

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTEENTH SESSION  
Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE 115th  
MEETING**

Friday, 28 November 1958,  
at 10.30 a.m.



**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda items 21, 22, 23 and 12:	
Question of amending the United Nations Charter, in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 108 of the Charter, to increase the number of non-permanent members of the Security Council and the number of votes required for decisions of the Council ( <u>continued</u> )	
Question of amending the United Nations Charter, in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 108 of the Charter, to increase the membership of the Economic and Social Council ( <u>continued</u> )	
Question of amending the Statute of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 108 of the Charter of the United Nations and Article 69 of the Statute of the Court, with respect to an increase in the number of judges of the International Court of Justice ( <u>continued</u> )	
Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter I, section VI) ( <u>continued</u> ) . . . . .	127

**Chairman: Mr. Mihai MAGHERU (Romania).**

**AGENDA ITEMS 21, 22, 23 AND 12**

**Question of amending the United Nations Charter, in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 108 of the Charter, to increase the number of non-permanent members of the Security Council and the number of votes required for decisions of the Council (A/3138, A/SPC/L.28/Rev.1) (continued)**

**Question of amending the United Nations Charter, in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 108 of the Charter, to increase the membership of the Economic and Social Council (A/3139, A/SPC/L.28/Rev.1) (continued)**

**Question of amending the Statute of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 108 of the Charter of the United Nations and Article 69 of the Statute of the Court, with respect to an increase in the number of judges of the International Court of Justice (A/3140, A/SPC/L.28/Rev.1) (continued)**

**Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter I, section VI) (A/3848, A/SPC/30, A/SPC/L.29 and Add.1) (continued)**

1. U TUN SHEIN (Burma) said that despite the increase in the number of Member States, which had risen to eighty-one, there had been no change in the composition of the principal organs of the United Nations. Articles 23 and 61 of the Charter and Article 3 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, which had been adopted at the time when the Member States numbered less than fifty, had not yet been modified. His delegation considered that those three organs

would be able to work more effectively if their composition was enlarged appropriately and with due regard to equitable geographical distribution.

2. It realized, however, that an amendment of the Charter under Article 108 required ratification by all the permanent members of the Security Council and that raised the major political issue of representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. It was presumptuous to think that the present political climate was favourable for a Charter amendment. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.28/Rev.1) which, while reflecting the general feeling that the size of some of the organs of the United Nations should be increased, also took into consideration the prevailing political situation. His delegation hoped that the political situation would be more favourable at the fourteenth session than it was at present.

3. Mr. DE VAUCELLES (France) recalled that at the two previous sessions the proclaimed objection of one of the permanent members of the Security Council to any amendment to the Charter had twice led the Assembly to postpone consideration of the question. The statements made at the previous meeting by the representative of the Soviet Union showed that the position of that Power remained unchanged and that it was vain to expect it to agree to an amendment of the Charter at present.

4. The French Government, true to the principle of the universality of the United Nations, understood the motives which had prompted the Economic and Social Council to adopt resolution 690 B (XXVI) that favoured an increase in the membership of the Council. It also understood the reasons which prompted those who favoured that reform to request an increase in the membership of the Security Council. However, endorsing the views expressed at the previous meeting by the Danish and Netherlands representatives, it wished to warn the members of the Committee against any injudicious increase in the membership of those two bodies which, if they were to remain effective, would have to continue as organs of limited membership. His delegation would therefore oppose any proposal to increase the membership of those bodies in such a manner as to cause, through prolongation of debates and difficulty in arriving at agreement, an increase in the number of meetings in the case of the Security Council or an extension of the length of sessions in the case of the Economic and Social Council, which would merely hamper their work and increase the work-load of the Secretariat.

5. On the other hand, his delegation, like the delegations of the Union of South Africa and Denmark, was resolutely opposed to any increase in the membership of the International Court of Justice. The Court, according to Article 2 of its Statute, was composed of "a body of independent judges, elected regardless of

their nationality from among persons of high moral character, who possess the qualifications required in their respective countries for appointment to the highest judicial offices, or are jurisconsults of recognized competence in international law". There was no question of geographical distribution in the case of the Court, since it was specifically stated that its members were elected regardless of their nationality, the only restriction being that no two of the members could be nationals of the same State. Naturally, it was desirable that the various legal systems should be fairly represented in the Court, and the General Assembly, in its choice of members of the Court, had always respected that rule. It had been able to do so all the more easily as the membership of fifteen was ample to provide satisfaction in that connexion. Moreover, the Court was not a political body but a tribunal. Finally, account should be taken of the fact that, in relation to the total membership of the United Nations, only a small number of States recognized as compulsory the jurisdiction of the Court in the cases mentioned in Article 36 of its Statute. In the circumstances and subject to those reservations, his delegation was prepared to vote in favour of the two draft resolutions before the Committee; neither of the resolutions called, at least for the time being, for initiation of a Charter amendment procedure, an action which, in any event, would have no chance of succeeding. The two draft resolutions complemented each other and took into account the present situation while leaving the door open for the future. His delegation believed that nothing should prevent their unanimous adoption.

