



CONTENTS

Page

Question of admission to membership in the regional economic commissions of States not members of the United Nations (E/2458, E/2553, E/L.591, E/L.592, E/L.596, E/L.597, E/L.598) (continued).....	163
---	-----

President: Mr. Juan I. COOKE (Argentina)

Present:

The representatives of the following countries: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, France, India, Norway, Pakistan, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Observers from the following countries: Chile, Netherlands.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, International Monetary Fund.

Question of admission to membership in the regional economic commissions of States not members of the United Nations (E/2458, E/2553, E/L.591, E/L.592, E/L.596, E/L.597, E/L.598) (continued)

[Agenda item 8]

Mr. NUÑEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba) said that he had always been of the opinion that the unanimity rule did not apply to the admission of new members. His Government had thoroughly studied the question and had come to the conclusion that the right of veto applied only to such questions as the maintenance of peace, the pacific settlement of disputes, threats to the peace, breaches of peace and acts of aggression. An application for membership could therefore be approved by a majority, without the necessity for the concurring votes of the permanent members of the Security Council.

In the case in point the Cuban delegation would support the admission of Japan, Laos and Viet-Nam.

The General Assembly had expressed the view that the countries which had applied for admission to the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) fulfilled the conditions for membership laid down in Article 4 of the Charter. In 1952 in the Security Council 10 votes had been cast in favour of their admission, only the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics having voted against. With regard to Nepal, in September 1949 the members of the Security Council had voted for its admission and two members, the USSR and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, had opposed it. In the case of the Republic of Korea, in April 1949 there had been 10 votes in favour and two against, the USSR and the

Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. A vote had been taken three times in 1948 and 1949 on the question of the admission of Ceylon, and again the result had been nine in favour and two against, the USSR and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

4. Among the States proposed for admission to the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), the admission of Finland had been voted on twice, with nine votes in favour, and two against, each time, the contrary votes having been cast the first time by the USSR and Poland, and the second time by the USSR and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. The admission of Austria had been supported by nine members and opposed by the USSR and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. The admission of Italy had been voted on no less than five times between August 1947 and February 1952, with ten votes in favour and the USSR opposing. There had been three votes on the subject of Portugal's admission, two in 1947 and one in 1949, the result each time being nine in favour and the USSR and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic opposing. Ireland's application had been considered, together with that of Portugal, with the same result: nine votes in favour and contrary votes by the USSR and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

5. The only reason why the USSR had opposed the admission of those States to the United Nations had been that its Government did not maintain diplomatic relations with them. At a later date the USSR had announced both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly that it would be willing to vote for their admission on condition that a number of other States should be admitted *en bloc*, although they had not received the seven affirmative votes in the Security Council required under Article 27 of the Charter. The matter had been referred to the International Court, which had expressed the view¹ that the Charter did not permit a Member to make its affirmative vote dependent on the admission of other States which had not obtained the necessary number of votes.

6. There could be no doubt that the countries which had applied for admission to ECAFE complied with the requirements of Article 4 of the Charter, and having received the necessary majority in the Security Council, were eligible for admission not only to that organ but to the United Nations itself.

7. He would be unable to vote for the Norwegian draft resolution (E/L.596), since he thought that in the best interests of the United Nations the matter should be settled at the present session.

8. He would vote for the joint draft resolution submitted by France, Pakistan and the United States (E/L.591), and also for the joint draft resolution submitted by Belgium and the United States (E/L.592).

9. He would be unable to support the Czechoslovak draft resolution (E/L.597).

¹ International Court of Justice, *Reports of Judgments, Advisory Opinions and Orders*, Advisory Opinion of 28 May 1948.

10. Mr. DE WINTER (Belgium) agreed with the view expressed earlier in the debate that the Council could not apply different principles to the admission of new members to different regional commissions. The Belgian delegation had not joined in sponsoring draft resolution E/L.591 because Belgium was not directly concerned with Asia and the Far East, but it entirely agreed with the principles underlying that draft resolution and would vote in favour of it.

