



Wednesday, 19 October 1955,
 at 3 p.m.

New York

CONTENTS

Page

Tribute to the memory of Mr. Carlos Dávila, Secretary-General of the Organization of American States.....	251
Agenda item 14:	
Election of three non-permanent members of the Security Council (<i>continued</i>)	251
Procedural discussion	252
Agenda item 15:	
Election of six members of the Economic and Social Council	259

President : Mr. José MAZA (Chile).

**Tribute to the memory of Mr. Carlos Dávila,
 Secretary-General of the Organization of
 American States**

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): May I call upon representatives to rise. It is with deep emotion that I have to inform the General Assembly of the death of Mr. Carlos Dávila, Secretary-General of the Organization of American States.
2. The sorrow which the death of its eminent Secretary-General has brought the Organization of American States is shared by the Republic of Chile, which loses in him a citizen who for a time guided its destinies. The loss of Mr. Dávila is also a matter of grief to the United Nations, not only because the regional organization is composed of twenty-one Members of the United Nations and maintains close collaboration with the United Nations, but also because of the outstanding services which Mr. Dávila rendered to the cause of international co-operation, and to the United Nations in particular.
3. As provisional President of Chile, as a writer, a journalist and a diplomat, Mr. Dávila was a brilliant champion of the fundamental principles of the United Nations. In the early years of our activities, he worked among us as the representative of Chile on the Economic and Social Council, after having represented Chile on the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Shortly before assuming office as Secretary-General of the Organization of American States, he visited Latin America on a mission to publicize the work of the United Nations.
4. In paying a tribute to the memory of this distinguished American, I am overcome with grief at the thought of the friend and compatriot I have lost. May I on behalf of the General Assembly convey my sincere condolences to the delegations of the American States, and in particular to the delegation of Chile.
5. I call upon the representatives to observe a minute's silence in tribute to the memory of Mr. Dávila.

The representatives observed a minute's silence.

AGENDA ITEM 14

**Election of three non-permanent members of the
 Security Council (*continued*)**

6. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Assembly will remember that, at its last meeting, two of the three non-permanent members of the Security Council whose terms of office begin on 1 January 1956 were elected on the first ballot. In accordance with rule 95 of the rules of procedure, we then took three ballots restricted to the candidates which had obtained the greatest number of votes in the previous ballot, namely, the Philippines and Poland. The three ballots were inconclusive. Two further ballots, the fifth and sixth in chronological order, were then taken and, in accordance with rule 95, were unrestricted. As those two ballots were also inconclusive, the Assembly decided not to proceed with the election at that meeting.
7. We must therefore now take a seventh vote, which will be the third unrestricted ballot for the election of one non-permanent member of the Security Council. In this ballot, any Member State not now represented on the Security Council is eligible, with the exception of Australia and Cuba which have already been elected for a two-year term of office.
8. In accordance with rule 94 of the rules of procedure, the election will be held by secret ballot and there will be no nominations.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Barrington (Burma) and Mr. Kiselyov (Byelorussian SSR), acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	59
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	59
Abstentions:	1
Number of members voting:	58
Required majority:	39
Number of votes obtained:	
Philippines	31
Yugoslavia	27

9. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): As no country obtained the required majority in this ballot, we must continue with the balloting. The next three ballots will be restricted to the two candidates which obtained the greatest number of votes in the previous ballot, namely the Philippines and Yugoslavia.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Barrington (Burma) and Mr. Kiselyov (Byelorussian SSR), acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	59
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	59
Abstentions:	1

Number of members voting: 58

Required majority: 39

Number of votes obtained:

Philippines 30

Yugoslavia 28

10. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): As this ballot was also inconclusive, we shall now take a second restricted ballot in which votes may be cast only for the Philippines or Yugoslavia.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Barrington (Burma) and Mr. Kiselyov (Byelorussian SSR), acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers: 59

Invalid ballots: 0

Number of valid ballots: 59

Abstentions: 1

Number of members voting: 58

Required majority: 39

Number of votes obtained:

Philippines 31

Yugoslavia 27

11. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): This ballot also was inconclusive.

12. I recognize the representative of the United States on a point of order.

Procedural discussion

13. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): I wish to make the following motion: that further balloting in the Security Council election be adjourned to a future meeting and that the General Assembly proceed today with the elections to the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council. I may say that this procedure accords with that followed at previous Assembly sessions in similar circumstances.

14. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Representatives have heard the United States proposal that further balloting in the Security Council election should be adjourned and that we should proceed with the other elections.

15. Mr. ENGEN (Norway): My delegation agrees with the representative of the United States that apparently a situation has developed with regard to the election of members of the Security Council which does not lend itself to solution at the present meeting. On the other hand, I think that it is important that the General Assembly should be able to reach its decisions in the light of issues clearly stated. In view of this, I wonder whether it would be wise to proceed with elections to the two other organs, leaving behind us a situation with regard to the Security Council which has not been clarified.