6. Mr. LONCAR (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation was convinced of the need to increase the membership of the principal organs of the United Nations and to alter their geographical composition in order to take into account the substantial increase in the number of Member States. However, any satisfactory solution of the question first required the agreement of the great Powers. As was well known, such agreement had not been achieved.

7. That situation prevented even considering a partial solution of the problem through an increase in the membership of the Economic and Social Council, the need for which was undeniable. The need to increase the membership of the Economic and Social Council was part of the general problem involved in the revision of the Charter and it would be unrealistic to try to settle that matter separately. When conditions were more favourable, it would be desirable to deal with all the problems simultaneously. It was for those reasons that his delegation had joined the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.28/Rev.1), which called for postponement of consideration of the three questions until the fourteenth session.

8. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) said that his delegation accepted the arguments advanced in favour of an increase in the membership of the Security Council and in the Economic and Social Council. With regard to the scale of increase that would be desirable, his delegation would state its views when the General Assembly examined those questions as to substance, but he could say already that it would favour a cautious attitude and ask for the increase to be kept within limits which would enable the two Councils to work effectively. With regard to the International Court of Justice, his delegation shared the views expressed by several dele-

gations including the French, which had made reservations concerning the need of an increase in the number of members. The only action open to the General Assembly at the present stage was to defer consideration of those items. The debate had clearly shown that the atmosphere was not favourable, in view of the fact that the political positions taken by certain delegations, particularly the delegations of the permanent members of the Security Council, made it impossible to amend the Charter.

9. His delegation accepted, though with some reluctance, the need to postpone consideration of the items, as proposed in paragraph 1 of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.28/Rev.1). However he had reservations about the immediately preceding preambular paragraph, stating that an amendment of the Charter required a larger area of agreement than prevailed at present. The proximity of the two passages was unfortunate, because it seemed to imply that there was a causal link between the two facts.

10. As the Netherlands representative had pointed out at the previous meeting, the fact that certain obstacles impeded an amendment of the Charter did not in itself preclude the General Assembly from adopting, by a two-thirds majority, a resolution or a series of resolutions amending the Charter. It was true that such resolutions would not come into effect until a further process had been completed: their ratification by two-thirds of the Members of the General Assembly, including all the permanent members of the Security Council. Constitutionally, however, there was no reason why the Assembly should not consider items 21, 22 and 23 forthwith.

11. His delegation was a co-sponsor of the nineteen-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.29 and Add.1), in which the Assembly would do no more than accede to a request of the Economic and Social Council, which had expressly invited it to consider the question of increasing the Council's membership. The General Assembly would thus decide to include in the agenda of its fourteenth session the item which the Council had asked it to examine. Clearly, it could do no less than that. Despite the opposition of the Soviet Union, whose vote had been one of the two cast against resolution 690 B (XXVI) in the Council, his delegation hoped that the nineteen-Power draft resolution would be adopted by a substantial majority.

12. Mr. BARTLETT (United States of America) recalled the considerations which had led his delegation to join forty-five others in supporting an increase in the membership of the Economic and Social Council, when the item had been discussed in the Second Committee. Only the States of the Soviet bloc had opposed the increase, arguing that the Charter could not be amended until the question of the representation of China in the United Nations had been settled in their favour. That was the same position which the Soviet bloc had taken two years ago, when the General Assembly had discussed the proposal to enlarge the Security Council, a proposal which the United States had supported then and continued to support. His delegation regretted that the Soviet bloc had seized upon that pretext to deprive the newly-admitted Member States of the right to participate fully in the work of the United Nations. The Soviet position seemed hard to reconcile with the Soviet Union's professed sympathy for the wishes and aspirations of the new Members.

13. Almost all Member States, including the Soviet Union, favoured an increase in the membership of at least some organs of the United Nations. Yet the representative of the Soviet Union had expressed opposition to the nineteen-Power draft resolution on the ground that he was opposed to any amendment of the Charter. At the present stage no one was being asked to vote in favour of amending the Charter or even of a specific proposal for increasing the membership of a United Nations organ. Neither of the two draft resolutions proposed a charter amendment. The Soviet Union's opposition was therefore founded on arguments irrelevant to the draft resolutions under consideration.

