

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SESSION
Official Records



**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 218th
MEETING**

Tuesday, 6 December 1960,
at 3.35 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 23: <i>Question of an increase in the membership of the Security Council and of the Economic and Social Council (continued)</i>	199

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

AGENDA ITEM 23

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

1. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to vote first, in accordance with rule 131 of the rules of procedure, on the amendments (A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1) to draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3.
2. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic), speaking on a point of order, suggested that since it appeared likely that the same thing would happen to draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3 as had happened to draft resolution A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 at the previous meeting, the Committee might refrain from voting on it and on the amendments in document A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1. That was not a formal proposal, but simply a suggestion intended to avoid acrimony and save time. On the other hand, he saw no reason why the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1) should not be put to the vote.
3. Mr. CALERO RODRIGUEZ (Brazil) said that he would support that suggestion, for practical reasons. Members of the Committee had had the opportunity when the votes were taken at the previous meeting to express their views on the revision of the Charter.
4. Mr. BEELEY (United Kingdom) said that the point made by the representative of the United Arab Republic applied equally to the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1). The Committee could either close the debate or vote on all the draft resolutions before it; he himself had no objection to either course.
5. The CHAIRMAN said that before passing on to the last draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1) the Committee must first decide whether it wished to vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3 and on the amendments in document A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1.
6. Mr. NORIEGA (Colombia) said it was his understanding that the effect of deciding to vote would be to allow a period of grace, during which members of the Committee would have the opportunity to come to an agreement. That being so, the United Kingdom representative's position appeared to be the most reasonable and the most logical.

7. Mr. HOOD (Australia) fully supported that view. He himself felt that all the proposals should be put to the vote. However, draft resolution A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1 was incomplete; it was hard to know what the Committee would have decided by approving it, seeing that a blank had been left in paragraph 1 of the operative part.

8. Mr. JHA (India) had assumed that after a vote had been taken on draft resolution A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and the amendments in document A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1, draft resolutions A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3 and A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1 would be put to the vote, on the clear understanding that the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3 would be able to withdraw their draft if they wished. It was premature to consider whether a vote should be taken on draft resolution A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1, though he would be glad to see it put to the vote, since it dealt with an entirely different subject. While it might have been possible to amalgamate the two original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3), draft resolution A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1 was quite separate.

9. Mr. DOSUMU-JOHNSON (Liberia) suggested that parts A and B of draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3, as amended, should be regarded as two quite distinct texts.

10. Mr. BOURGUIBA (Tunisia) felt that while the Committee could refrain from voting on draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3 and the amendments in document A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1 on the grounds that the result of the vote would probably be the same as at the previous meeting, that was no reason for setting aside draft resolution A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1, which was entirely different in spirit and purpose.

11. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) felt that the discussion in progress was a useful and constructive one. The Indian representative would certainly understand that it would be difficult for the many sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3 to consult together in order to decide whether to withdraw their text. In any event, the Committee could at any time take a decision on the subject. As one of the co-sponsors of that draft resolution, he would be prepared to withdraw it, if all representatives agreed that in view of the results of the voting on the other draft resolutions, the matter should be closed for the moment. It was too late to hope for a compromise solution at the present session. That being so, the wiser course would be to postpone the matter till next year, in the hope that progress would be made towards a solution in the interval.

12. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that under rule 129 of the rules of procedure, voting could be interrupted only on a point of order. The discussion which had been taking place, although useful, could not continue indefinitely. The Committee should vote

successively on the two procedural motions before it, beginning with the suggestion of the representative of the United Arab Republic. If the latter was put to the vote, the Mexican delegation would abstain. If it was not adopted, the Committee would then have to vote on the various proposals.

13. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) said it would be useful if the United Kingdom representative would explain his position more fully—a matter of great importance in view of the fact that the co-operation of the permanent members of the Security Council would be essential to the smooth working of a committee set up under draft resolution A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1.

14. Mr. BEELEY (United Kingdom) said that he had simply made a comment on the suggestion put forward by the representative of the United Arab Republic. He felt that as a matter of simple logic there were only two alternatives before the Committee: to continue with the voting or to close the debate at once. He himself was prepared to accept either course.

15. Mr. CALERO RODRIGUEZ (Brazil) agreed that draft resolution A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1 was quite different from the other drafts, and that there was no connexion between it and the draft resolutions on which the Committee had voted on the previous day. He for his part would vote against that draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1), because it was not a practical proposal, took no definite stand on the principle of redistribution and did not specify the composition of the proposed committee. The Liberian representative's suggestion that the amendments in document A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1 should be divided into two quite separate parts was not acceptable, since Part B would then go beyond the scope of the question under discussion. Redistribution must be coupled with an increase in the membership of the two Councils.