16. I think that the General Assembly has established a certain procedure for the elections to the three permanent organs of the United Nations for a definite purpose. I believe that we are all aware that these elections are not unconnected with each other, and I should like to ask the representative of the United States whether he does not think it would be more profitable, from the point of view of reaching a solution of the deadlock which has arisen with regard to the election of members to the Security Council, if this Assembly maintained the established procedure of carrying out the elections to the three principal organs in a certain sequence.

17. My delegation is rather afraid that the situation which has arisen with regard to the election to the Security Council will be more difficult to solve if we leave it unfinished now and proceed to the other two elections. For that reason, I should like to move that the General Assembly postpone the elections to all three principal organs of the United Nations until a later date.

18. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The representative of Norway has moved an amendment to the United States proposal, to the effect that all the elections should be postponed to a later meeting.

19. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq): This is not the first time in the history of the United Nations that we have experienced such a deadlock, and it seems to me that our procedure in the past has been to move on and to complete the elections to the other Councils, leaving the completion of the Security Council election until a later date. I disagree with the representative of Norway and would suggest that, if we completed the elections to the other two Councils, the problem which has arisen in connexion with the Security Council would probably be facilitated. In other words, I do not share the view of the representative of Norway that the postponement of all the elections would improve the chances of reaching a solution — quite the contrary.

20. That is why I wish to support the proposal made by the United States representative that we should postpone the election of the remaining non-permanent member of the Security Council and proceed now with the elections to the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council.

21. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet delegation supports the proposal that the elections to the Security Council as well as to the other organs should be postponed to the next meeting. The Soviet delegation cannot support the proposal that we should suspend the election to the Security Council and begin voting for members of the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council.

22. I associate myself with the arguments of the representative of Norway, but would like to add something. The General Assembly has adopted a definite order for the consideration of the questions on its agenda. It has also adopted an order for the conduct of the elections to the principal organs of the United Nations; those elections should begin with the Security Council, then go on to the Economic and Social Council, and after that to the Trusteeship Council. The order for the elections to the principal organs of the United Nations agreed upon at this session of the Assembly is the same as that which has been followed at previous sessions, and we see no need for the Assembly to depart from it.

23. It should be obvious that the decision the Assembly takes on the candidates for the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council will to a large extent be determined by the results of the elections to the Security Council. It is all the more important to bear this in mind in connexion with the candidates put forward on behalf of one or other of the geographical areas for the vacant seats in the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council. In these circumstances, the Soviet delegation considers that it would be unwise to depart from the order established by the General Assembly for the conduct of elections to the Organization's principal organs. The situation which has now arisen regarding the elections to the Security Council

is proof that more time is needed for delegations adequately to prepare themselves for the elections to the other organs of the United Nations.

24. For these reasons, the Soviet delegation proposes that the elections to the Security Council, as well as to the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council, should be deferred to the next meeting.

25. As for our attitude to the proposal made by the United States representative, I should like to draw attention, in that connexion, to the fact that rule 83 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure states that "when a proposal has been adopted or rejected, it may not be reconsidered at the same session unless the General Assembly, by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting, so decides". It is hardly necessary to point out that in the present instance we are dealing, not with a procedural question, but with a very serious political question. It may be objected that in the past there have been occasions when the Assembly has proceeded to conduct elections to the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council before completing the elections to the Security Council. That is true: there have been such occasions. But, as the members of the Assembly may remember, in all those cases there was no divergence of views on the matter, and the decision was taken unanimously, that is, by even more than a two-thirds majority. Thus the precedents would seem merely to confirm that on this occasion, when the question is one of reconsidering a decision already taken by the Assembly, we should adhere strictly to rule 83 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

26. I should therefore, like, once again, to emphasize the view of the USSR delegation that we should postpone further elections both to the Security Council and to the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council until the next meeting, and that, in voting on this matter, we should be guided by rule 83 of the rules of procedure.

27. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): I should like to give our view of the parliamentary situation now confronting the General Assembly.

28. As we understand it, the motion submitted by the representative of Norway is an alternative motion to ours. Rule 92 of the Assembly's rules of procedure states, in part: "A motion is considered an amendment to a proposal if it merely adds to, deletes from or revises part of that proposal." The motion of the representative of Norway does not add to, delete from or revise our proposal. It is a motion in itself. As I have said, my understanding is that it is offered as an alternative to our proposal.

29. Rule 93 of our rules of procedure states: "If two or more proposals relate to the same question, the General Assembly shall, unless it decides otherwise, vote on the proposals in the order in which they have been submitted." Since the United States proposal was submitted first, we contend, respectfully, that the United States proposal should be put to the vote first.

30. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We now have before us a proposal by the representative of the United States that the Assembly should adjourn further balloting in the election of one non-permanent member of the Security Council. The representative of Norway has proposed the postponement of all the elections that were to be held at this meeting. This proposal is supported by the representative of the Soviet

Union, who feels that, under rule 83 of the rules of procedure, the United States proposal would involve the reconsideration of a previous decision and would therefore require a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting.

31. If no other representative wishes to speak, I shall ask the representative of Norway whether he regards his proposal as an amendment to the United States proposal.

