

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



FOURTH COMMITTEE 213th

MEETING

Wednesday, 28 November 1951, at 10.30 a.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

	Page
Question of the full participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council (Trusteeship Council resolution 310 (VIII), A/C.4/L.142, A/C.4/L.143, A/C.4/L.144 and A/C.4/L.145) (continued).....	71

Chairman: Mr. Max HENRÍQUEZ UREÑA (Dominican Republic).

Question of the full participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council (Trusteeship Council resolution 310 (VIII), A/C.4/L.142, A/C.4/L.143, A/C.4/L.144 and A/C.4/L.145) (continued)

[Item 55] *

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Guidotti, observer of the Italian Government to the United Nations, took a place at the Committee table.

1. Mr. SHEIKIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) held that there were at that time no grounds for consideration by the Fourth Committee of the question of the participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council. According to Article 86 of the Charter, only States Members of the United Nations could be members of the Trusteeship Council. Since the French draft resolution (A/C.4/L.142) provided for the participation of Italy, he considered that the Fourth Committee was not competent to deal with it. At the 212th meeting certain representatives, in particular those of Australia and the Netherlands, had opposed the position taken by the USSR and Polish delegations, on the grounds that the Fourth Committee was competent to consider the question and that the French draft resolution was in order. The arguments of those two representatives could not be accepted, for it was the task of the First Committee to settle such question. Consequently, his delegation would vote for the Polish draft resolution (A/C.4/L.145) to the effect that the Committee was not competent to deal with the matter.

2. Mr. STARY (Czechoslovakia) said that Italy had not yet become a Member of the United Nations simply because the French, United Kingdom, United States and other delegations had rejected all proposals for the admission of several new Members on an equal footing. Czechoslovakia, like the Soviet Union, did

not oppose the admission of Italy and all the other countries that were entitled to apply for membership. In its note of 11 October 1951 on the revision of the Treaty of Peace with Italy, addressed to the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States, the USSR Government had stated that it wished Italy to enjoy the same rights as other countries and that it was not opposed to a revision of the peace treaty or to the admission of that country, provided Finland, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria were treated in like manner.

3. The French draft resolution was based on the assumption that an Administering Authority could not fully discharge its duties unless it was a member of the Trusteeship Council and of the United Nations. Article 81 of the Charter, however, carried no such implication and it had actually been interpreted in that sense by the General Assembly itself, when entrusting the administration of Somaliland to Italy.

4. That aspect of the question had also been raised at the San Francisco Conference; in fact, it was submitted in a joint United Kingdom and United States declaration, contained in the official documents of that Conference,¹ that if a State withdrew from the United Nations for reasons that did not bring discredit upon it and declared itself ready to continue to assume the responsibilities devolving upon it as an Administering Authority, there was no need to transfer the trusteeship of the territories it administered nor to modify the system of annual reports, petitions and visiting missions; moreover, any such State would retain the right to attend Trusteeship Council meetings where questions affecting such territories were discussed.

5. Hence, an Administering Authority did not necessarily have to be a member of the Trusteeship Council. It was sufficient that it should take part in the work

¹ See *Documents of the United Nations Conference on International Organization, San Francisco, 1945, Vol. X*, published in co-operation with the Library of Congress, 1945, United Nations Information Organizations, London, New York, p. 636 and 637.

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

of the Council in the manner laid down in the Charter, particularly in Article 87, and in the rules of procedure of the Council, only when the latter was considering problems affecting the territory administered by that Authority. He thus considered that the French draft resolution was ill-founded and that the Fourth Committee was not competent to deal with it. He would therefore vote for the Polish draft resolution.

