AGENDA ITEMS 19, 20 AND 21

1. Mr. PETROS (Ethiopia) said that his delegation had taken an active interest in the efforts made during the previous few days to obtain a single joint draft resolution which would reflect the opinion of the majority of the Committee. Unfortunately unanimity had not been achieved, and the Committee had before it two draft resolutions, neither of which seemed entirely satisfactory. Neither mentioned the only point on which the whole Committee was in agreement—namely, the inadequate representation of African and Asian Members in certain organs of the United Nations. In order to remedy that omission, his delegation, together with those of Liberia and Tunisia, had submitted an amendment (A/SPC/L.35) to the Salvadoran draft resolution (A/SPC/L.32/Rev.2), and a similar amendment (A/SPC/L.36) to the twelve-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.33 and Add.1), which would add to the appropriate preambular paragraphs of both draft resolutions the words "which would make it possible to improve the present distribution of seats in those organs". The amendments were not directed against any particular group of States but, he hoped, reflected faithfully the opinions expressed during the debate. The sponsors sincerely hoped that the amendments would secure a unanimous vote.

2. Mr. UNGER (Sweden) said that although his delegation had not taken part in the general debate on the possibility of increasing the membership of the Security Council, it had followed with great interest the forceful and eloquent arguments advanced in favour of amending the Charter to that end. His delegation, like many others, considered it unnecessary and even undesirable at the present time to increase the number of judges of the International Court of Justice, but felt that there were good reasons for seeking to amend the Charter to increase the membership of the Security Council and of the Economic and Social Council, that was particularly true of the Economic and Social Council. The question of increasing the membership of that Council had been raised when the United Nations consisted of only fifty-one States and was all the more important now that eighty-two States belonged to the Organization, many of them developing countries that had only recently been admitted to membership.

3. His delegation shared the general disappointment that no solution could yet be found to the problem, and felt that the items should be placed on the agenda of the next session. Any forward step was to be encouraged, and all possibilities should be explored, such as the suggestion made by the representative of the Philippines (131st meeting) that the Economic and Social Council membership problem might be temporarily solved by invoking Article 69 of the Charter, under which the Council might invite any Member of the United Nations to participate in its deliberations on any matter of particular concern to that Member.

4. With all that in mind, his delegation had given careful consideration to the two draft resolutions now before the Committee, both of which seemed acceptable. Indeed, they were very similar, except for the committee proposed by the delegation of El Salvador. He had no great hopes for the success of such a committee, but he would not object to giving it a trial. Besides studying the possibility of arriving at an agreement to facilitate the desired amendments of the Charter, it could also consider any appropriate provisional solutions of the problem of membership of the Economic and Social Council. His delegation's attitude to the tasks and general activities of such a
committee was conditioned by the well-known views of his country with regard to the representation of China in the United Nations. Once again a final decision on the three items under discussion would have to be postponed.

5. Both draft resolutions before the Committee reflected the strong desire of Member States to bring about a positive solution, and provided for the inclusion of the three items in the agenda of the fifteenth session of the General Assembly, but for the reasons he had given his delegation was inclined to give preference to the draft submitted by the delegation of El Salvador.

6. Mr. PLAJA (Italy) regretted that it had not been possible to formulate a single draft resolution which would have satisfied the two groups of sponsors of the texts before the Committee. While the possibility had still existed, his delegation had moved an adjournment of the debate so that some compromise might be achieved. No doubt both groups had done what they thought was right, and the representative of El Salvador was especially to be commended on the conciliatory efforts he had made in twice revising his proposal. Many delegations favourable to the twelve slightly involved, since in any case, despite all efforts, unanimity could unfortunately not be achieved. If the two draft resolutions before the Committee were examined in that light, the Salvadorian draft would undoubtedly have found to be the better, since it proposed a new step in the form of the establishment of a committee. He did not feel that the pessimistic comments on the usefulness of the committee were entirely justified at that time; judgement on that respect should be reserved until the committee had had an opportunity of proving its worth.