32. Mr. ENGEN (Norway): My delegation's view concerning the parliamentary situation is the following. When I made my first intervention I suggested that the representative of the United States might consider amending his proposal to the effect that the postponement should apply to elections to all three Councils. It was my understanding, when the President referred to my proposal, that he considered it as an amendment to the original proposal. That is still the opinion of my delegation, that it is an amendment to the original proposal.

33. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Assembly has heard the Norwegian representative's interpretation of his proposal. Does any representative wish to speak on this procedural question?

34. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand): I am going to speak on the question of procedure, but, as there are many questions of procedure, I hope that I may be considered to be in order. The question of procedure with which I am going to deal is whether we should postpone the elections to all three Councils or only the elections to the Security Council, and then proceed with elections to the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council.

35. I think that we should be guided by the practice which the Assembly has adopted in the past. I remember that we have had deadlocks on elections to the Security Council. There have been many, many ballots, and there has been adjournment of the elections to the Security Council. But, so far as I remember, the General Assembly has proceeded with the elections to the other two Councils without postponing them all, and that is why my delegation wishes to support the proposal for postponing only the elections to the Security Council and for proceeding with the elections to the other two Councils.

36. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (*translated from Spanish*): The representative of Thailand has adduced weighty reasons in favour of the United States proposal, to which my delegation whole-heartedly subscribes. In fact, there are many precedents where the Assembly, seeing that it could not continue with elections to the Security Council, went on with elections to the other two Councils; we do not see any valid reason in this case for proceeding otherwise. We subscribe whole-heartedly to this view and we shall vote in favour of the United States proposal.

37. With regard to the Norwegian proposal, my delegation regards it, not as an amendment to the United States proposal, but as a separate proposal, which can be voted on separately. There is nothing to prevent us from voting on whether to postpone the elections to the Security Council, and then voting on whether to postpone the elections to the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council too. The essence of the United States proposal is its provision for the postponement of the elections to the Security Council; to suggest that the postponement should apply to the elections to

the other two Councils is not to amend the United States proposal but to make a different one, unconnected with the first, and which therefore can be voted on separately.

38. With regard to the Soviet representative's arguments concerning the order of the elections to the three Councils, I believe that this is simply a matter of Assembly practice, but that no formal proposal to that effect has been adopted. It is true that, on our agenda, the elections to the Security Council come first, then to the Economic and Social Council and then to the Trusteeship Council, but this certainly does not mean that the order is necessarily imposed by a decision of the General Assembly and cannot be changed.

39. We are faced with a *de facto* situation, a very regrettable one, certainly, which prevents us from taking any decision now on this still vacant seat on the Security Council, but there is nothing in principle, in the Charter or in the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, to prevent us from proceeding immediately to the elections to the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council.

40. My delegation consequently considers that the Soviet delegation's reference to rule 83 of the rules of procedure is completely irrelevant. We have no decision to reconsider, and there is therefore no reason to concern ourselves about a two-thirds majority. My delegation is firmly convinced that we need only a simple majority in order to decide to accept the United States proposal and to reject the separate proposal of Norway.

41. Mr. DAVID (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from Russian*): I should like to state my views on the question of procedure.

42. The proposal submitted by the United States representative is in effect intended to alter the order of elections to the principal organs of the United Nations. The Czechoslovak delegation feels compelled to draw attention to a number of problems arising out of that proposal.

43. It is necessary, first of all, to realize that the elections to the principal bodies of the United Nations constitute an important political act and that the order in which the elections take place also has political significance. It is no accident that, whenever the Organization's principal organs are mentioned in the Charter, a precise order is preserved, the Security Council taking first place, before the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council. As an example, we could quote Article 7 of the Charter. The same is true of the rules of procedure. Thus, the importance of the Security Council, the body bearing primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, is emphasized.

44. That is why both the Charter and the rules of procedure presuppose that the elections shall take place in the following order: the elections to the Security Council first, and then the elections to the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council.

45. Any interference with this natural order constitutes a threat to the important principle of equitable geographical representation on the Security Council, established by Article 23 of the Charter. Consequently any change in the order already established constitutes an important political question, which must be decided in accordance with rule 86 of the rules of procedure, that is, by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting.

46. It was precisely in the light of the principles to which I have referred that the General Assembly laid down the order of the elections by unanimously adopting [530th meeting] the relevant recommendations of the General Committee. The General Assembly has acted and is acting in accordance with that established order, as is clearly apparent not only from the course of the last meeting but also from the course of this meeting today. According to rule 83 of the rules of procedure, a decision already taken may be reconsidered only if the General Assembly so decides by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting.

47. For these reasons, and also in consequence of the nature of this problem, which is an important one, rules 86 and 83 of the rules of procedure are applicable and they require a decision by a two-thirds majority vote of the General Assembly.

48. With regard to the elections at the sixth session of the General Assembly, which have been referred to as a precedent, it must be said that that very precedent proves that it is wrong to change the normal order of elections. As everyone knows, the order of elections to the Security Council in 1950 and 1951 led to a violation of the principle of equitable geographical distribution and of the London agreement of the permanent members of the Security Council. To conduct the elections on the basis of that precedent might again lead to a violation of that important principle.