14. As for Charter amendment, the Soviet Union was asking to be paid the price demanded for giving its consent, a price consisting in the realization of a Soviet political objective entirely unrelated to the increase in the membership of the Economic and Social Council. Moreover, the Soviet Union's pretence that China was not represented in the United Nations was another example of the former's refusing to accept United Nations decisions, since the question of Chinese representation had been discussed and settled earlier in the session.

15. The United States delegation was a co-sponsor of the nineteen-Power draft resolution and would of course vote in its favour. It would also vote in favour of the seven-Power draft resolution. The two draft resolutions represented the only practical course open to the Committee.

16. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) said that he shared the feeling expressed by practically all delegations that there should be an increase in the membership of some organs of the United Nations. However, the question could not be settled without an amendment of the Charter. In the present political climate, any attempt to settle the issue during the current session would be premature. His delegation had accordingly joined the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution, who felt that a debate at the present time could not produce positive results. It hoped that the fourteenth session would open in more auspicious circumstances.

17. His delegation did not feel it could support the nineteen-Power draft resolution, because the seven-Power draft resolution constituted the best and most practical course of action available.

18. Mr. BEELEY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the seven-Power draft resolution, which explicitly recognized that an obstacle was impeding any amendment of the Charter in the present circumstances.

19. He could not understand the reasons which had induced the representative of the Soviet Union to oppose the nineteen-Power draft resolution, of which the United Kingdom delegation was a sponsor. He formally proposed that paragraphs 1 and 2 of that draft resolution should be voted on separately, to enable the Soviet delegation to explain to which of the two paragraphs it was opposed.

20. Baron DE GAIFFIER D'HESTROY (Belgium) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the seven-Power draft resolution, since it did not object to a postponement of the debate until the next session of the General Assembly.

21. It was among the sponsors of the nineteen-Power draft resolution, and could only confirm what it had said in the Second Committee (551st meeting) on the important problem of the composition of the Economic and Social Council. It reserved its position, however, with regard to the most suitable time for initiating a procedure for amending the Charter.

22. Mr. VOUTOV (Bulgaria) recalled that his delegation had always regarded any discussion of Charter amendments as useless in the absence of one of the permanent members of the Security Council, the People's Republic of China, whose Government would be unable to ratify any amendment thus prepared. His delegation would not vote against the inclusion of those items in the agenda of the next session, because it hoped that at the fourteenth session reason would prevail, and the People's Republic of China would take its place in the United Nations. There was great inconsistency in the attitude of those who claimed that they wanted to ensure a more equitable representation of all peoples and all geographical regions within the United Nations and yet persisted in excluding the largest country of the world. Any measures which the General Assembly might take would remain ineffective until the basic question was settled, namely, the restoration of the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

23. In the light of those considerations, his delegation would vote against the nineteen-Power draft resolution and would abstain in the vote on the seven-Power draft resolution.

24. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands) said that the representative of Bulgaria had misunderstood the intentions of the sponsors of the nineteen-Power draft resolution. As he had pointed out at the previous meeting, the sponsors of that draft understood very well the difficulties involved at the present time in amending the Charter. All they wanted was that the Committee should take a decision in principle in favour of an increase in the membership of the Economic and Social Council.

25. Mr. PARRA-VELASCO (Ecuador) considered that the General Assembly had a moral, and to a certain extent, a legal obligation to settle equitably the problem of representation in the principal organs of the United Nations. The moral obligation arose because, in the interest of the work of those organs, particularly the Economic and Social Council, the African and Asian States that had recently attained independence should be more widely represented. From the legal point of view, it had been understood at the time the Charter had been drawn up at San Francisco, that that instrument would be amended in due course, in the light of changes in the situation. He considered that the question of Chinese representation in the United Nations was entirely irrelevant to the question under discussion. The allocation of the new seats should be discussed after the Charter had been amended. He would vote in favour of the two draft resolutions before the Committee.

26. Mr. Itaat HUSAIN (Pakistan) said that his delegation was in favour of a modest increase in the membership of the Economic and Social Council and in the non-permanent members of the Security Council. His delegation was opposed to the creation of additional permanent seats in the Security Council. It was also

opposed to any increase in the number of members of the International Court of Justice, who sat as individuals and not as representatives of States. The Soviet Union representative had rightly pointed out that any increase in the membership of those organs implied an amendment to the Charter, which was impossible so long as the five permanent members of the Security Council disagreed on that point. The best course to follow in the circumstances was to include the question in the agenda of the fourteenth session of the General Assembly, in the hope that the situation would have improved by that time. His delegation would vote in favour of the two draft resolutions before the Committee.