7. Only one negative aspect had been specifically mentioned—the delegations of India and Ceylon feared that the committee might become a means of pressure. His own delegation for one could not see how any pressure could develop from the establishment of the committee and would not endorse such a step if it felt that it implied pressure in any way or to any degree. The duties and functions of that committee should be viewed from a practical point of view: by its very existence, and through contacts with the various delegations, it should continue to attract the attention of Member States to the problem with which it was entrusted, and at the same time it should study the solutions most likely to be supported by a majority of Member States and prepare the ground for their future implementation. Without the committee the problem under discussion would be forgotten until the next session of the Assembly, whereas the committee would at least keep its alive. It would act by persuasion rather than pressure. The delegations which had most eloquently expressed the desire for the enlargement of the Councils could be represented on it and the composition of the committee could in itself be a guarantee that no pressure would derive from its activities.

8. His delegation would support the draft resolution submitted by the representative of El Salvador. It would vote against the nine-Power amendment (A/SPC/L.34) but it would support the amendment sponsored by the delegations of Ethiopia, Liberia and Tunisia (A/SPC/L.35).

9. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) wished, before dealing with the two proposed amendments (A/SPC/L.34 and A/SPC/L.35) to his delegation's draft resolution, to clarify certain points which appeared to have been imperfectly understood after his two statements in the course of the 136th meeting.

10. In reply to questions raised by the representatives of Afghanistan and India, he would merely recall that in paragraph 2 of his revised draft resolution he had made a fundamental change. He had simplified the paragraph by deleting the title "Good Offices Committee" and the clause giving the committee authority to "engage in any consultations it may consider advisable with the representatives of Member States and in particular the permanent members of the Security Council", so that there could be no question of exercising pressure on one or more Members of the United Nations which might have difficulty in approving, or later ratifying, the required amendment of the Charter. According to the revised text, the committee would merely "study the possibility of arriving at an agreement which will facilitate the amendment of the Charter so as to increase the membership of the aforementioned organs". He recalled his previous reply to the representative of India who had objected that the committee proposed in the revised text would still have to consult Member States, including the permanent members of the Security Council, in order to feel the pulse of opinion prevailing in the period between the fourteenth and fifteenth sessions of the Assembly. He had explained at the 136th meeting that although the committee would not be authorized to hold official consultations on behalf of the Assembly, unofficial conversations could take place with representatives of Member States, including the permanent members of the Security Council, if such a procedure were deemed useful.

11. The representatives of Ceylon and India had emphasized the point that when the sixteen-Power draft resolution (A/3468/Rev.1) had been submitted by the African-Asian States at the eleventh session of the General Assembly in 1956, only an increase in the membership of the Security Council was involved, whereas at the present time it was not only the Security Council that was involved but also the Economic and Social Councils. Moreover the representative of India had declared (137th meeting) that the study committee proposed at the time by certain States, including his own, represented "the lesser of two evils", the alternative being a Latin American draft resolution which envisaged an increase in the membership of the Security Council and a distribution of seats which the sixteen African and Asian States did not find acceptable.

12. Both representatives had argued that circumstances were entirely different in 1956. However, the fundamental circumstance—the refusal of the Soviet Union to approve the amendments or to ratify them—remained unchanged. It was true that at the present time both Councils were concerned, and the Latin American delegations had openly expressed the view that the number of non-permanent members of the Security Council should be increased to eight and the membership of the Economic and Social Council to twenty-four. The proposed committee could begin its work on such a basis, and also study the question of the distribution of seats.

---

13. At the previous meeting certain representatives had quoted from statements made during the debate in 1956, but he himself could quote statements made by the representatives of Jordan, Ceylon and Ethiopia on 20 December 1956 at the 528th and 529th plenary meetings of the General Assembly, which would show clearly that the intention of the African and Asian delegations sponsoring the sixteen-Power draft resolution had been that a committee should undertake a thorough study of all aspects of the question of increased membership with a view to finding a satisfactory solution. Moreover, the study committee proposed by that draft resolution was to report to the General Assembly at its twelfth session in 1957. The Latin American countries had opposed the formation of such a committee because they wanted to have their draft resolution voted upon once and for all, so that the Charter might be amended without delay in order to increase the number of members in the Security Council and the number of votes required for decisions of the Council. They had modified their view when one of the sponsors of the revised African-Asian draft resolution declared that the committee would report to the General Assembly earlier, namely before the close of the eleventh session. That would explain the remarks he had been quoted as making on 20 December 1956.