49. The Czechoslovak delegation therefore supports the Norwegian delegation's proposal that the elections to all three Councils should be postponed to the next meeting.

50. Mr. URRUTIA (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): I apologize for intervening in this procedural debate, but since the President has invited our comments on this matter, I should like to make the following observations.

51. In the first place, when the General Assembly adopted its agenda, it did not decide on any order of priority. Thus, the Security Council appears on the agenda as item 14, the Economic and Social Council as item 15 and the Trusteeship Council as item 16, but this does not mean that the Assembly had already considered items 1 to 13, nor does it mean that after this we must go on to item 17.

52. Like the Committees, the Assembly accepts the General Committee's proposals in regard to items but reserves the right to determine its own order of priority. In this case, the Assembly has not yet decided on any order of priority. If, for example, at the last meeting it had decided to discuss item 18 first, and a resolution had been adopted on the order of priority, then today a two-thirds majority would of course be needed in order to change that decision. For the time being, however, we are following the ordinary procedure whereby the Assembly chooses the item it wishes to discuss. In fact, as a rule it is not even the Assembly that chooses it; the President is left free to arrange the agenda for the meeting and to place upon it the items which are ready for discussion.

53. As we all know, it is quite possible that, in the next few days, item 24, which deals with assistance to the under-developed countries, may come to the Assembly from the Second Committee before item 18, on the peaceful uses of atomic energy, for if the Second Committee finishes an item first, that item comes first on the Assembly's agenda. Thus there is no previously decided

order of priority. The numbers of the items are merely for purposes of reference. We have a series of items before us and we can decide which one we want to discuss. That being so, rule 83 cannot apply; it can apply only when there has been a decision, and so far there has been no decision on the order of priority.

54. In my opinion, the two proposals that have been made fall clearly within the scope of rule 79 (c), which refers to the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. The United States delegation has proposed that the debate on item 14, which is the election to the Security Council, should be adjourned and that we should consequently proceed to items 15 and 16, which are the elections to the two other Councils.

55. I do not think that the Norwegian proposal can be regarded as an amendment, for rule 92 states very clearly that "a motion is considered an amendment to a proposal if it merely adds to, deletes from or revises part of that proposal". It seems quite clear to me that the Norwegian proposal is a separate proposal.

56. We thus have before us a United States proposal for the adjournment of item 14 and a Norwegian proposal for the adjournment of items 14, 15 and 16. These are two different proposals, and therefore the one which was submitted first should be discussed first.

57. For these reasons, I would suggest that the President should decide, first, that the Norwegian proposal is not an amendment but a new proposal, in accordance with rule 92, and that we therefore have two separate proposals; secondly, that since these two proposals come under rule 79 (c), they should be voted on in the order in which they were submitted and should be decided by a simple majority, since rule 83 is not applicable.

58. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation proposes to ask the Assembly to close this debate and to vote at once, first on the United States proposal and then on the Norwegian proposal.

59. I should like, however, to refer briefly to the statement of the representative of Czechoslovakia, who insisted on quoting rule 83 of the rules of procedure, which relates to proposals previously adopted. As has already been said over and over again, there is not, strictly speaking, any previously adopted proposal in this case requiring a two-thirds majority for its reconsideration, in accordance with rule 83. Nevertheless, not only did the Czechoslovak representative base his arguments on the assumption that the Assembly had already adopted a decision — which is not the case — but he also invoked rule 86, in order to claim that we were dealing with an important question which would require a two-thirds majority.

60. There can be no doubt that we are now discussing a purely procedural matter, which is very far from being one of the important questions which, under the rules of procedure, require a two-thirds majority. From a political point of view, it is a matter of importance to certain countries to be elected or not to be elected to one of the Councils, or to support or not to support a specific candidate, but, from the intrinsic point of view of the purposes of the United Nations, these are not important matters. I therefore consider that this procedural point does not come under rule 86 of the rules of procedure.

61. To these legal considerations my delegation would like to add a reference to the work of the United Nations, which is being interrupted by the impasse which

we have reached in relation to the election of a member of the Security Council.

62. The Trusteeship Council is scheduled to hold a special session this month, in order to consider arrangements for sending a visiting mission to the Trust Territories. In order to appoint the members of this visiting mission, which is to start work in the coming year, it is absolutely essential to know now which countries are to be members of the Trusteeship Council next year. I believe that it had been planned to open the special session on 18 October; as it proved impossible for the Assembly to elect the two new members of the Council at its last meeting, the session had to be postponed to 24 October. If the election of the members of the Trusteeship Council were to be postponed again, it would be necessary to postpone the special session of the Council once again and this, I repeat, would delay the normal course of the work of the United Nations. My country is a member of the Trusteeship Council and is anxious that the session should be held as soon as possible. There has already been one postponement, and it would be neither fair nor proper to put off the election to the Trusteeship Council because of reasons of a political nature which have suddenly been put forward, and because it is impossible to elect a member of the Security Council — a matter which has no bearing whatsoever on the elections to the other two Councils.