11. The two draft resolutions E/L.591 and E/L.592 were based on the same principles and differed only in the geographical scope of their application and because there were differences in the rules of procedure of the two regional commissions. In both cases the States concerned fulfilled the requisite conditions for membership.

12. In reply to the Czechoslovak representative's remarks at the 779th meeting, he pointed out that the Belgian delegation had consistently opposed the principle of mass admission. Each case should be judged on its merits and in the light of the advantages to be derived from the co-operation of the country in question with the United Nations and its subsidiary bodies.

13. He would be unable to vote for the Norwegian draft resolution (E/L.596).

14. Mr. LOOMES (Australia) said that the Australian delegation entirely subscribed to the conclusion in the Secretary-General's memorandum (E/2458) that the Council had authority by virtue of Article 68 of the Charter to grant full membership in the regional commissions to States which were not members of the United Nations.

15. The Australian delegation also endorsed the Secretary's view that the Council was not legally required to apply the criteria of Article 4 to the admission of non-member States to the regional economic commissions. Nevertheless, as the memorandum went on to say, there was nothing in the Charter to prohibit the Council from taking into account factors such as those mentioned in Article 4 in deciding upon the question of membership in the regional commissions. The test of eligibility for admission to full membership in the regional economic commissions could therefore be based on a number of factors, one of which was eligibility for admission to the United Nations.

16. The draft resolutions before the Council implied that the majority vote in the General Assembly was a factor; that was correct only to the extent that it was one of the factors to be taken into account, but it was not the sole determining factor, and eligibility for admission to membership in the regional commissions could in certain cases be independent of it.

17. As far as the admission of new members to ECAFE was concerned, the Council had before it definite recommendations by ECAFE that it should admit to membership those associate members which were responsible for their own international relations and had applied for membership. There was no doubt that the States mentioned in draft resolution E/L.591 were entitled to full membership in the Commission.

18. In particular, he would stress the claims of Ceylon, which was a full member of the British Commonwealth of Nations and with which Australia maintained close and friendly relations. Ceylon had already shown itself ready and willing to co-operate in the work of ECAFE. It was most unfortunate that, owing to circumstances of which all members of the Council were

aware, Ceylon had been prevented from playing its part as a full Member of the United Nations; it should at least be granted full membership in ECAFE.

19. The Australian delegation felt that somewhat different considerations applied to ECE. He had been impressed by the Norwegian representative's cogent remarks, which he felt should be given full consideration.

20. Mr. KOS (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation's position was based on the principle of universality. On the basis of that principle, it considered that all the countries which participated in the work of ECE and which were genuinely independent should be admitted to full membership. The question was primarily political rather than economic, and he would therefore support the Norwegian proposal (E/L.596) that the question of admission to ECE be deferred. There were signs of an improvement in the atmosphere and of willingness to co-operate in the economic field; to force upon the members of ECE a decision for which they had not asked might have an unfortunate effect.

21. With regard to ECAFE, he would support the applications for membership of Ceylon, Japan and Nepal, all of which met the required criteria and would be able to give valuable co-operation to the Commission.

22. On the other hand, he doubted the wisdom of admitting Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam, since there was not sufficient proof that they fulfilled the required standard of independence. It would seem illogical to agree to their admission to the commission on the ground that they were responsible for their international relations, when at the same time responsible political persons in those countries were demanding independence from France. A decision should therefore be deferred until their status had become clearer.

23. With regard to the Republic of Korea, its Government did not really represent the whole of Korea and to admit it to membership now could only create further difficulties.

24. In view of the above reasons he would be unable to support the admission of those four countries to ECAFE.

25. Mr. SAKSENA (India) said that he had been glad to hear from the Executive Secretary of ECAFE a statement of the Commission's objectives (776th meeting), but felt that those who had listened to him must have been saddened by his concluding remarks in which he had referred to lack of resources and pleaded for the establishment of institutions capable of making adequate financial resources available to that large and important area for development purposes.

26. The countries in the region had been endeavouring to utilize their meagre resources to improve living conditions in the area. India had given technical assistance and provided facilities for training in its institutions to technicians from the area.