14. As he had said at the 136th meeting, his draft resolution went further than the proposal of the African and Asian countries, in that it suggested that between December 1959 and September 1960 a United Nations body should keep the whole matter of amendment of the Charter alive and prepare conclusions to be submitted in due course to the fifteenth session of the General Assembly. He had stated his conviction that the Charter might be amended without delay in order to increase the number of members in the Council and the number of votes required for decisions of the Council. There were naturally differences of opinion between the Latin American countries and some of their Asian and African colleagues; but some of the latter had in fact informed him privately that they would have been prepared to accept his revised text but for reasons of regional solidarity.

15. With regard to the statement made by the representative of Mexico (137th meeting), he had to confess that he had been surprised and disappointed to hear that the delegation of Mexico would vote in favour of the twelve-Power amendment (A/SPC/L.34) to delete operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Salvadorian draft, since they constituted its very core and were what distinguished it from the twelve-Power draft resolution. It had been suggested by the representative of Jordan (137th meeting) that, if the Salvadorian delegation would waive priority concerning the voting on its draft resolution, the twelve-Power amendment to it might be withdrawn, but he saw no advantage to be derived from the withdrawal of that amendment, the approval of which seemed highly uncertain.

16. With regard to the amendment proposed by the delegations of Ethiopia, Liberia and Tunisia (A/SPC/L.35) his delegation would be pleased to vote in favour of what it considered to be a valuable addition.

17. With regard to the composition of the committee envisaged in the operative part of paragraph 2 of his draft resolution, he wished to propose formally that it should be made up of five members, one from the African-Asian countries, another from Latin America, another from Western Europe, another from Eastern Europe and another from the British Commonwealth of Nations, to be appointed by the President of the General Assembly after prior consultations with the representatives of the various groups concerned.

18. He wished to leave on record his appreciation of the good faith of the twelve African and Asian States which had submitted a draft resolution; he would have wished to reach agreement with them on the submission of a joint draft resolution which might have had the support of all the Members of the United Nations. While he himself had been willing to compromise, the twelve African and Asian delegations had found it difficult to reach an agreement among themselves about renouncing even a fraction of their claims. In the final analysis, all delegations were engaged in a common undertaking, and the important thing was that at some future date the proposed amendment to the Charter should be effected.

19. Mr. BOLAND (Ireland) felt that the discussion on the question had been valuable but that there was not much to be achieved by prolonging it. He therefore formally proposed the closure of the debate under rule 118 of the rules of procedure. The Chairman might perhaps use his discretion, under rule 128, to request representatives to exercise their right of reply and explanation of vote after the voting had taken place.

20. Mr. JHA (India) agreed that all relevant points had been covered in the debate and that it had been unduly prolonged, but he hoped that the representative of Ireland would not press his motion for the closure of the debate, as that might have the result of depriving delegations of the proper use of their right of reply. He himself, in asking for the floor, had not wished to enter into the debate but he must insist upon the right of his delegation to make its point of view clear and in particular to correct the impression which might have been given by certain statements made by the representative of El Salvador. He was not, however, opposing the motion for closure.

21. Sir Claude COREA (Ceylon) agreed that the members of the Committee could not go on interminably replying to each other, but he felt he was entitled to exercise his right of reply in regard to the draft resolution (A/SPC/L.33 and Add.1) which his own and other delegations had submitted, particularly when an amendment (A/SPC/L.36) had been submitted only that day. The representative of El Salvador had already exercised his right of reply, and rightly so.

22. He merely wished to reply to one or two references made by the representative of El Salvador to a statement of the representative of Ceylon in 1956. He wished to make his delegation's position on that point quite clear.

23. He would oppose the motion for closure on the grounds that no motion for closure, however justified, should prevent the exercise of the valuable right of reply.

24. The CHAIRMAN said that, as the representative of El Salvador had already exercised his right of reply in respect of his draft resolution, the representatives...
of Ceylon and India should also be allowed to exercise that right in connexion with the twelve-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.33 and Add.1). He asked the representative of Ireland, who had moved the closure of the debate, to take that into consideration.

25. Mr. BOLAND (Ireland) said that the question whether the right to reply or to explain votes should be exercised before or after the vote was a matter for the discretion of the Chair, and his formal opinion on the motion for closure.

26. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) thought that under rule 118 of the rules of procedure a motion for closure would not curtail the right of a representative to speak in reply. He would therefore support the motion for closure proposed by the representative of Ireland, which would not prevent the Chair from extending the right of reply, after which a vote could be taken on the motion for closure.

27. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) said he would oppose the motion for closure.

28. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the motion for closure of the debate, it being understood that the representatives of India and Ceylon would be given the right of reply as they had requested.