63. I wish to make a formal request that this debate should be concluded and a vote taken. Like other delegations, I consider that we have here two separate proposals: the first, in order of submission, is the United States proposal, and the second the Norwegian proposal. I formally request, therefore, that the vote should be taken in that order.

64. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): Whether the Norwegian proposal is an amendment or a separate proposal — and I will come to that in a moment — the situation in which we find ourselves seems to be this: there have been three proposals, one by the United States, a second by Norway, and a third by the Soviet Union. They all contain one main thought, and that is that we seem to have reached a point this afternoon where we cannot usefully continue the election of a member to the Security Council. I imagine that this is a feeling which is generally shared in the General Assembly.

65. Then there is a secondary point, the point raised in the proposal of the representative of Norway, and that is whether only the election of the member of the Security Council or the elections for all three Councils should be postponed. Those delegations which, like the United Kingdom delegation, feel that the elections for all three Councils should be postponed and which therefore support the representative of Norway, clearly would be in a difficulty if called upon first to vote on the United States proposal. They would not wish to vote in favour of postponing only the Security Council election, if they hold the views I attribute to them, and yet they are presumably in favour of postponing the further discussion of the Security Council election for the moment. Therefore it seems to me that, as a matter of practical convenience and common sense, it would be far the best course to take the sense of the Assembly on the secondary point, that raised by the representative of Norway.

66. It seems to me clear that the Norwegian proposal is in fact an amendment to the United States proposal, since it is an addition to the proposal for postponing the election to the Security Council. It seems to me, on

grounds both of common sense and of procedure, we should proceed to vote first on the Norwegian proposal and thereafter on the United States proposal, which would by then either include or not include the Norwegian proposal.

67. Finally, the question of whether a simple majority or a two-thirds majority would be required — the question raised by the Soviet representative — would not arise unless the amendment was defeated. I think I should say that, in our view, the motion of the United States is a procedural one and not, properly speaking, a reversal of an Assembly decision. Therefore I share the view expressed on this point by the representative of Colombia.

68. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The representative of El Salvador moved the closure of the debate. Since he followed his motion with a specific proposal on the order in which the votes should be taken, I hope that he did not mind my giving the floor to the United Kingdom representative, who asked to speak afterwards. If the representative of El Salvador presses his motion for the closure of the debate, I shall have to ask the Assembly if any representative wishes to speak against the closure. I know that there are several representatives who wish to speak on the substance of the matter, but, since the closure of the debate has been moved, I ask whether any representative wishes to speak on this last question, to oppose the closure of the debate. I shall call first on the representative of New Zealand and then on the representative of Iran.

69. Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand): I take it that to a certain extent — I am not quite sure how much — we are now discussing the motion for closure of this debate. I have another proposition to put before the meeting which I think will deal with the matter as expeditiously as has been proposed by the representative of El Salvador. May I say that I agree with the views expressed by the representative of Colombia, but I am by no means sure that, had we devoted to voting the time which we have devoted to this discussion, we might not have proceeded a little more quickly and better for the Assembly. But the time is now 5 p.m., or near there-to. It is quite obvious that we cannot proceed further.

70. I actually oppose the closure because I think on the whole that closure is not an advisable procedure to adopt in the Assembly, and I simply move the adjournment of the meeting, which must be put without further debate.

71. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): In accordance with rule 78 of the rules of procedure, the motion which has just been made cannot be discussed and must be voted upon immediately, without debate. Consequently I shall ask the Assembly whether it wishes the meeting to adjourn. The vote will be taken by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Greece, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: India, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia, Belgium, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia.

Against: Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iraq, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Thailand, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela,

Bolivia, Brazil, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador.

Abstaining: Greece, Guatemala, Indonesia, Iran, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkey, Union of South Africa, Yemen, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Burma, Chile, Egypt.

The motion was rejected by 23 votes to 18, with 18 abstentions.

72. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We will therefore continue with the meeting. Does the representative of Iran wish to speak on the motion for the closure of the debate.

73. Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) (*translated from French*): I do not intend to speak against the closure of the debate, but I do think that the proposal made by the representative of El Salvador was not entirely in conformity with the rules of procedure. It is not the practice for a representative to intervene twice and then propose the closure, since then anyone could propose the closure.

74. I accordingly intend to make a suggestion which, I hope, will spare us a procedural debate. And let me make it clear that I shall not insist on my suggestion unless the representatives of the United States and Norway, the authors of the two proposals before the Assembly, accept it. If they do not, I shall withdraw it.

75. If I understand the position correctly, the representative of the United States has proposed that the election of a non-permanent member of the Security Council shall be postponed until a later meeting, and that we proceed to elect the members of the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council. If my interpretation is accurate, I should like to propose that a vote be taken in parts. In other words, the Assembly would vote first on the proposal for postponing the election of a non-permanent member of the Security Council until a later meeting, and then on the proposal for proceeding forthwith with the elections to the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council. That procedure would reconcile the proposals of the representatives of the United States and Norway.