16. Mr. DIMECHKIE (Lebanon), supported by Mr. TETTAMANTI (Argentina), said that unless the sponsors of the draft resolutions withdrew their texts, it would be impossible to avoid a vote. Accordingly, he proposed that in order to save time all the amendments before the Committee should immediately be put to the vote all together.

17. Mr. JHA (India), referring to the Australian representative's statement, pointed out that if draft resolution A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1 was approved, there would be time to hold informal consultations on the exact composition of the committee before the matter was taken up by the General Assembly.

18. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that under rule 132 of the rules of procedure the Committee could decide after each vote whether to vote on the next proposal. There was therefore no need for a complex procedure; all that was necessary was that the Chairman should put that prior question to the vote.

19. Mr. BEELEY (United Kingdom) pointed out that rule 132 of the rules of procedure applied only where two or more proposals related to the same question. The meaning of the expression "the same question" was clear. On the previous day the Committee had voted on the subject of the composition of the Economic and Social Council; what was not being discussed was the Security Council. Moreover, rule 132

would apply with more force to the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1).

20. The CHAIRMAN said that he had acted in a spirit of conciliation and with a view to achieving general agreement. In his view, according to the strict letter of the rules of procedure rule 132 did not apply, since in principle the voting had already begun.

21. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said it mattered little whether or not a vote was taken on the draft resolutions: they would not affect the situation in any way, since they were of purely academic significance. However, he could not accept the Chairman's interpretation of rule 132 of the rules of procedure, which would set a dangerous precedent. According to the Chairman rule 132 did not apply to the present situation, because the voting had already begun. In point of fact, the voting had been interrupted solely so that the Committee could decide whether it wished to vote on the next proposal or not. If that was denied, a veritable vicious circle might result. When the Committee had several draft resolutions before it, any representative was entitled, after a first vote had been taken, to ask whether the Committee wished to vote on the next proposal. Accordingly, he would like to ask the Committee to decide whether it wished to vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3 and the amendments in document A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1.

22. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) pointed out that while draft resolution A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5, on which the Committee had already voted, and draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3, on which it was about to vote, both related to the agenda item under consideration, they nevertheless had to do with different questions. The USSR representative's interpretation of rule 132 of the rules of procedure was therefore surely wrong.

23. Mr. DOSUMU-JOHNSON (Liberia) said that the sponsors of the amendments (A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1) would be prepared to withdraw their text if the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3 did likewise.

24. Mr. PLAJA (Italy) supported the Lebanese representative's motion that the voting should be begun with a vote on all the amendments.

25. The CHAIRMAN regretted that he was unable to accept the USSR representative's interpretation of rule 132 of the rules of procedure.

26. Mr. DJIKIC (Yugoslavia), explaining his vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and amendment A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1, said that the increase in the number of Member States had brought about a situation which rendered necessary an expansion of the United Nations principal organs. That expansion required amendments to the Charter which he hoped would come about in the near future. Amendment must not be imposed by unilateral decision; it could only be the result of agreement between the States concerned and more especially between the permanent members of the Security Council, who should endeavour to arrive at agreement on that matter at the earliest opportunity. In the meantime, the redistribution of the existing seats would constitute at least a partial solution. That was why his delegation had voted in favour of the amendment A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1. Its vote in favour of the amended version

of draft resolution A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 as a whole should not be construed as approval of the method advocated therein for amending the Charter. If the draft resolution had been put to the vote in its original version, his delegation would have voted against it; and it would vote against draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3 concerning an increase in the membership of the Security Council. A compromise still seemed possible, however, and his delegation would therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1. He hoped that that text would be improved by the incorporation of the idea of redistribution suggested by the African-Asian amendments.

27. Mr. SULEIMAN (Sudan) asked that the amendments relating, respectively, to parts A and B (A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1) should be put to the vote separately.

28. Mr. SEIDENFADEN (Denmark) asked for a separate vote on the word "immediate" and the words "to be effective at this session" in part B of amendment A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1.

29. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the inclusion in draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3 of the words "Part A" and of the amendment to the preamble proposed in document A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1.

Those amendments were adopted by 44 votes to 32, with 16 abstentions.

The amendment (A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1) to operative sub-paragraph 1 (e) of draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3 was adopted by 48 votes to 3, with 41 abstentions.

30. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the inclusion of the word "immediate" and the words "to be effective at this session" in the text of part B proposed in amendment A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1 for insertion after operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

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

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

Abstaining: Cuba, Cyprus, Haiti, Israel, Thailand.

The inclusion of the word "immediate" and of the words "to be effective at this session" was adopted by 49 votes to 42, with 5 abstentions.

31. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment contained in document A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1 proposing the insertion of part B after operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

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

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

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

Part B was approved by 40 votes to 37, with 19 abstentions.