27. The Indian delegation's view was that, apart from such help as they could get, the countries of Asia should engage in a co-operative effort to help each other and should utilize the forum provided by ECAFE to consider their needs and devise measures to satisfy them. In order to be an effective medium, that forum should include all the States in Asia which had full control over their own destinies. The Indian delegation regretted that even today ECAFE included a representative of the Government of China, a country which could play a decisive role in the economic r

bilitation of the area. ECAFE could not be said to truly representative of the region so long as China is not a member.

With regard to the admission of other Asian countries to membership in ECAFE, India felt that they should all be enabled to play their respective parts in the great enterprise of economic development, subject to the one qualification that they should be fully sovereign States. That was essential because in the organizations established by the United Nations the voice of the people should be heard and not the voices of subordinate governments which were not based on the people's will.

With reference to the specific issue, the Council had previously decided that it was not competent to admit non-members of the United Nations as full members of the regional commissions. At the fifteenth session (701st meeting), the United States representative had quoted the Secretariat's opinion to prove that the Council was competent, and had stated that it had rejected a similar proposal the previous year in relation to ECE, not because it was not competent, but because Finland, Italy and Switzerland had been lumped together with a number of other States which did not fulfil the requirements of Article 4 of the Charter. That contention had introduced a further complicating factor. Eventually, consideration of the issue had been postponed to the sixteenth session, and the Council had asked for a legal study of the question. That legal study appeared in document E/2458, and its conclusion was that the Council was competent to grant full membership with voting rights in its commissions to States which were not members of the United Nations.

The Indian delegation was not entirely satisfied with the interpretation given and felt that the first step should be to consider it and decide whether or not it was acceptable. Assuming that the interpretation was accepted, the Council should then proceed to consider resolution 12(X) adopted by ECAFE on 18 February 1954 (para. 218 of E/2553), with the terms of which India was in full agreement. The resolution clearly did not imply that all the States which were associate members were entitled, regardless of their political status, to be admitted as full members. The resolution imposed on the Council the obligation to choose from among the candidates for membership only the countries that satisfied the criterion it had specifically prescribed.

No differences of opinion had been expressed with regard to Ceylon, Japan and Nepal; the Indian delegation, in accordance with the views it had expressed, had therefore no objection to their admission.

With regard to the other four States—the three States of Indo-China and the Republic of Korea—the doubt continued to exist. The question when the former would assume independent status was still subject of negotiation, and the Council must decide whether it was prepared to consider that they were responsible for their foreign relations, in the terms of ECAFE resolution 12(X). That was a political question which it would be inappropriate for the Council to decide. It should be the responsibility of the Security Council and the General Assembly, and the Economic and Social Council should defer consideration of the question until a decision had been reached, or until the ambiguity in regard to the status of those States had been cleared up, whichever was earlier. The Indian

delegation had submitted a draft resolution embodying that proposal (E/L.598).

33. It seemed clear from the Secretary-General's memorandum (E/2458) that the Council was under no obligation to apply the criteria of Article 4 of the Charter to the cases under consideration. Whether it should do so or not was a different matter. As long as the Council had taken no decision, it was open to any delegation to insist that those criteria should be met. India was formally opposed to the application of any criteria which would bar admission to membership of countries on the ground that they adhered to the communist or any other ideology. The United Nations as a world forum should make room for all countries, regardless of their political beliefs and in accordance with the principle of universality. On that ground the Indian delegation would oppose draft resolution E/L.592, not from any sentiment of unfriendliness towards the countries it named, but because it could see no sufficient reason why they should be singled out for preferential treatment, without even the excuse that the action had been initiated by ECE. As the Norwegian representative had pointed out at the 779th meeting, by adopting that draft resolution the Council would disturb the harmony which had recently characterized the proceedings of ECE.

34. The Indian delegation would therefore support the Norwegian draft resolution (E/L.596).

35. With regard to the second paragraph of draft resolution E/L.591, he pointed out that a mere declaration of eligibility by the General Assembly was meaningless in terms of the Charter, which required that the question should first be dealt with by the Security Council. As the Security Council had failed to endorse the General Assembly's view, it remained inoperative and should not be quoted as a justification for a move to secure the admission of these States to the regional commissions.

