

(a) **States Sponsored by the U.S.S.R.**

Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, the Mongolian People's Republic, North Korea, "the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam" (Viet-Minh) and Roumania;

(b) **Other States**

Austria, Cambodia, Ceylon, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, the Republic of Korea, Laos, Libya, Nepal, Portugal and Viet-Nam.

Three proposals regarding the admission of new members were submitted at the sixth session of the General Assembly. The first of these was a resolution sponsored by the Soviet Union by which the General Assembly would have asked the Security Council to reconsider the applications of 13 states (Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, Ceylon, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, the Mongolian People's Republic, Nepal, Portugal and Roumania) and to consider the new application of Libya. This Soviet proposal included all the outstanding applicants except the disputing claimants in Korea and in Indo-China. The proposal led to a heated debate in the Political Committee of the Assembly and was attacked by the United States Representative as "blackmail". It was adopted in the Political Committee by a vote of 21 in favour, 12 against and 25 abstentions (including Canada), but was rejected in the plenary session of the Assembly since it failed to secure the necessary two-thirds majority. The vote in the plenary session was 22 in favour, 21 against and 16 abstentions (including Canada).

The second resolution on this subject to be considered by the Assembly was submitted by the Peruvian Delegation. This resolution declared that the admission of new members should be based exclusively on the conditions contained in Article 4 of the Charter. Article 4 states that membership in the United Nations is open to all peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the Charter and, in the judgment of the United Nations, are able and willing to carry out these obligations. The Peruvian resolution further recommended that the Security Council reconsider all pending applications, basing this re-examination exclusively on the facts submitted by applicants regarding their qualifications under Article 4. This resolution was adopted by the Assembly by a vote of 43 in favour, 8 against and 17 abstentions (including Canada).

The third proposal which was submitted by a number of Central American delegations would have requested an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice concerning the use of the veto by a permanent member of the Security Council to block a favourable recommendation on an applicant state. On March 3, 1950 the Court had given its opinion that the General Assembly could not, by itself, effect the admission of an applicant state in the absence of a recommendation by the Security Council. This opinion of the Court did not, however, deal with the question of how the Council should make such recommendations, i.e. whether or not the veto could be used. A number of delegations were reluctant to discuss the substance of this Central American resolution because the date on which it was brought into the Political Committee left little time for adequate consideration of the problems involved. Accordingly, the Central