiselyov (Byelorussian SSR) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	59
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	59
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	59
Required majority:	40
Number of votes obtained:	
Philippines	33
Yugoslavia	26

57. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): The first restricted ballot having given no result, we shall now hold the second restricted ballot in this series.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Barrington (Burma) and Mr. Kiselyov (Byelorussian SSR) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	59
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	59
Abstentions:	1
Number of members voting:	58
Required majority:	39

Number of votes obtained:

Philippines	32
Yugoslavia	26

58. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): The second restricted ballot has also been inconclusive. A third restricted ballot will now be held.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Barrington (Burma) and Mr. Kiselyov (Byelorussian SSR) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	59
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	59
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	59
Required majority:	40

Number of votes obtained:

Philippines	32
Yugoslavia	27

59. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): The third and last restricted ballot has been equally inconclusive. Twenty-eight ballots have now been held in all. We shall now begin a fresh series of unrestricted ballots.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Barrington (Burma) and Mr. Kiselyov (Byelorussian SSR) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	59
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	59
Abstentions:	1
Number of members voting:	58
Required majority:	39

Number of votes obtained:

Philippines	29
Yugoslavia	25
Greece	1
Iceland	1
Sweden	1
Syria	1

60. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): The twenty-ninth ballot has proved equally inconclusive. The ballots which have just been held, all with regrettably negative results, show that the deadlock over the vacant seat in the Security Council for the period beginning 1 January 1956 continues.

61. The situation is serious, since only a few days now remain before the date fixed for the end of the present session. What is even more important is the fact that in less than one month's time the terms of office of three of the present members of the Security Council will end, and so far only two members have been elected to replace them.

62. It will be recalled that Article 23 of the Charter stipulates that the Security Council shall consist of eleven members, which, in accordance with Article 24, bear "primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security". Should the Council next January consist of only ten members, it is to be feared that there might be serious legal impediments to its proper working.

63. This situation, I consider, makes it imperative for all representatives to make every effort to break the deadlock. To the same end, the active co-operation of

all those to whom the Organization has entrusted positions of honour and responsibility is also essential. It is to be hoped that the awareness of the obligations which we all feel towards the United Nations will prevail over any other considerations.

64. If no agreement is reached, I for my part am ready to assist the Assembly in reaching a decision by calling a meeting which would not rise until the vacant seat had been filled and the Security Council was again in a

position to fulfil its important task. It would also be desirable to propound some solution to prevent a repetition of such events, which do not redound to the credit of the United Nations.

65. I would ask representatives to think over these suggestions, which I make with the sole purpose of contributing to the normal working of the United Nations.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.