36. Moreover, the General Assembly had merely expressed the view, for the consideration of the Security Council, that certain States were peace-loving within the meaning of Article 4, which Article, according to the Secretary-General, was not pertinent to the matter of admission to the regional commissions. The second paragraph of the draft resolution had thus no bearing on the question and merely confused the issue.

37. In taking its stand India was actuated by no unfriendly sentiments for the countries concerned. On the contrary, it hoped that all countries in Europe which desired to be members of ECE would soon be admitted to full membership, and that the improvement in the status of the three States of Indo-China would remove the last barrier to their admission as full members of ECAFE.

38. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that the discussion in the Council had followed the familiar pattern of previous discussions in the General Assembly and in Security Council on the admission of new members to the United Nations.

39. There were two ways of approaching that question and the related question of membership in the regional economic commission. One was illustrated by the Czechoslovak draft resolution (E/L.597), the effect of which would be to give equal opportunities for full membership to all States which participated in the work of the Economic Commission for Europe. The other approach was exemplified by the draft resolution submitted by Belgium and the United States (E/L.592). It was well

known that the United States was opposed to the development of trade relations between European countries and stood for discrimination against the peoples' democracies, while protecting its own favourites.

40. Draft resolution E/L.592 proposed that paragraph 7 of the terms of reference of ECE should be amended so as to include Austria, Finland, Ireland, Italy and Portugal as members of the Commission. Other European countries, such as Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, had taken an active part in the work of ECE, yet the United States had not called for their admission. That was an extension of the cold war into the field of European trade in pursuance of the United States policy of subordinating the European economy to its own ends. The United States had set up the Organisation for European Economic Cooperation under the Marshall Plan in order to advance its designs of gaining control of European trade. It had therefore viewed the setting up of ECE, a truly European body, with anxiety, and had constantly endeavoured to restrict ECE's activities. That was why the United States wished to impose on ECE a membership in keeping with its own wishes.

41. He regretted that the Belgian representative had seen fit to associate his delegation with such a draft resolution. The Belgian representative had stressed the importance of admitting Austria, Finland, Ireland, Italy and Portugal. What did he think about the importance of admitting Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania? The inclusion of Portugal and Ireland among the countries to which membership was to be extended was difficult to understand. Ireland had not even applied for membership and had never been actively associated with the work of ECE, whereas the Balkan States to which he had referred had always taken an active part in the Commission's work.

42. The argument that the General Assembly had determined that certain States were eligible for membership in the United Nations was specious. States could only be regarded as eligible for membership if the General Assembly and the Security Council had concurred on the desirability of admitting them. Figures purporting to show how many affirmative votes any country's application for membership had received were meaningless. A simple addition of population figures would show that the majority of the people not represented in the United Nations were citizens of those countries to which admission had been denied.

43. It was well known that some representatives in the Security Council and in the Economic and Social Council waited to see how the United States would vote before casting their own votes. It was regrettable that political considerations should have delayed the admission to membership in the United Nations of the fourteen States whose applications were supported by the Soviet Union, but it would be even more regrettable if that particular manifestation of the cold war were to invade the Economic and Social Council. The United Nations was not an association of countries thinking entirely like the United States; membership was open to all nations which accepted the principles of the Charter.

44. His delegation, while not supporting the draft resolution submitted by France, Pakistan and the United States (E/L.591), had no objection in principle to the admission to ECAFE of Ceylon, Japan and Nepal, provided that the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China—a nation of some 500 million people, with

inexhaustible economic resources—were first restored including full rights to membership in ECAFE, and provided also that Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania were allowed full membership in ECE together with other countries, such as Switzerland, which desired to participate.

45. The Norwegian draft resolution (E/L.596) would have the effect of granting full membership in ECAFE to the countries specified in draft resolution E/L.591 while postponing action on a similar issue raised in the case of ECE and forming the subject of draft resolution E/L.592. He could see no reason for such discrimination. So far as ECE was concerned, his delegation would support the Czechoslovak draft resolution (E/L.597), which had the merit of being objective and impartial.