6. Mr. SEVILLA SACASA (Nicaragua) recalled that that was not the first time that the free nations of the world and their representatives had been concerned with the admission to the United Nations of Italy, a great Latin country and one of the mainsprings of Western civilization, a peace-loving nation which fulfilled all the requirements laid down by the Charter for the admission of new Members. Unfortunately, all efforts toward that end had come to nought, owing to the inexorable and obstructionist provisions of Article 27 of the Charter, in other words, the veto clause, which impeded progress towards peace and undermined the organ established in San Francisco. It might be asked what the fate of the French draft resolution would be. The answer was that, in the Security Council, one more veto would be added to the repeated vetoes cast by one Power, while the other nations obligated to respect the rules prescribed by the Charter remained passive. Nevertheless, one more effort should be made and the draft resolution should be adopted, together with the judicious amendment submitted by Guatemala (A/C.4/L.143). If another crisis should arise, it would be necessary to seek a more effective means not only of saving Italy, but of avoiding abuse and achieving justice.

7. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) recalled that the traditional relations between his country and Italy had emerged unimpaired from the last world war. On the conclusion of that war, Haiti had resumed diplomatic relations with Italy and renewed its very valuable historic, cultural and commercial links with that country. It associated itself with those countries which were in favour of the admission of Italy. His delegation had voted for General Assembly resolution 289 B (IV) confiding the trusteeship of Somaliland to Italy. He thus considered that that country should participate not only in the work of the Trusteeship Council but also in that of the other organs of the United Nations, for it accepted all the obligations laid down in the Charter and offered full guarantees of its peaceful intentions and democratic character.

8. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) recalled that his delegation had been one of the first to ask for the recognition of the principle of universality. Unfortunately, Article 4 of the Charter was drafted in terms that had led to confusion and to disputes. None the less, he felt that any State that showed readiness to respect the obligations laid down in the Charter should be admitted to the United Nations without quibble and without delay. The case of Italy was exceptional in that that country had also been given the administration of a Trust Territory and was unable to perform its task satisfactorily without being a member of the Trusteeship Council. Moreover,

the qualities and potentialities of that country were such as to render its contribution to the defence of peace indispensable. His delegation would therefore vote for the French draft resolution as amended by Guatemala (A/C.4/L.144).

9. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) said that his delegation, a member of the Trusteeship Council, had voted for resolution 310 (VIII) in which the Council had asked the General Assembly to include the question of the full participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council in the agenda for its sixth session. The admission of Italy, he felt, would be the natural counterpart to the obligations assumed by that country under the Trusteeship Agreement adopted by the General Assembly. If it was true, as some had stated in the Committee, that there could be no rights without duties and *vice versa*, Italy's position was all the more abnormal and inadmissible; that country was represented on the Trusteeship Council as an Administering Authority but did not have a vote, and while its qualifications were regarded as adequate for confiding to it the trusteeship of Somaliland, they were not regarded as justifying its admission to the United Nations. In opposition to an overwhelming majority of the international community a group of delegations refused to recognize that Italy fulfilled the conditions necessary for admission. Those same delegations, however, required Italy to undertake certain obligations and criticized its administration of Somaliland. Such a state of affairs, which was inconsistent with the moral principles that should guide the action of the United Nations, was due to a wrong use of the right conferred by Article 27, paragraph 3, of the Charter.

10. In accordance with the attitude of his country towards Italy, to which it was linked by historic ties and a deep sense of latinity, he would vote for the French draft resolution as amended by Guatemala. In the light of the debate, he was sure that an overwhelming majority would support that draft resolution and thus express the desire of the international community to welcome to the United Nations a country that was the immortal cradle of Latin civilization and culture.

11. Mr. ZIAUD-DIN (Pakistan) thought that, when a country was given responsibility, it was only fair to make it possible for that country to assume that responsibility in a fitting manner. For that reason, Italy must become a member of the Trusteeship Council and of the United Nations. In his view, moreover, all countries that fulfilled the conditions of membership of the United Nations had a legitimate right to be admitted. He regretted that the differences separating the great Powers were preventing many countries from becoming Members of the Organization. It was unnecessary to recall the important civilizing role that Italy had played and his delegation would have pleasure in voting for the French draft resolution.

12. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) stated that his delegation was one of those who believed that Italy could make a more valuable contribution to the operation of the International Trusteeship System than it had made heretofore if it were enabled to participate fully

in the work of the Trusteeship Council: Italy could do that only by becoming a Member of the United Nations. He therefore associated himself with those who had expressed the hope that the Security Council would consider Italy's request for admission favourably. In point of fact, since the Charter provided that the Trusteeship Council should be composed solely of Members of the United Nations, full participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council necessarily implied its admission to the United Nations. The fact that Italy had accepted the responsibilities devolving on it as an Administering Authority was proof that it was willing to carry out the obligations contained in the Charter, and placed it in a very special position which ought to be given particular consideration when the more general question of the admission of new Members was being examined.

13. He would vote for the French draft resolution as amended by Guatemala because it reasserted Italy's incontestable right to belong to the United Nations; on the other hand, he would vote against the Polish draft resolution. He hoped that the Security Council would also give favourable consideration to requests for admission on the part of countries which, like Italy, fulfilled the necessary conditions for membership of the United Nations.

14. Mr. GAJEWSKI (Poland) said that the admission of new Members did not come within the competence of the Fourth Committee; examination of that question was subject to a special procedure laid down in Article 4 of the Charter and in rules 133 to 137 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure. Moreover, the question ought to be considered by the First Committee, in view of its political character and of the fact that the question of the admission of new Members had been placed on that Committee's agenda. The Polish delegation therefore considered that the French draft resolution could not be accepted by the Fourth Committee. The attitude of his delegation was in no way due to the feelings it entertained towards Italy; Poland had in fact already shown its sympathy for that country when, in 1947, it proposed that the Security Council should admit Italy to the United Nations.² The position the Polish delegation was adopting was solely due to his country's steadfast desire to respect the principles of the Charter, which had always guided it in its foreign policy.

15. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) said there were three main points to be borne in mind in connexion with the problem: the decision of the Trusteeship Council to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the need for the full participation of Italy in the Council's work; the firm belief of the Trusteeship Council and of the Fourth Committee that the decision was one for the General Assembly; and, lastly, the question of how Italy's participation in the work of the Trusteeship Council could be secured. The last problem could be

dealt with by an amendment to Article 86 of the Charter, which would enable a non-member State to have a *sate* in the Trusteeship Council. Such a course, however, had serious disadvantages owing to its complexity. The best course would undoubtedly be to admit Italy to the United Nations. Italy unquestionably fulfilled the necessary conditions. Morally, no one could deny Italy's contribution to civilization; in addition, the fact that it had been entrusted with the administration of a Trust Territory was proof of the qualifications it was recognized to possess. Legally, it also fulfilled all the conditions laid down in Article 4 of the Charter.

16. The factors which had so far prevented Italy from becoming a Member of the United Nations were, in reality, foreign to the substance of the question. To secure Italy's admission, the General Assembly could invoke the principle of universality or, alternatively, the necessity for Italy's participation in the work of the Trusteeship Council. By urging that necessity the French draft resolution made a useful contribution to the settlement of the question. It provided for an appeal to the Security Council to obtain the admission of Italy, and laid stress on the fact that it was for the General Assembly to consider and settle the question in the last instance.

17. The Guatemalan amendment was perfectly logical; it contained an implicit allusion to General Assembly resolution 296 E (IV), according to which Italy fulfilled the conditions for membership laid down in Article 4 of the Charter. He saw no objection to that resolution's being mentioned explicitly, as the Peruvian representative had proposed (212th meeting). The Polish draft resolution was, he felt, unwarranted, since it was nowhere laid down that consideration of such a question fell exclusively within the competence of the First Committee. The General Assembly had absolute power with regard to the allocation of items on its agenda to the various Committees. The question of competence consequently did not arise, and the Argentine delegation would vote for the French draft resolution. The confidence in Italy displayed by the United Nations in entrusting it with the administration of the Trust Territory of Somaliland required that every method for giving Italy its proper place in the United Nations should be explored during the current session.