The motion was adopted by 38 votes to 27, with 11 abstentions.

29. Sir Claude CORREA (Ceylon), exercising the right of reply, said that the point he wished to make was simple. The representative of El Salvador had been entirely within his rights in pointing out that the African-Asian countries had in 1956 asked for a study committee. But the debate in 1956 had centred almost exclusively on the specific proposal of the Latin American countries that the Charter should be amended by increasing the number of non-permanent members of the Security Council by two. The question of an increase in the membership of the Economic and Social Council had not then come up, as it had not been part of the proposal. At that time everybody had been in agreement that the matter could not be decided without further consideration and that, as the then representative of Ceylon had suggested, the question of the extent of the increase and the distribution of seats in the Security Council was a matter for study. That had been the reason for the suggestion that a committee should be appointed to undertake that study. There had indeed been, as the representative of Ethiopia had stated in 1956, a need to reconsider the divergent views on the question. There had not been any divergence of view as to whether an expansion of membership was necessary, but there had been divergences of view as to whether two additional seats would be sufficient and whether the geographical distribution proposed in the resolution submitted by the Latin American countries was suitable or not. A committee had been necessary to decide on that matter, and the African-Asian countries had accordingly supported the idea of such a committee.

30. The draft resolution submitted by twelve African and Asian countries at the current session (A/SPC/L.33 and Add.1) did not, in his view, refer to distribution. Its main purpose was to secure an increase in the membership of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. Once such an increase had been obtained, the distribution could be equitably arranged; that would probably be left to the Special Political Committee. If the increase in membership were not obtained, distribution would go by the board, and a committee to study it would no longer be necessary; the idea of establishing such a committee had therefore been abandoned. In 1956 the request for a committee had been reasonable, but in 1959 it no longer appeared necessary. The suggestion that a committee should be set up was, in his view, one objectionable feature in the draft resolution submitted by El Salvador (A/SPC/L.32/Rev.2) because he felt that the entire Special Political Committee was animated by one desire—namely, to secure an increase in membership, and forces should not be dissipated by the discussion of other minor questions. He regretted that the twelve-Power draft resolution would not come up first for the vote, because he felt that if it were to be voted on first it would obtain complete support.

31. He agreed that the time had come to take a step forward and he ventured to submit that the twelve-Power draft resolution was such a step, because for the first time in the history of the United Nations it referred to the manifestation of a unanimous and universal desire to amend the Charter in such a way as to increase the membership of the principal organs of the United Nations. If that draft resolution were adopted, further steps could be taken after a year. Within that period it might be possible for all to unite behind a formal, specific proposal to amend the Charter.

32. That was the one point on which he differed with the representative of El Salvador, but it was for the Committee to decide which of the two methods proposed was the better.

33. Mr. JHA (India), explaining for the benefit of the representative of El Salvador what he had meant in describing the draft resolution submitted by the African-Asian delegations in 1956 as "the loser of two evils" (137th meeting), said that in 1956 there had been two draft resolutions, one calling for amendment of the Charter and suggesting specific increases in the membership of the Security Council, and the other asking for a study committee to go into the matter in all its aspects. He was of the opinion that the proceedings of the General Assembly at that time revealed the fact that many Members had regarded both draft resolutions as most undesirable and the expressions used to describe them had been quite strong. Both draft resolutions had in fact been considered so undesirable that neither text had been put to the vote in the General Assembly, which had merely decided to postpone the question until the twelfth session. He quoted a statement made by the representative of El Salvador himself in 1956, also statements by the representatives of France, Iraq and India. The expression he had used the other day did not apply anything in the nature of evil intent on the part of the sponsors of the draft resolutions submitted in 1956.

34. Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) understood that it was the feeling of the representative of El Salvador that the committee to be set up under his draft resolution should consist of five members. As the second revision to the draft resolution (A/SPC/L.32/Rev.2) still referred to "three or five" States in that connexion, he inquired whether the Committee was to understand that the draft resolution had been modified accordingly.

35. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) replied in the affirmative. Thus, operative paragraph 2 of the revised draft resolution should read: "Decides to set up a committee consisting of representatives of five States ...".
36. His delegation had formed the opinion that all the different groups within the Organization should be represented in the committee. In that connexion, he repeated his formal proposal that the five members in question should be appointed by the President of the General Assembly after consultation with the representatives of the African-Asian group, the Latin American group, the Western European group, the Eastern European group and the British Commonwealth of Nations.