46. Mr. TAFAZZAL ALI (Pakistan) stressed his delegation's belief in the principle of universality of membership in the United Nations, irrespective of political creeds. He believed that the same principle should apply to the membership of regional economic commissions.

47. His delegation would therefore support the draft resolution submitted by Belgium and the United States (E/L.592), but he wished to make it clear that, if other representatives had proposed other countries for full membership in ECE, his delegation would have considered such proposals sympathetically.

48. He would also support the Czechoslovak draft resolution (E/L.597) as this would indicate that his delegation wished to act with complete impartiality.

49. The Indian representative had pointed out that approval by the General Assembly of certain candidates for admission to the United Nations had no legal force. That might be true, but the expression of such a view by the General Assembly had an undoubted moral force. By accepting the draft resolutions, he considered that the Council would advance the principles which the United Nations was pledged to maintain.

50. Mr. HSIA (China) noted that some representatives had deplored the fact that communist-dominated mainland China was not a member of ECAFE. There had been talk of the "restoration" of China's rights. He could not understand why that question had been raised in the Council, since it already had been settled by ECAFE itself.

51. He had noted with some surprise the Indian representative's observations, which seemed to be in variance with India's ancient culture and high moral principles. He was surprised that India should extol the virtues of realism and preach counsels of expediency. A realist was a defeatist, and if realism were to be accepted as a guiding principle in international affairs it would be necessary to rewrite the Charter. In the fight against evil, so many other things besides realism had to be considered.

52. His delegation was fully prepared to support the draft resolution submitted by France, Pakistan and the United States (E/L.591); he thought that it satisfied the legitimate demands of countries which desired full membership in the Commission, while fulfilling the elementary requirement that applicants should be peace-loving States willing to accept the provisions of the Charter. He also accepted the Belgian-United States resolution (E/L.592) on ECE membership

ce he considered that the countries named therein would strengthen the Commission.

Mr. EL-TANAMLI (Egypt) stated that his delegation was animated by two principles: the need for universality in the United Nations and its regional economic commissions, and the desirability of voluntary acceptance by governments of membership in the regional economic Commissions, since only by the voluntary association of all sovereign States in a region could such a commission discharge its tasks satisfactorily.

Applying those principles to the draft resolution submitted by France, Pakistan and the United States (E/L.591), he agreed that Ceylon, Japan and Nepal were eligible for membership in ECAFE; but he had certain reservations regarding the Republic of Korea, Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam. It was true to say that, for economic co-operation was to bear fruit, the cooperating States must remain masters of their own affairs at the international as well as the national level, and that international economic co-operation was realized through means of national policy. Hence the independence of States must be absolute. In the light of that consideration the Associated States of Indo-China might be regarded as unsuitable for membership.

It was equally true, however, that all peoples which did not yet enjoy complete sovereignty must be assisted to attain full independence with the utmost possible speed, and the admission of the States in question to membership in ECAFE might promote that most desirable objective, provided that they were represented by their own nationals. Consequently, his delegation would certainly have voted in the normal way for the admission of the States in question.

There were, however, certain practical objections to their admission. The situation in Indo-China was far from normal, and it would not be realistic to ignore the fact that in present circumstances the Associated States had more urgent problems to consider than the question of membership in ECAFE, so that any discussion of the matter at the present stage would be tilting at windmills.

Moreover, his delegation adhered to the general principle of universal eligibility for admission to the United Nations. Two important delegations from the region had already intimated their opposition to the admission of the Associated States to ECAFE at the present juncture, and he would therefore abstain as far as possible if States were concerned.

The Secretariat had replied to the legal question whether the Council could admit non-members to full membership in regional economic commissions, and his delegation was not in a position to contest the opinion of the Legal Department.