18. Mr. NAJAR (Israel), referring to the Polish draft resolution, observed that his delegation also attached great importance to the legality of discussions. In the case considered, however, it should be pointed out that the competence of Committees of the General Assembly was determined by the contents of their agenda, each of them having to deal with the items referred to it by the General Assembly. The Fourth Committee had been instructed by the General Assembly to consider the question of the full participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council, and Article 86 of the Charter, as everyone was aware, laid down that members of the Trusteeship Council must be Members of the United Nations; the question of the admission of Italy to the United Nations was

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Second Year, Supplement No. 90, 204th meeting.*

consequently a fundamental part of the question of Italy's participation in the work of the Trusteeship Council. Undoubtedly, therefore, the matter lay within the competence of the Fourth Committee. If certain delegations had objections to make, they ought to have made them during the discussion on the agenda.

19. The Israel delegation would consequently vote against the Polish draft resolution and for the French draft resolution as amended by Guatemala.

20. Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) observed that, in the opinion of his delegation, the United Nations could achieve the universal character it was essential to give to it only when all States fulfilling the conditions laid down in Article 4 of the Charter had become Members. It was most regrettable in particular that Italy, which had played such a large part in the development of civilization and was currently assuming large responsibilities in the international field, should still be outside the Organization.

21. His delegation would consequently vote for the French draft resolution as amended by Guatemala.

22. Mr. MATTAR (Lebanon), after reminding the Committee of the friendly relations existing between his country and Italy, declared that the remarkable manner in which Italy had filled the position of trust given to it by the United Nations in Somaliland, and in general all the actions of the Italian Government since the end of hostilities, could not but inspire the wish that Italy should be admitted to the organs of the United Nations. In particular, it would be most desirable for Italy to be enabled to participate fully in the work of the Trusteeship Council, which could greatly profit by its experience.

23. It was certainly regrettable that the provisions of the Charter made it impossible to go further than the French draft resolution, for it was to be feared that the difficulties which had stood in the way of Italy's admission in the past might once again paralyse the Security Council. It was to be hoped, however, that those difficulties would finally be overcome and that Italy would eventually be able to take the place to which it was entitled.

24. The Polish draft resolution was quite unwarranted : what the Fourth Committee had before it was not purely and simply the question of Italy's admission to the United Nations, but resolution 310 (VIII) of the Trusteeship Council, and examination of the work of the Trusteeship Council came pre-eminently within the competence of the Fourth Committee.

25. Mr. CARIAS (Honduras) declared that his delegation, which had stated at the 337th plenary meeting of the Assembly that it would make every endeavour to restore Italy to a proper legal position in the community of nations, could not but support the French draft resolution as amended by Guatemala, which recommended the full participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council.

26. He wished in the first place to state that, in the opinion of his delegation, there was no doubt that

the revision procedure provided by the Charter itself would always enable the United Nations to determine its policy and to settle questions of jurisprudence in a manner in keeping with the requirements of a constantly changing situation and, in particular, would enable it to admit Italy to membership.

27. In addition to other reasons for the admission of Italy to the United Nations and its full participation in the work of the Trusteeship Council, sufficient stress could not be laid on the scope and importance of the task Italy had undertaken in Somaliland, in spite of innumerable difficulties the solution of which required constant efforts on the part of the Administering Authority as well as effective assistance from the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

28. Italy had managed to transform the uncompromising hostility of certain political groups into constructive opposition, undertaken the task of adapting tribal organization to the requirements of modern administration, begun to put into effect an educational programme for children and adults and, in general, successfully applied itself to the work of preparing the indigenous peoples for self-government and independence ; that fact was recognized by the Trusteeship Council which, in that connexion, had expressed its regret that Italy did not belong to the United Nations (A/1856, p. 81). For Italy to be able to continue, under the best conditions, with the work it had begun, it was essential that it should have all the rights and privileges enjoyed by Members of the United Nations.

29. Mr. TARZI (Afghanistan) said that his delegation felt that Italy, which the United Nations had made responsible for administering a Trust Territory, ought to be able to participate fully in the work of the Trusteeship Council and ought, therefore, to be admitted to the United Nations. The Afghan delegation consequently supported the French draft resolution as amended by Guatemala.

30. U TUN SHEIN (Burma) stated that his delegation, which firmly believed in the principle of the universality of the United Nations was prepared to support not only Italy's candidature, but also applications for admission submitted by any peace-loving States which were prepared to carry out the obligations of Members of the United Nations under the Charter.