76. I should add that, if this procedure were adopted, I should request a vote on the United States proposal as a whole, regardless of the result of the vote on the two parts of the proposal. Some delegations might, for instance, adopt a position on the first part of the proposal based on the hope that the second part would be accepted or rejected, and they should logically be given an opportunity to vote again on the proposal as a whole.

77. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I should like to thank the representative of Iran for his interesting observations. The President is obliged, however, under rule 77 of the rules of procedure, to ask the Assembly to vote once the closure of the debate has been moved and two speakers have spoken on the motion. I therefore took the liberty of asking the representative of Iran if he was going to speak on the closure of the debate. Since no representative has asked to speak on the closure of the debate, I shall ask the Assembly whether it endorses the motion for the closure of the debate put forward by the representative of El Salvador.

The motion was adopted by 24 votes to 11, with 18 abstentions.

78. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The debate is now closed and we must proceed at once to the voting. With the Assembly's permission, I shall explain the situation with regard to the voting, in order to justify the order in which the proposals will be taken.

79. The United States representative wishes to speak on the voting procedure.

80. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): I just want to comment briefly on the order of the voting. The United States accepts the suggestion of the representative of Iran for the division of the vote. We think that is an orderly way in which to proceed. Needless to say, we hope that we will be supported on both questions.

81. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The representative of Norway wishes to speak on the voting procedure.

82. Mr. ENGEN (Norway): Like the United States representative, I should like to say that I accept the suggestion made by the representative of Iran. I should like to thank him for his helpful intervention.

83. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Since the authors of the two proposals to be voted on have accepted the suggestion of the representative of Iran, I am not called upon to make any ruling in that respect. I shall therefore put the United States proposal to the vote in two parts, as a whole. The United States proposal is as follows:

"That further balloting in the Security Council election shall be adjourned to a future meeting and that the Assembly shall proceed today with the elections to the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council."

84. In accordance with the suggestion of the representative of Iran, accepted by the authors of the two proposals, we shall vote first on the first part of the United States proposal, as follows:

"That further balloting in the Security Council election shall be adjourned to a future meeting".

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Sweden, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia.

Against: None.

The first part of the proposal was adopted by 59 votes to none.

85. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I understand from the President's explanation that we are now going on to vote on the second part of the Norwegian delegation's proposal, to the effect that the elections to the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council should be postponed to the next meeting. Is my understanding correct?

86. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Strictly speaking, that is not what we are going to vote on. Strictly speaking, we are following the suggestion of the Iranian representative; consequently, we are going to vote on the second part of the United States propo-

sal, which says the same thing as the Norwegian proposal, but in another way, that is to say, the Norwegian representative is proposing that we postpone and the United States representative is proposing that we vote. I do not know whether I have made myself clear.

87. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The President has expressed his thought very clearly. He proposes now to put to the vote the second part of the United States proposal. I should like to object to that procedure and to suggest that we now vote on the second part of the proposal submitted by the Norwegian delegation, because it does not touch upon the substance of the matter, but is of a purely procedural character. It is intended simply to give all delegations an opportunity to reflect on the elections not only to the Security Council but also to the other principal organs of the United Nations. As for the second part of the United States delegation's proposal, that touches on the substance of the question. It would lead us to consider changing a decision already taken by the General Assembly regarding the order in which we should consider certain questions, and I therefore reserve my right to speak again regarding the voting procedure.

88. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): With the permission of the Assembly and, in particular, of the Soviet representative, I should like to clarify the situation.

89. The suggestion of the Iranian representative that we should vote first on the United States proposal, but in parts, was accepted both by the representative of the United States and by the representative of Norway, who had proposed an amendment to the United States proposal. After they had accepted the suggestion, the Chair asked the Assembly whether it was in agreement because, if so, the Chair would not have to make a ruling regarding the order of voting. There was no objection, and the Iranian suggestion was accordingly considered as accepted and the Assembly acted upon it by voting on the first part of the United States proposal, which it unanimously approved. We should now act on the second part of the Iranian suggestion, and vote on whether or not to proceed with the elections to the other two Councils, as proposed by the United States representative.

90. Now the USSR representative is proposing that our second vote should be on the Norwegian proposal, which is that we should also postpone the elections to the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council.

91. Thus, the two proposals would have the same effect, but are put inversely, that is, if we continued to act on the Iranian suggestion, the Assembly would vote on whether to elect members to the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council at this juncture. If that were rejected, the elections to those Councils would be postponed. If we voted on the Norwegian proposal and it was adopted, the elections to the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council would still be postponed.

92. As the Assembly accepted the Iranian suggestion to vote on the United States proposal in parts and then as a whole, and that procedure was also accepted by Norway, the Chair will carry it out. Consequently, with all respect to the representative of the USSR, we are going to vote on the second part of the United States proposal, by roll-call, as the United States has requested.

93. I call on the USSR representative on the voting procedure.

94. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I still think that it would be more correct to vote first on the second part of the Norwegian proposal. But, if the General Assembly shares the President's views on this point, then in that connexion I should like to raise the question of the voting procedure.