27. Mr. OGAWA (Japan) said that his Government was in favour of an increase in the membership of the three organs under discussion. As his delegation had already pointed out in the Second Committee (550th meeting), the Asian and African countries were inadequately represented in the Economic and Social Council, which was detrimental to the many activities of that organ. Furthermore, as the Economic and Social Council dealt chiefly with technical and humanitarian problems, political considerations should not be taken into account when an increase in its membership was contemplated. For that reason his delegation had joined the sponsors of the nineteen-Power draft resolution.

28. He thought that the Security Council could carry out its functions more effectively if there was an increase in the participation of the Asian and African countries. As to the International Court of Justice, in whose activities his country had actively co-operated in the past, it would benefit considerably by the participation of judges chosen from countries with different civilizations and legal systems. His delegation would vote in favour of the two draft resolutions under discussion.

29. Mr. MILLER (New Zealand) stated that he would vote in favour of the two draft resolutions before the Committee. He noted that there was a close correspondence between the operative part of the seven-Power draft resolution and operative paragraph 2 of the nineteen-Power draft resolution, of which his delegation was a co-sponsor. Like most members of the Committee, he was in favour of an increase in the membership of the Economic and Social Council for reasons already given by many speakers, in particular the representatives of Venezuela and the Netherlands. It was his delegation's hope that the matter would be treated on its merits rather than as one element of a controversy in which opinion in the Assembly was deeply divided.

30. Mr. SHAHA (Nepal) said that, in the opinion of his delegation, the seven-Power draft resolution closely reflected the present situation with regard to the question of amending the United Nations Charter. The Charter could certainly not be amended so long as no understanding could be reached among the great Powers. His delegation shared the view of the Soviet representative that the exclusion of the legitimate Government of China was a major injustice. His country's position on the question of the representation of China was well known. However, his delegation had no objection to the seven-Power draft resolution, which recognized the need to increase the size of some United Nations organs, while taking into account the political

realities of the situation. As to the nineteen-Power draft resolution, of which Nepal was a co-sponsor, it confined itself to the consideration of an increase in the membership of the Economic and Social Council, which would chiefly benefit the smaller countries. It would be to the advantage of those countries if, in the consideration of that problem, the economic or technical questions could be separated from the political ones. His delegation would vote in support of the two draft resolutions before the Committee.

31. Mr. JANTUAH (Ghana) said that no country could be more interested than his own in economic and social development and in the maintenance of international peace and security. That double aim could be reached only by giving the Economic and Social Council, the Security Council and the International Court of Justice the means of carrying out their duty effectively, and for that an increase in the membership of those three major organs of the United Nations would be necessary. Such an increase could not be effected without amendments to Articles 23 and 61 of the United Nations Charter and to Article 3 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, and it was generally recognized that because of differences of opinion among the permanent members of the Security Council, whose agreement was necessary, the present time would not be a suitable one for making such amendments. The efforts made in that direction would be futile and might also prove to be the occasion for accusations and recriminations which would not be in the interests of peace. Thus, although it considered that the increase in the number of States Members of the United Nations, particularly of Asian and African countries, justified an increase in the three major organs of the United Nations, his delegation recognized that it was wiser to postpone consideration of that question to the next session of the General Assembly. For that reason it had joined other delegations in submitting the seven-Power draft resolution, which it hoped would be approved by a substantial majority of the Committee.

32. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to correct some false impressions which might have been formed as a result of the statements made by certain delegations, in particular that of the United States. The Soviet Union had never considered that representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations was the price for its support of an amendment to the Charter. It was not concerned with any question of price but with something quite different. It considered that before attempting to amend the Charter, which on the whole enabled the United Nations to carry out its duties satisfactorily, the provisions of that Charter must be carried out and the injustice done to China, a permanent member of the Security Council, must be wiped out. There was no connexion between the reparation of that injustice and a revision of the Charter. Those two questions were entirely independent of each other. It was generally recognized that the conditions necessary for a revision of the Charter did not exist and that consideration of that question should be postponed. In the meantime, however, discussion continued and the Committee had before it a draft resolution which prejudged the question. The reason for that situation was that the supporters of a revision of the Charter had encountered opposition and were endeavouring to achieve their purpose by roundabout manoeuvres and in stages. For that reason, they had submitted a draft resolution which

had for its real purpose the amendment of the Charter, although in appearance it was not bound up with a change in the Charter.