31. It was proposed, however, that the case of Italy should be singled out and examined first, on the ground that that country had been given the administration of a Trust Territory and ought therefore to be able to participate fully in the work of the Trusteeship Council, which it would not be able to do unless it became a Member of the United Nations. The argument had some force, but it must not be forgotten that it was also extremely important to admit other applicant States. The Burmese delegation therefore expressed the earnest wish that an early decision should be taken in favour of all those States and, in the hope of facilitating such a decision, it would vote for the French draft resolution as amended by Guatemala.

32. Mr. DERMIZAKY (Bolivia), after referring to the bonds of friendship between Bolivia and Italy, observed that the discussion which had just taken place in the Fourth Committee had clearly shown that the majority of the members were in favour of the French draft resolution, which his own delegation had welcomed with the warmest appreciation.

33. The arguments for the admission of Italy, a State to which the United Nations had confided the administration of the Trust Territory of Somaliland, were too well known to need repetition, just as it would be superfluous to refer to the principle of the universality of the United Nations, the importance of which had already been stressed by a number of other representatives. There was no need to dwell on the merits of a cause so just that it should prevail without difficulty.

34. Paradoxical as it might seem, however, the United Nations, paralysed by the right of veto, was powerless in the circumstances to meet the wishes of the majority. But it must be hoped that the decision adopted by the Fourth Committee would be taken into account by the other organs of the United Nations and that the injustice Italy was suffering would eventually be righted.

35. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) stated that the Fourth Committee was not competent to discuss Italy's admission to the United Nations. That was not, in spite of what certain representatives had asserted, the item on the Committee's agenda; the item on the agenda was the question of the full participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council. Moreover, it was clear that, had the question of the admission of Italy to the United Nations been placed on the agenda of the General Assembly, it would have been referred not to the Fourth but to the First Committee; the agenda of the latter, in point of fact, included the question of the admission of new Members.

36. The endeavour to initiate a discussion on the admission of Italy to the United Nations in the Fourth Committee, a committee in no way empowered to deal with such a question, was in reality part of the policy of discrimination which a number of States, including the United States, the United Kingdom and France, were pursuing towards certain countries.

37. Moreover, the argument which had been adduced in justification of the French proposal, namely, that the Fourth Committee was competent to deal with the question of Italy's admission to the United Nations because the Trusteeship Council had, in its report, expressed its regret that Italy was not a Member and because examination of the Council's report came within the purview of the Committee, was not valid, since the Trusteeship Council itself had no competence in the matter.

38. Likewise, it was rather surprising that representatives endorsing the French draft resolution should invoke, in explanation of their attitude, the principle of universality of the United Nations, when the Com-

mittee was in fact being asked to take a decision in the case of one country only, the applications for admission by other States being completely ignored.

39. Other representatives had also relied on general considerations regarding Italy's contribution to world civilization in support of the French draft resolution; however, significantly enough, not one had sought to justify his position on legal grounds. In fact, neither in the Charter nor in the General Assembly's rules of procedure was there the slightest provision authorizing the Fourth Committee to examine such a question.

40. In those circumstances, the French draft resolution was undeniably an infringement of the Charter and of the rules of procedure. The Ukrainian delegation would therefore vote for the Polish draft resolution.

41. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) had no doubts, for his part, as to the Fourth Committee's competence. The General Assembly had instructed the Committee to examine the question of the full participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council; after a thorough study, the Committee, like the Trusteeship Council, had recognized that such participation would be useful. It had further recognized that such participation was not possible in existing circumstances, since Article 86 of the Charter specified that only Members of the United Nations could be members of the Trusteeship Council and Italy had not yet been admitted to membership of the Organization. The Fourth Committee might have recommended the General Assembly to amend that Article of the Charter, so as to allow non-member States to become members of the Trusteeship Council. It seemed to him simpler, however, to admit Italy to membership of the United Nations. At the same time, the Committee agreed that the General Assembly was not competent to take such a decision in the absence of a recommendation from the Security Council. At the present stage, the question whether that recommendation must perforce be positive or whether it might also be negative did not arise.