95. The Soviet delegation considers that the question we are now about to vote on constitutes a proposal for changing the order of discussion of items in the General Assembly, an order which was determined by the General Assembly itself. The arguments of those representatives who say that we should not thereby be violating decisions already taken are unfounded. As you will remember, the General Assembly adopted recommendations made to it by the General Committee. Among those recommendations was a proposal for a certain order for dealing with questions, namely, that the Assembly should proceed first with the elections to the Security Council, then with the elections to the Economic and Social Council and lastly with the elections to the Trusteeship Council. The position, therefore, is that we are being asked to change the order we have adopted, and for that change a majority vote of two-thirds is required.

96. Accordingly, I propose that the voting on the second part of the United States proposal should take place in accordance with rule 83 of the rules of procedure, that is, that this proposal should be adopted only if it receives a majority of not less than two-thirds of the votes.

97. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Before taking the vote, I shall comment, with your permission, on the view just expressed by the representative of the Soviet Union. He feels that in this case rule 83 of the rules of procedure should be applied because we would be altering a decision previously adopted. Rule 83 states, in part:

"When a proposal has been adopted or rejected, it may not be reconsidered at the same session unless the General Assembly, by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting, so decides."

98. This is how the Chair sees the problem. The agenda for the meeting, which appears in the *Journal*, was drawn up by the Chair. On this point, however, there was no decision by the Assembly. At a previous meeting, the Assembly considered that it should not go on with the vote and postponed the vote. But, in the Chair's view, this is not a case to which rule 83 applies. Accordingly, unless you wish me to ask the Assembly to decide, I shall take a roll-call vote on the second part of the United States proposal.

99. I call on the representative of Turkey on a point of order.

100. Mr. SARPEN (Turkey): Any intervention at this stage is out of order, except on a point of order connected with the conduct of the voting. That is what I am doing, namely, raising a point of order on the conduct of the voting. In my opinion the situation is very clear. We have before us a proposal presented by the representative of the United States. A vote by division was requested by the representative of Iran, and we had actually started voting after that vote by division had been agreed to by the parties concerned and by the President. We had voted on the first part

of the proposal and were about to vote on the second when the interventions began. All we have to do is to go on and to vote on the second part of the proposal now before the Assembly.

101. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I, too, should like to confine my statement exclusively to the question of the voting. We adopted the first part of the United States proposal and also of the Norwegian proposal, which simply suggests the postponement of the Security Council elections, by a simple majority, and we consider that that was correct. The second part, however, concerns a change in the established order of considering items. I am sorry, but I must remind the President that the order for the consideration of items was decided on by the Assembly. We approved the General Committee's proposals and no one raised any objections at that time.

102. I therefore consider that my suggestion that we should in this instance vote in accordance with rule 83 of the rules of procedure is wholly justified and I still insist that the voting should be conducted in conformity with that rule.

103. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Since I take it from what the USSR representative has said that he does not agree with the President's ruling, I have to put that ruling to the Assembly without further discussion. I accordingly ask the Assembly to vote on whether it supports that ruling.

The ruling was upheld by 37 votes to 6, with 6 abstentions.

104. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on the second part of the United States proposal.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Czechoslovakia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Thailand, United States of America, Venezuela, Bolivia, Brazil, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba.

Against: Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, India, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia, Belgium, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile.

Abstaining: Egypt, Greece, Indonesia, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkey, Union of South Africa, Uruguay, Yemen, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia.

The second part of the proposal was adopted by 26 votes to 20, with 13 abstentions.

105. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): In accordance with the suggestion of the Iranian representative, we shall now vote on the proposal as a whole.

106. I call on the representative of Poland on a point of order.

107. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland): I had asked to speak before the vote was taken on the President's ruling. Unfortunately, I was not permitted to speak. It was not my intention to challenge the President's ruling. I simply wished to draw the President's attention to the fact that there were certain explicit rules

governing this case and that, therefore, no ruling by the President was required.

108. I still believe that the proposal as a whole explicitly reverses a decision previously taken by the Assembly.

109. It is not true that it is because of a mere decision by the President that the Assembly has been called upon to vote first on the vacancies in the Security Council, then on those in the Economic and Social Council, and finally on those in the Trusteeship Council. The decision to follow that order was first taken by the General Committee, and the General Assembly then confirmed the decision.

110. What I have said is substantiated by the report of the General Committee [A/2980]. A certain order of consideration of items is established in two places in that document: in the section entitled "Agenda of the tenth session of the General Assembly", and in the section entitled "Allocation of agenda items". In the list of items allocated to the plenary meetings of the Assembly we read the following:

"13. Election of three non-permanent members of the Security Council;

"14. Election of six members of the Economic and Social Council;

"15. Election of two members of the Trusteeship Council."

Further confirmation of my contention is to be found in the supplement to *Journal* No. 1231, setting out the agenda of the tenth session of the General Assembly, as adopted by the Assembly at its 521st, 525th, 529th, 530th and 532nd meetings. There, too, the order is quite clear: first, election of members of the Security Council; then, election of members of the Economic and Social Council; and, finally, election of members of the Trusteeship Council.