33. The Soviet Union therefore refused to support a draft resolution which had as its true purpose the revision of the Charter. Some representatives wished to create the impression that a more equitable distribution of the composition of the Economic and Social Council could not be achieved without an increase in its membership, and consequently without an amendment to the Charter on that point. He disputed the validity of that argument. He pointed out that out of the eighteen members of the Council there were only three from Africa and Asia, whereas thirty States from those regions were represented in the United Nations, four Latin American States, although twenty States from that part of the world were Members of the United Nations, and lastly six States Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), although only fifteen members of that Organization were Members of the United Nations. It was clear that a more equitable geographical representation could be ensured forthwith in the Economic and Social Council, without waiting for a revision of the Charter. The NATO States need only make room in the Council for a greater number of Asian and African countries. The NATO countries were over-represented in the Council, yet they were the first to demand, with a great show of eloquence, that its membership should be increased. It was high time to remedy that situation.

34. Mr. SHAHA (Nepal) said that his delegation set a high value on the support that the Soviet Union could give to the nineteen-Power draft resolution which Nepal was co-sponsoring. His delegation, in agreement with several of the co-sponsors, was therefore prepared to omit from the draft resolution the preamble which recalled Economic and Social Council resolution 690 B (XXVI), to which the USSR had been opposed. Moreover, the draft resolution was entirely without prejudice to the question of an amendment to the Charter. He asked whether, on those terms, the Soviet delegation would be prepared to accept the draft resolution as amended.

35. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), replying to the question, said that, in any event, his delegation would be able to agree only to operative paragraph 2 of the nineteen-Power draft resolution.

36. Mr. KHALATBARI (Iran) drew attention to the fact that the wording of the French text of paragraph 1 of the nineteen-Power draft resolution could be improved by replacing, at the end of the paragraph, the word "continueront" by the word "continuent" and the words "de façon expéditive" by the words "d'une façon efficace".

37. Mr. DE VAUELLES (France) thought that the first amendment proposed by the representative of Iran was justified. It did not seem to him, however, that the second amendment met the case. The intention was to avoid delay in the Council's work rather than to ensure that it was efficiently done. That idea should therefore be expressed.

38. He referred to the fact that, in operative paragraph 2 of the nineteen-Power draft resolution, the Soviet delegation had objected to the title given to the item to be included in the agenda for the fourteenth

session of the General Assembly. Yet the title was the same as that in the seven-Power draft resolution to which the Soviet delegation had said it would not object.

39. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would note the statements of the Iranian and French representatives and make the necessary changes in the French text of the nineteen-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.29 and Add.1).

40. He put to the vote the seven-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.28/Rev.1).

The draft resolution was adopted by 61 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

41. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the nineteen-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.29 and Add.1). He announced that a vote by roll-call had been requested on each of the paragraphs of the draft resolution.

The preamble to the draft resolution was put to the vote.

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

In favour: Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain.

Against: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania.

Abstaining: Sudan, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Saudi Arabia.

The preamble to the draft resolution was adopted by 47 votes to 9, with 16 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution was put to the vote.

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

In favour: Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama.

Against: Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary.

Abstaining: Saudi Arabia, Sudan, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Liberia, Libya, Morocco.

Operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution was adopted by 47 votes to 9, with 16 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution was put to the vote.

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

In favour: Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti.

Abstaining: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia.

Operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution was adopted by 66 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole was put to the vote.

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

In favour: Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Libya, Luxembourg, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Tun-

isia, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland.

Against: Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary.

Abstaining: Indonesia, Iraq, Liberia, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Ghana, India.

The draft resolution as a whole (A/SPC/L.29 and Add.1) was adopted by 49 votes to 9, with 14 abstentions.

42. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico), explaining his vote, said that his delegation had always maintained that there should be an increase in the number of members of the organs of the United Nations corresponding to the increase in the number of Member States of the United Nations. Nevertheless, in present circumstances, his delegation considered that the General Assembly could only decide to postpone consideration of items 21, 22 and 23 of its agenda to its next session. For that reason the Mexican delegation had voted for the two draft resolutions submitted to the Committee. Its vote was, however, without prejudice to Mexico's position as to the substance of the question, namely, amendment of the Charter in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 108.

43. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) proposed that the Committee should postpone the remaining explanations of vote to its next meeting. He accordingly moved the adjournment of the meeting.

The motion was adopted by 29 votes to 2, with 21 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.