32. Mr. BEELEY (United Kingdom) asked for two separate votes: one on the two preambular paragraphs and the other on the rest of part A of draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3, as amended.

33. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) thought that a vote on the preamble could be avoided and asked for a separate vote on operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of part A of draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3, as amended.

34. Mr. BEELEY (United Kingdom) accepted that proposal.

35. At the request of Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) the CHAIRMAN put to the vote separately operative sub-paragraph 1 (a) contained in part A of draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3, with particular reference to the words "thirteen" and "eight".

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Ivory Coast, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Japan, Jordan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria,

Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy.

Against: Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Nepal, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Somalia, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq.

Abstaining: Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Niger, Pakistan, Panama, Sudan, Uruguay, Yemen, Burma, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Iran, Israel.

Operative sub-paragraph 1 (a) (part A) of draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3, as amended, was adopted by 42 votes to 32, with 21 abstentions.

The operative part of draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3 (part A) as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 73 votes to 14, with 6 abstentions.

36. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution (A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3) as a whole, as amended.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

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

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

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

Draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3, as amended, was rejected by 42 votes to 36, with 17 abstentions.

37. Mr. MILLET (France) said that his delegation shared the feelings of the African-Asian group, and particularly of the African States recently admitted to the Organization, concerning the need to find a just solution for the problem under discussion. The main reason why debate on that problem was deadlocked was Soviet obstruction. That was what had created,

in many African-Asian delegations, the legitimate desire to remedy the situation by a redistribution of the existing seats. The French delegation was not in principle opposed to such a redistribution, but considered that, given the existing circumstances, it could not take place at the current session. The French delegation was, however, prepared to study, forthwith, the means by which a redistribution might be effected at the sixteenth session, pending the adoption of amendments to the Charter.

38. With regard to the Economic and Social Council, the French delegation had, in its vote, been guided by those considerations, while regretting that no compromise formula could be found. It continued to hope that, between the end of the Committee's discussions and the time when the problem would be examined in plenary meeting, new efforts would be made to arrive at a majority agreement on redistribution. It was in that hope that the French delegation had abstained in the vote on the whole of draft resolution A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3 as amended.

39. Mr. YOSANO (Japan) recalled that at the General Assembly's fourteenth session his delegation, together with that of El Salvador, had proposed the adoption of a draft resolution (136th meeting) whereby a committee would have been set up to study the possibilities of arriving at an agreement which would have enabled the Charter to be amended for the purpose of increasing the membership of the two Councils if no progress had been made at the fifteenth session. The fact was, however, that the Special Political Committee had so far made no progress in that respect. For that reason the Japanese delegation was prepared in the light of resolution 1404 (XIV), to support the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1). If, however, there still seemed to be some likelihood of making progress at the fifteenth session, his delegation would naturally support any constructive proposal to that end.

40. Mr. NONG KIMNY (Cambodia) noted with regret that the Committee had not succeeded in finding a solution for a problem which was admittedly recognized, by all, to be difficult. Moreover, the division of opinion which had been created had led to an impasse. The Cambodian delegation had voted in favour of the amendments submitted by the thirteen Powers (A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1), considering that those amendments might have remedied a situation which was generally regarded as no longer corresponding to the needs of the moment.

41. As the discussion had concluded with a partly negative result, he, in his capacity as chairman of the African-Asian group for November 1960, wished to recall the efforts made by that group to arrive at an agreement. When he and several of his colleagues had sounded out the European and Latin American groups, those groups had, after the lapse of several weeks, given a negative reply. That reply, moreover, had not been preceded by any meeting at which serious discussions on the different standpoints might have been embarked upon. The two groups in question had possibly been unable to negotiate because they themselves had had difficulty in agreeing with each other.

42. At the present juncture there was a risk that, in plenary meeting, the elections to the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council might also lead

to an impasse—which would be an even more serious development, as it would paralyse the work of those two Councils after 1 January 1961. The smaller countries would possibly suffer from that situation more than the larger ones, whatever might have been said about the differences in their respective responsibilities. In order to avoid the Organization being paralysed, a situation which would in the long run be damaging to the interests of all, the negotiations that had been proposed should be started as soon as possible. In that connexion he addressed a friendly but pressing appeal to the Latin American and European groups.

43. Since the two original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3) had been rejected, the Cambodian delegation was left with no alternative but to support the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1). That draft had at least the merit of leaving the question open until the sixteenth session.

44. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) said that he wished, first of all, to supply certain explanations with regard to the statement made by the Cambodian representative. He had taken part in talks between a small group of Latin American delegations and a small group of African-Asian delegations. There were several reasons why the Latin American group had been unable to give its reply before two weeks had elapsed: all the representatives in the General Assembly were overburdened with work, it was difficult to assemble the various groups without some delay, and the taking of decisions on questions of that importance was always a delicate matter. Speaking on behalf of his own delegation, and not of the Latin American group, he said that, with somewhat more flexibility on the part of the African-Asian group, it might have been possible to reach an agreement. Thus, the Latin American group had been prepared to accept, as a compromise solution, the amendments proposed by the representative of Cyprus, although those amendments were not entirely satisfactory in several respects. The African-Asian group, however, had not concurred in that idea. As a result, there had been no alternative but to vote on the original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3) and on the amendments submitted by certain countries of the African-Asian group (A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1, A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1).

45. So far as the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1) was concerned, the Salvadorian delegation had no objections to its substance. It could not, however, vote for a vague text such as that of the first operative paragraph.

46. Mr. WILCOX (United States of America) said that the United Nations could work in harmony only if the majority of its Members saw that their interests were being safeguarded. As a means to that end, the expansion of the two Councils had long been necessary. The first move in that direction should be made at the Assembly's current, fifteenth session, with the adoption of a decision by a two-thirds majority. Such a decision, which was in accordance with the Charter, could be taken by the General Assembly.

47. Two sets of reasons had led the United States delegation to vote against the amendments submitted by Nigeria (A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1). In the first place, a general redistribution of the existing seats would

not, in fact, be a measure easy to implement in so short a time. In the United Nations, preparations for elections began several months before the start of the General Assembly's session, so as to permit the selection of candidates and the clarifying, in advance, of the election procedure, which otherwise would become too complicated and might accidentally lead to inequitable results. Moreover, an immediate redistribution of existing seats would prejudice the interests of almost half the Members of the Organization. Lastly, redistribution would be tantamount to sanctioning the position of those who, for political reasons unconnected with the problem under discussion, were blocking any increase in the Council's membership. The United States delegation did not intend to lend itself to such a manoeuvre. There was no doubt on anyone's part that the only fair way of ensuring equitable geographical distribution for all was to expand the Councils, a procedure which the great majority of Member States approved.

48. With regard to the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1), he did not see what the proposed committee could well do. The question of the Councils' expansion had been discussed at length, and the positions on each side were perfectly clear. For more than four weeks the Committee itself had explored every possibility, without arriving at a solution. What more could the proposed committee do? Moreover, the result of the votes which had just been taken gave no sufficiently clear guidance for such a committee. In those circumstances the committee's establishment could only arouse vain hopes, a development which had its dangers. It would therefore be better to leave things as they were until the sixteenth session.

49. Mr. DOSUMU-JOHNSON (Liberia) said that he would vote against the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1), since there was no reason to think that the proposed committee would achieve any useful results. Such steps could never solve the problem unless the great Powers concerned showed that they were ready to make concessions of some kind. The Soviet delegation had made it clear that it would accept no amendment of the Charter unless certain conditions were fulfilled.

50. Mr. SEIDENFADEN (Denmark) recalled that he and several other delegations had tried during the past few days to find a compromise between, on the one hand, the very reasonable wishes of the African-Asian group for redistribution, and on the other hand, the fact that such a redistribution was for well-known reasons not possible in the current year. The aim of those delegations had been to bring about an agreement on redistribution the following year. He expressed regret that such an agreement had not been reached.

51. Mr. JHA (India) defended the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1), against the charges that it served no purpose and was vague about the composition of the proposed committee. Draft resolutions A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3 had certainly been less useful since they were designed to bring about amendments of the Charter even though there was at present no chance that all the permanent members of the Security Council would ratify them. In the circumstances, the setting-up of the committee proposed in the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1) would at

least have the advantage of allowing negotiations to continue. The machinery proposed was very simple and would not impose any preconceived formula on anyone. The contemplated committee would be bound only to take into account all the views expressed in the General Assembly. It would be able to study more carefully the many sides of the difficult problem of the redistribution of seats, and it could examine the future composition both of the Security Council and of the various functional commissions which it was thought desirable to enlarge. Practical solutions were in any case more likely to emerge from closed meetings than from open meetings such as those of the Special Political Committee.

52. The sponsors of the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1) had thought that the exact composition of the proposed committee could be settled in the General Assembly or in informal talks.

Also, for example, the President of the General Assembly might be asked to appoint the members.

53. Although the Committee had rejected the two original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3) that was no argument against adopting the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1), which actually recommended a completely different method. In any case, it would be best to postpone the vote on the five-Power draft resolution, so that certain aspects of it could, as necessary, be clarified. He accordingly proposed that the meeting should be adjourned.

The motion for the adjournment of the meeting proposed by the representative of India was adopted by 46 votes to 8, with 31 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.