37. Mr. SHAHA (Nepal) said he would vote in favour of the amendments submitted by Ethiopia, Liberia and Tunisia (A/SPC/L.34 and A/SPC/L.36) to the Salvadorian and the twelve-Power draft resolutions. He would like the name of Nepal to be added to the list of sponsors of those amendments.

38. Mr. CASSELL (Liberia) could not agree with the suggestion of the representative of El Salvador that the proposed five-member committee should have only one member from the African-Asian group of States. He felt that there should be one member from Africa and one from Asia.

39. Mr. DEVAKUL (Thailand) said he would abstain from voting on both draft resolutions, as the only practical result of either would be to postpone the question yet again. He felt that those States which were truly in favour of amending the Charter should adopt a resolution to that effect without regard to the prospect of ratification.

40. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said he would vote in favour of the nine-Power amendment (A/SPC/L.34) for the reasons he had explained at the previous meetings, and he would also vote for the four-Power amendments (A/SPC/L.35 and A/SPC/L.36). If the nine-Power amendment was rejected, he would vote in favour of the Salvadorian draft resolution (A/SPC/L.32/Rev.2) as it stood, since his delegation was not opposed to it but felt that the unfortunate division of opinion to which it had given rise would reduce the number of affirmative votes and therefore detract from the force of the resolution ultimately adopted. If the twelve Powers wished for a vote on their draft resolution (A/SPC/L.33 and Add.1) after the vote on the Salvadorian draft resolution, the Mexican delegation would vote in favour of that also.

41. Mr. RAFIG (Afghanistan) said that his delegation had not been in favour of including the question of the distribution of seats in the two Councils in the twelve-Power draft resolution because the main purpose of the resolution was to bring about an increase in membership. It was precisely because the question of distribution was extremely important in its own right that his delegation considered it to be out of place in a resolution relating to an increase in the number of seats. The delegation of Afghanistan would not vote against the two four-Power amendments, but would abstain.

42. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the nine-Power amendment (A/SPC/L.34) to the revised draft resolution proposed by El Salvador.

At the request of the representative of El Salvador, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, United Nations, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Australia.

Against: Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Belgium, Brazil.

Abstaining: Canada, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ireland, Laos, Thailand, Austria, Bolivia.

The amendment was not adopted, 35 votes being cast in favour and 35 against, with 11 abstentions.

43. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the four-Power amendment (A/SPC/L.35) to the revised draft resolution submitted by El Salvador.

At the request of the representative of El Salvador, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal.

Against: None.


The amendment was adopted by 63 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.

44. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) asked for a vote by division on the Salvadorian draft resolution as amended. He requested that the preamble should be voted on as a unit, and the operative part paragraph by paragraph.

45. Mr. URQUOAJ (El Salvador) opposed a vote by division on the ground that it would constitute a duplication of the previous vote. When the representative of Ceylon had requested a separate vote on the operative paragraphs, in his statement at the 136th meeting, he (Mr. Urquova) had pointed out that the same paragraphs could not be the subject of an amendment to delete them and of a separate vote.

46. Sir Claude COREA (Ceylon) said that the Salvadorian draft resolution had not been voted upon, but
only the nine-Power amendment. Since an objection had raised the request for a separate vote, the matter would have to be decided by the Committee.

47. Mr. BEELEY (United Kingdom) thought that the point at issue came under rule 124 of the rules of procedure, under which, when a proposal had been adopted or rejected, could not be reconsidered at the same session unless the Committee, by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, so decided.

48. The CHAIRMAN indicated that he concurred in regarding rule 124 as applicable.

49. Str Claude COREA (Ceylon), supported by Mr. JIA (India), asked the Chairman to reconsider the matter, on the ground that rule 124 applied to reconsideration of proposals and appeared to be inapplicable in the present case.

50. Mr. MOREAU DE MELEN (Belgium) said that the Committee should not be asked to vote on the same text twice. To vote first on a proposal to delete two paragraphs and then to vote on the paragraphs themselves amounted to reconsideration.

51. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) could not agree that rule 124 applied. The Committee should vote on the proposal of the United Arab Republic delegation for a vote by division.

52. Mr. HOOD (Australia) said that the Committee was not being asked to reconsider a proposal, but to vote on the Salvadorian draft resolution. There had been an unsuccessful attempt to amend it, and the Committee now had before it the text of the draft resolution.

53. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico), opposing the view that rule 124 applied, emphasized that the rule applied to proposals, whereas it was an amendment that had been voted upon.

54. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) observed that the sponsors of the amendment had made an unfortunate parliamentary choice in moving it instead of requesting a vote by division at the outset. Rule 124 barred them from making a second attempt to delete the paragraphs to which they objected.

55. The CHAIRMAN observed that he wished to avoid legalistic interpretations and that in the interest of harmony he would proceed under rule 130.

56. The CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to vote on the request of the United Arab Republic for a vote by division on the Salvadorian draft resolution.

At the request of the representative of El Salvador, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria,Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland.

Against: Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstaining: Thailand, Canada, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ireland, Laos.

The proposal was rejected by 41 votes to 35, with 6 abstentions.

57. The CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to vote on the revised draft resolution submitted by the delegation of El Salvador (A/SPC/L.32/Rev.2), as amended, and with the modification to operative paragraph 2 indicated by the sponsor.

At the request of the representative of El Salvador, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

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


Abstaining: Indonesia, Ireland, Jordan, Lebanon, Philippines, Sudan, Thailand, Tunisia, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya.

The revised draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 47 votes to 25, with 10 abstentions.

58. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) said that, since the resolution which had just been adopted embodied the substance of the twelve-Power draft resolution, the Committee could now decide, in accordance with rule 132 of the rules of procedure, not to vote on that draft resolution. He therefore formally moved that the Committee should not vote on the twelve-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.33 and Add.1).

59. Mr. ESCOBAR (Colombia) supported that motion, pointing out that the adoption of two resolutions covering virtually the same points might cause confusion.

60. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the motion of El Salvador that the Committee should not vote on the twelve-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.33 and Add.1) or the four-Power amendment thereto (A/SPC/L.36).

At the request of the representative of El Salvador, the vote was taken by roll-call.

El Salvador, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.
61. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) having said "no" indicated that he meant to vote in favour of his own motion and should have said "yes", as should those supporting his motion not to put the twelve-Power draft resolution to the vote.

62. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that those voting in favour of the Salvadorian motion not to put to the vote the twelve-Power draft resolution should say "yes" and those opposed, "no".

63. The CHAIRMAN repeated that explanation, saying that those in favour of the Salvadorian motion not to put to the vote the twelve-Power draft resolution should say "yes" and those against the motion, "no".

The vote was then taken.

In favour: El Salvador, Finland, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Italy, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador.

Against: Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia.

Abstaining: Ethiopia, Greece, Iceland, Japan, Laos, Tunisia, Turkey, Australia, Austria, Cuba.

The motion was adopted by 36 votes to 34, with 10 abstentions.

64. Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary) said he had been confused by the explanations and had voted in favour of the Salvadorian motion by mistake. He wished to change his vote and to vote against the motion.

65. The CHAIRMAN replied that the statement of the representative of Hungary would be noted in the record.

66. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested the Chairman to put to the vote the draft resolution still before the Committee since as a result of the change in the Hungarian vote the Salvadorian motion had been rejected.

67. The CHAIRMAN regretted that as the vote had been cast and the result declared no changes could now be made. The subject of the vote had been clearly stated before the voting began, and members had had ample opportunity to ask the Chair for further clarification.

68. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked the Chairman to reconsider his ruling in view of the fact that the representative of El Salvador had been allowed to change his vote.

69. The CHAIRMAN explained that the representative of El Salvador had been allowed to change his vote because there had been some doubt as to the precise motion before the Committee. He had then clearly stated the motion before proceeding with the vote.

70. Mr. JHA (India) also asked the Chairman to reconsider his decision and to take a second vote on the Salvadorian motion, since the deciding vote had been cast by mistake.

71. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) pointed out that the subject of the vote had been made abundantly clear at the outset by the Chairman and also by the representative of the USSR. A correction received during the voting would have been acceptable, but Hungary's correction had been submitted after the result of the vote had been declared. United Nations records contained numerous instances of unsuccessful attempts to change a vote, particularly where that vote was decisive. If the Hungarian delegation was allowed to change its vote, the Salvadorian motion, which had just been carried, would be defeated. He felt it would be a fatal mistake to establish such a precedent, which might jeopardize the future work of United Nations bodies.