42. Hence, the French draft resolution was fully within the scope of the question referred to the Fourth Committee, and that body was perfectly competent to discuss it and take a decision. It would appear that the draft resolution should not meet with any objection from those who had endorsed or had not opposed the conferring of the trusteeship upon Italy, because in so doing they had acknowledged that Italy had fulfilled the conditions laid down in Article 4 of the Charter.

43. The Belgian representative would accordingly vote for the French draft resolution as amended by Guatemala, and against the Polish draft resolution.

44. Mr. LEA PLAZA (Chile) enthusiastically supported the French draft resolution as amended by Guatemala for he deemed it urgent that Italy's position as an Administering Authority should be regularized. The draft resolution justly stressed the need for admitting Italy to membership of the United Nation

and thus conferring upon it its full rights, a historic reparation long desired by Chile.

45. Mr. DOIDGE (New Zealand) stressed that the question before the Committee did not relate purely and simply to the admission of new members. New Zealand was one of the States which would like to see countries such as Ceylon and Ireland admitted to membership, but the case before them related to the special position of Italy as Administering Authority of a Trust Territory.

46. New Zealand, for its part, unreservedly favoured the admission of Italy. Moreover, the French proposal as amended by Guatemala was fully justified, since it sought to ensure the full participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council and recommended, to that end, its admission to the United Nations. It was inconceivable that the United Nations should further delay the admission of a nation to which civilization owed so much. In addition, there could be no doubt that Italy fulfilled every condition set out in Article 4 of the Charter. The proof was that Italy had been entrusted with the administration of Somaliland and had carried out its task in an exemplary fashion. It ought therefore to enjoy the rights corresponding to its responsibilities.

47. Mr. WORM-MULLER (Norway) was whole-heartedly in favour of Italy's admission. That great nation, the cradle of Western civilization, ought long since to have been admitted to the United Nations, as it fulfilled all the conditions laid down in the Charter. Moreover, its admission had become essential as, by the very terms of the Charter, Italy could not become a member of the Trusteeship Council before being admitted to membership of the United Nations.

48. For those reasons, his delegation would vote for the French draft resolution as amended by Guatemala.

49. Mr. SAVUT (Turkey) fully concurred with those delegations which had expressed their support for Italy's well-merited admission to the United Nations. There appeared to be general agreement that Italy's admission to membership was a prerequisite for its full participation in the work of the Trusteeship Council.

50. He recalled that the question of Italy's admission had first been raised in 1947 and that, from the outset, Turkey had supported the application, being convinced that Italy was a peace-loving State which fulfilled all the conditions set out in Article 4 of the Charter.

51. The fact that Italy had been entrusted with the administration of Somaliland for a period of ten years showed that it was not only able and willing to carry out the obligations of the Charter, but had loyally and successfully done so. Accordingly, the Turkish delegation would vote in favour of the French draft resolution as amended by Guatemala. Nevertheless, it wished to stress how important it was for the Security Council to give urgent consideration to the problem, in accordance with the terms of the draft itself, which meant, in the Turkish delegation's view, before the end of the sixth session of the General Assembly.

52. Mr. MENDOZA (Guatemala) noted that the first introductory paragraph of the Polish draft resolution (A/C.4/L.145) contained its own definition of the procedure for the admission of new Members. It was none the less true that neither the Charter nor the rules of procedure referred to the possibility of examining the applications of various States as a group; on the contrary, it was abundantly clear that the spirit of the Charter required each application to be considered separately, so as to determine whether the States in question fulfilled the conditions laid down in the Charter. The admission of a particular State could not therefore be made the subject of any arrangement; it must not in any way depend upon the acceptance or rejection of the applications for admission from one or several other States.

53. Moreover, according to the second introductory paragraph of the Polish draft resolution, the Fourth Committee was not competent to deal with the question that had been submitted to it. That argument might have been pertinent if the Committee had been asked to examine in general the applications of various States for membership. However, the committee was concerned with one State only, which occupied a special position in relation to the United Nations, since it was desirable that Italy, as the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Somaliland, should participate with full rights in the work of the Trusteeship Council, and for that purpose its prior admission to the United Nations was essential.