There were three proposals regarding the admission of new members to ECE. There was justice in all of them. The Norwegian draft resolution (E/L.596) was based on the principle that ECE had not asked the Council to take any action on the admission of new members; furthermore, any decision which the Council took might not violate the principle of universality to which his delegation attached such great importance.

If, however, the Council did not adopt the Norwegian draft resolution, he would support the Czechoslovak draft resolution (E/L.597), which also maintained the principle of universality. Should that proposal be adopted, he would be bound to vote for the Bel-

gian-United States draft resolution (E/L.592), as he could not vote against the admission of any European country to ECE.

61. In voting thus, however, he would wish to make it clear that his delegation considered that the Eastern European countries had an equal legal right to membership of ECE.

62. Mr. GARCIA OLANO (Argentina) said that his delegation's attitude to the question of admission of new members to the United Nations was based on the strictly legal interpretation of the principles underlying the Organization, namely the sovereign powers of the General Assembly, the universality of membership, and the equality of sovereign States. He was glad to note that after years of discussion, the number of countries ready to defend the sovereign powers which Chapter IV of the Charter conferred on the General Assembly was increasing. The first paragraph of draft resolution E/L.592 and the second paragraph of E/L.591 indicated that trend.

63. His Government's attitude was even more liberal with regard to the admission of non-member States to the regional commissions. It was clear from the Secretary-General's memorandum (E/2458) that the Council was not legally required to apply the criteria of Article 4 of the Charter in such cases. Regardless of whether they were members of the United Nations or not, all States directly concerned with the activities of the regional commissions should participate as fully as possible in their work. The General Assembly itself had proclaimed the principle of universality. If that principle applied to political organs, it applied even more strongly to technical bodies.

64. Mr. ENGEN (Norway) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution E/L.591. Its vote should not be interpreted as an endorsement of the principle which the second paragraph sought to establish. The Council's right to admit non-member States to the regional commissions could not be challenged, but when the Council tried to lay down criteria for admission which had not been accepted in principle by the General Assembly and the Security Council, the organs of the United Nations primarily concerned with the admission of new members, its action bordered on being *ultra vires*. The General Assembly had recommended the admission of a number of States, but it had not yet been able to give effect to that recommendation. It was difficult to see how the Council could be in a better position than the Assembly.

65. With regard to the Associated States of Indo-China, he was not convinced that the question of whether or not they enjoyed a full measure of control over their international relations was of decisive importance. On the question of admission to the regional commissions, the Council was not bound by Article 4 of the Charter. Even if the three Associated States did not have full control over their international relations, admission to an international body such as ECAFE could be instrumental in helping them to achieve independence. He fully supported their admission.

66. Mr. ABELIN (France) noted, in reply to the Indian representative in particular, that his Government had solemnly and formally proclaimed the independence of the three Associated States of Indo-China on several occasions. In the Treaty of 22 October 1953 which specifically stated the independence of Laos, Article 3

imposed on the French Government the obligation to uphold the sovereignty and independence of Laos in all international bodies. Certain transfers of competence, mainly technical in character, had been delayed until the present and were now being negotiated with Viet-Nam only because these were special arrangements and because a war had been forced on Viet-Nam and France and was being fomented from abroad by an alien creed.

67. The Yugoslav representative had invoked certain newspaper articles in support of his arguments. He himself had a high respect for the Press, but he felt that newspaper articles were scarcely the basic political data on which the members of the Council could base their positions.

68. It should be reiterated that the General Assembly had recognized that Viet-Nam, Cambodia and Laos were eligible for membership in the United Nations, and he wished to emphasize that ECAFE had twice explicitly requested that they should be admitted to full membership in the Commission. To postpone any decision on the three States would be to hamper their exercise of the attributes of independence.

69. Mr. HOTCHKIS (United States of America) said that he felt bound to reply to certain criticism which the USSR representative had levelled at the United States and at the Council as a whole. The USSR representative had repeatedly referred to trade relations in Europe and Asia. That was not the subject under discussion. Indeed, the question of East-West trade had been specifically excluded from the agenda of the current session. The point at issue was the question of membership in the regional commissions, and that was entirely separate. East-West trade was being discussed at that moment under the auspices of ECE on a basis of perfect equality, i.e., all participating Governments including those from Eastern Europe enjoying equal rights.