72. Mr. PETROS (Ethiopia) recalled that several representatives had shown signs of uncertainty and hesitation when casting their votes. He himself had intended his vote to signify that the twelve-Power draft resolution should be put to the vote, and wished to have his vote changed accordingly.

73. Mr. PLAJA (Italy) pointed out that, as there had been an appeal against the ruling of the Chairman, that appeal should be immediately put to the vote in accordance with rule 114 of the rules of procedure.

74. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said it would be most unfortunate if, through an involuntary mistake, the Committee's wishes were distorted. He therefore appealed to the Chairman to reconsider his decision, to ensure that the views of the majority prevailed in the Committee.

75. Mr. ESCOBAR (Colombia) deplored the fact that certain delegations were claiming that the result of a vote could be changed after the motion had been carried. Such an action would establish a dangerous precedent that would jeopardize the Committee's future deliberations. He believed that, if the Committee did not uphold the ruling of the Chairman, the entire vote would have to be taken again, to enable each representative to cast his vote advisedly.

76. In view of the lateness of the hour, he formally moved the adjournment of the meeting in accordance with rule 119 of the rules of procedure.

77. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the motion for adjournment.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Luxembourg, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Italy, Liberia.

Against: Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Upper Volta, Vietnam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cam-
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Chairman three times before the vote was that the subject of the vote had been clearly explained vote had been declared by the vad orian motion, and that was the estab lishment of an undesir able precedent. 81. Mr. Sobolev said no justification for after and thus reverse the decision 80. Mr. Sobolev (Union of Soviet Socialist Repub lic) said he shared the view of the representative of Ceylon that there had been some confusion and mis understanding during the vote in question. He would not challenge the Chairman's ruling but felt that, as one mistaken vote had changed the result of the voting, an exceptional situation had been created. It had been suggested that a new vote should be taken on the Salvadorian motion, and that was the most practical way of ascertaining the Committee's true intention regarding the twelve-Power draft resolution.

81. Mr. Casse ll (Liberia) admitted that there had been some confusion during the vote, but emphasized that the subject of the vote had been clearly explained three times before the vote was taken. The representative of Hungary had been distinctly heard to vote in favour of the Salvadorian motion. The result of the vote had been declared by the Chairman and it was not proper for any member to change his vote thereafter and thus reverse the decision so reached. That would establish an undesirable precedent and the Chairman had been correct in ruling that the vote could not be changed. The Chairman's ruling had not been formally challenged and therefore still stood. He saw no justification for taking another vote, as some representatives had suggested, on a motion that had already been carried.

82. Mr. JHA (India) felt that it was more important to reach decisions which reflected the true intentions of the Committee's members than to apply the rules of procedure strictly. He recalled that in May 1949 the President of the General Assembly had retaken a vote on a motion affecting the Italian colonies because he had been in doubt as to whether the vote had been recorded properly. In the vote that had just been taken on the Salvadorian motion at least two members of the Committee had made a mistake in casting their votes, and he appealed to the Chairman to exercise his discretion and to allow the mistake to be corrected by taking a fresh vote which would reflect the true intentions of the Committee.

83. The Chairman said he had tried to approach the matter objectively. A motion had been put to the Committee and carried by a majority vote. By virtue of that vote, the proponents of the motion had acquired certain rights and he had not considered it proper to deprive them of those rights by allowing one representative to reverse his vote. He had been under the impression that his ruling on that point had been challenged, but that was apparently not so.

84. In view of the desire of a group of African and Asian countries to have their resolution considered by the Committee, he would urge, in the interest of harmony, the acceptance of the Indian suggestion that a fresh vote be taken on the motion in question. He believed that such a procedure would not, in fact, deprive other parties of any essential rights that had accrued to them.

85. Mr. Urqui a (El Salvador) said that, while he was in agreement with the first part of the Chairman's statement, he could not agree with his conclusion. He felt that the Chairman's reconsideration of his ruling, under pressure from certain delegations, might have an adverse effect on the Committee's work, in so far as the rules were not being strictly applied. When the Chairman had announced the adoption of the Salvadorian motion, some representatives had withdrawn in the belief that the matter was settled, and if the vote was retaken the opponents of the motion would have an unfair advantage. For that reason and because of the lateness of the hour, he moved the adjournment of the meeting under rule 119 of the rules of procedure.

The motion for adjournment was adopted by 40 votes to 33, with 2 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 8.10 p.m.