54. Lastly, the third introductory paragraph of the Polish draft resolution had no basis, since it was for the General Committee of the Assembly to allocate the items of the agenda to the various Committees, the Assembly itself being thereafter called upon to ratify the decisions of the General Committee. The allocation of the item under discussion in the Fourth Committee had not been opposed in the General Committee, or in the Assembly when the General Committee's report (A/1950) had come up for approval. Furthermore, there was no provision in the Charter reserving to the First Committee the right to consider items relating to the admission of a State.

55. For those reasons, the Guatemalan delegation would oppose the Polish draft resolution.

56. Mr. GUIDOTTI (Italy) was happy to note that the vast majority of the Members of the United Nations recognized that Italy fulfilled all the requisite conditions for admission to that Organization and that its continued exclusion was therefore unjust.

57. He wished to pay a tribute to Mr. Maurice Schumann, for his brilliant statement in submitting his delegation's draft resolution relating to Italy's admission. The Italian people would not fail to be profoundly moved by that statement. He also thanked the Guatemalan delegation for its part in defending Italy's cause and assured all the delegations which had so warmly expressed their feelings of attachment to Italy of the Italian people's gratitude.

58. He hoped that a just and equitable solution would soon be reached concerning Italy's admission to the United Nations. The discussion in the Fourth Committee was but a prelude to action which would be important not only for Italy but for many other countries.

59. Mr. ANDREN (Sweden) said that, although he had, for his part, some doubts as to the Fourth Committee's competence to take cognizance of the question of the admission of new Members, he nevertheless thought that the particular urgency of Italy's admission to the United Nations could not be gainsaid. Justice demanded that that great nation, to which civilization owed so much and to which the United Nations had just confided the administration of a Trust Territory, should at last take its place within the United Nations. It was for that reason that the Swedish delegation would vote for the French draft resolution as amended by Guatemala.

60. Mr. STARY (Czechoslovakia) noted that there were two aspects to the problem. First, it was necessary to settle whether Italy could carry out its task as Administering Authority of the Trust Territory of Somaliland without being a Member of the United Nations. The answer was in the affirmative ; but Italy's participation in the work of the Trusteeship Council ought to be limited to the Council's examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Somaliland.

61. The second aspect of the problem was purely and simply concerned with Italy's admission to the United Nations. His view was that the Fourth Committee was not competent to examine that question.

62. On those grounds, the Czechoslovak delegation would vote for the Polish draft resolution and against the French proposal.

63. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) found that no valid argument had been adduced to support the adoption of the French draft resolution. There was no provision in the Charter or the rules of procedure to allow the Fourth Committee to examine the question of the admission of new Members.

64. Moreover, there was no basis for the argument that, because the General Committee had allocated to the Fourth Committee the question of Italy's full participation in the work of the Trusteeship Council, the Fourth Committee was competent to deal with it, since that question obviously could not be considered before

a decision had been reached on the question of Italy's admission to the United Nations.

65. He stressed that the Soviet Union was not opposed to Italy's admission to the United Nations ; it objected, however, to the discriminatory methods and irregular procedure envisaged in the French proposal as amended by Guatemala.

66. The USSR delegation would accordingly vote for the Polish draft resolution and against the French proposal as amended by Guatemala.

67. Mr. SHEIKIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) stated that he would vote for the Polish proposal and against the French draft resolution as amended by Guatemala, because the Fourth Committee, as he had already affirmed, was not competent to examine the question of the admission of new Members.

68. The CHAIRMAN put the Polish draft resolution (A/C.4/L.145) to the vote.

That draft resolution was rejected by 48 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

69. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) asked for a vote by rollcall on the French draft resolution as amended by Guatemala (A/C.4/L.144).

A vote was taken by rollcall.

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

In favour : Iran, Iraq, Israel, Libya, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia.

Against : Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia.

The proposal was adopted by 50 votes to 5.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.