70. Every country mentioned in draft resolutions E/L.591 and E/L.592 had been recognized by the General Assembly as eligible for membership in the United Nations, in terms similar to those used with regard to Italy, for example, in resolution 296 E (IV). On the other hand, no such decision had been taken with regard to Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Albania and Communist China.

71. As for the argument that Ireland had not asked to be admitted to full membership in ECE, the second paragraph of draft resolution E/L.592 and sub-paragraph (a) of the third paragraph of draft resolution E/L.591 made it quite clear that the resolutions would not automatically confer full membership in ECE and ECAFE on the States mentioned in them. Each country would have to apply for membership.

72. The USSR representative's contention that everyone followed the United States lead when it came to voting cast serious doubt on the independence and integrity of all the representatives in the Council. They all represented sovereign States and were responsible only to their own Governments.

73. He would vote in favour of draft resolutions E/L.591 and E/L.592 and against the draft resolutions submitted by Norway and Czechoslovakia (E/L.596 and E/L.597).

74. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that there was absolutely no justification for the United States representative's statement that

questions of European trade and East-West trade were irrelevant to the matter under discussion. The Council was discussing the admission of members to the regional commissions. That was not an academic or formal question. The purpose of admitting additional countries to full membership was to enable them to participate fully in the commissions' work. ECE's terms of reference set out in Council resolution 36 (IV), paragraph 1, clearly indicated the extensive and important economic activities in which members of ECE could participate. The economic reconstruction of Europe, raising the level of European economic activity and maintaining and strengthening the economic relations of the European countries among themselves and with other countries of the world, manifestly implied an interest in stimulating trade.

75. Draft resolution E/L.592 was clearly political and discriminatory. It ran counter to the growing tendency towards the peaceful expansion of trade and friendly economic relations among European countries. It was regrettable that the United States should take such a negative attitude towards the restoration of normal economic relations in Europe.

76. Mr. LOOMES (Australia) asked for an explanation of the phrase "till the competent organs of the United Nations have dealt with this question" in the Indian draft resolution (E/L.598). The General Assembly had already decided that Laos, Cambodia and Viet-Nam were eligible for admission to the United Nations. Hence, it was difficult to see exactly what "competent organs" the Indian representative had in mind.

77. Mr. SAKSENA (India) explained that his delegation did not feel that the criteria for membership in the regional commissions were necessarily those specified in Article 4 of the Charter, on which the General Assembly's decision had been based. The General Assembly had given no verdict on whether the three States in question enjoyed full control over their international relations. In his delegation's opinion, only States with full control over their international relations could speak with authority for the people of the countries concerned. If that criterion was not satisfied, the General Assembly's verdict, based on Article 4, was of no consequence. By "competent organs" he meant the General Assembly and the Security Council. He hoped that the discussion in the Economic and Social Council would lead the competent organs to examine the question and come to some decision. The issue was political, not economic, and the Council should not precipitately take any action which might have political consequences.

78. He requested that the Indian draft resolution (E/L.598) should be put to the vote first. It could be considered as an amendment to draft resolution E/L.591, a proposal to defer action on certain provisions of that draft resolution, or a previous motion under the second paragraph of rule 66 of the rules of procedure. In all three cases, it would take priority.

79. Mr. EL-TANAMLI (Egypt) said that he had not studied the question raised by the Indian representative. He would therefore prefer that the phrase "till the competent organs of the United Nations have dealt with this question" should be deleted. If it was maintained he would like it to be put to the vote separately.

80. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the Indian representative's request concerning the order of voting, but asked that

Under rule 56 of the rules of procedure no further action should be taken on the Indian draft resolution or draft resolution E/L.591 for twenty-four hours.

Mr. ABELIN (France) said that the members of the Council had probably adequately familiarized themselves with the subject in two meetings and it was therefore advisable to proceed immediately to the vote.

82. After a procedural discussion, Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that further discussion should be postponed to the following meeting.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.