111. Hence, there can be no doubt that the General Assembly decided upon a certain order for these elections. In drawing up the agenda for today's meeting, the President was merely implementing that decision. Proof of this fact is to be found in today's *Journal*, where the agenda for this meeting is listed. In brackets after each item there is a number which corresponds to the number which that item has in the complete agenda of the tenth session, and, once again, the order is quite clear.

112. I therefore believe that this matter falls within rule 83 of the rules of procedure, which relates to the reconsideration of decisions. Rule 83 is not subject to a ruling by the President. Any decision which must be made on rule 83 must be made in accordance with rule 87. I repeat: this case comes under rule 83 of the rules of procedure.

113. We all know that the United States proposal is not a simple procedural motion. The proposal did not startle anyone; no one was left breathless when it was submitted. We have all read about it in the Press for two days now. It has been spoken of as a mere attempt to prejudice the elections. We believe that any move to prejudice the elections has no place in this Assembly.

114. Furthermore, we believe that once the Assembly has made a decision it must maintain that decision. If we reverse one resolution after another, one decision after another, no one can be certain that what has been decided today will not be changed tomorrow or the day after, as the result of some differently constituted

majority. That is why the Assembly adopted a much stricter rule concerning the reconsideration of decisions. The rule on reconsideration was adopted to give greater weight to the decisions taken by this great organ of the United Nations.

115. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): In accordance with the Assembly's decision, we now have to vote on the proposal as a whole.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: United States of America, Venezuela, Afghanistan, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Thailand, Turkey.

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

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, Indonesia, Israel, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Union of South Africa.

The proposal was adopted by 29 votes to 8, with 22 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 15

Election of six members of the Economic and Social Council

116. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I should remind members that the term of office of the following members of the Council expires at the end of this year: Australia, India, Turkey, the United States of America, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

117. Paragraph 2 of Article 61 of the Charter provides that retiring members shall be eligible for re-election. Accordingly, all the Members of the United Nations are eligible with the exception, of course, of the twelve Council members whose terms of office do not expire this year. They are: Argentina, China, Czechoslovakia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Norway, the Netherlands, Pakistan, the United Kingdom and the USSR.

118. In accordance with rule 94 of the rules of procedure, the election will be held by secret ballot, without nominations.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Barrington (Burma) and Mr. Kiselyov (Byelorussian SSR), acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	59
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	59
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	59
Required majority:	40

Number of votes obtained:

United States of America.....	50
Canada	48

Indonesia	44
Yugoslavia	39
Greece	37
Brazil	36
Costa Rica	29
Afghanistan	26
Israel	5
Philippines	2
Syria	2
Turkey	2
Burma	1
India	1
Iran	1
Mexico	1
Venezuela	1

The United States of America, Canada and Indonesia, having obtained the required two-thirds majority, were elected members of the Economic and Social Council.

119. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): In accordance with rule 96 of the rules of procedure, the next ballot will be restricted to the countries with the largest number of votes, that is, Yugoslavia, Greece, Brazil, Costa Rica, Afghanistan and Israel.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Barrington (Burma) and Mr. Kiselyov (Byelorussian SSR), acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	59
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	59
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	59
Required majority:	40
Number of votes obtained:	
Yugoslavia	46
Brazil	35
Greece	34
Afghanistan	28
Costa Rica	23

Yugoslavia, having obtained the required two-thirds majority, was elected a member of the Economic and Social Council.

120. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now have to take another ballot restricted to these four countries: Brazil, Greece, Afghanistan and Costa Rica.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Barrington (Burma) and Mr. Kiselyov (Byelorussian SSR), acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	59
Invalid ballots:	2
Number of valid ballots:	57
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	57
Required majority:	38
Number of votes obtained:	
Greece	33

Brazil	32
Afghanistan	24
Costa Rica	19

121. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): As no country has obtained the required majority, we shall have to proceed to another ballot restricted to the same four countries: Greece, Brazil, Afghanistan and Costa Rica. I should like to remind representatives that they can only vote for two countries because there are only two seats vacant. Otherwise, their votes are not valid. This is the last restricted ballot.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Barrington (Burma) and Mr. Kiselyov (Byelorussian SSR), acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	59
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	59
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	59
Required majority:	40

Number of votes obtained:	
Greece	37
Brazil	31
Afghanistan	26
Costa Rica	22

122. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): No country was elected in this ballot either. In accordance with the rules of procedure, the next ballot will be unrestricted. Each representative is entitled to enter on his ballot paper the names of two countries. He is not restricted to any specific countries, with the exception of those which are already members of the Council or have just been elected.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Barrington (Burma) and Mr. Kiselyov (Byelorussian SSR), acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	59
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	59
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	59
Required majority:	40

Number of votes obtained:	
Greece	37
Brazil	30
Afghanistan	23
Costa Rica	20
El Salvador	1
India	1
Luxembourg	1
Philippines	1

123. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): As no country has obtained the required majority, may I suggest that we adjourn now and meet again tomorrow morning at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.