

The Polish representative introduced a resolution during the seventh session which was similar to previous Soviet "package" proposals and would have requested the Security Council to recommend the simultaneous admission of 14 states. In an attempt to remove the connotation that the admission of one state is dependent on the admission of another, the word "simultaneous" was deleted by amendment. Although this was sufficient to turn the Soviet bloc against the proposal, it did not satisfy those countries which are opposed to the principle of the "package deal", and the resolution in its final form was defeated by a vote of 9 in favour, 30 against (including Canada) with 10 abstentions.

The Assembly also had before it resolutions supporting new applications by Japan, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Libya and Jordan, all of which were adopted, the only negative votes being those of the Soviet bloc.

The Canadian Representative, in explaining his vote in the Political Committee, expressed appreciation of the contribution which the Latin American delegations had made to the work of the Committee, but deferred expressing the Canadian views on their proposals, in view of the fact that there would be an opportunity of making them known to the Special Committee. He did say however, that it was his belief that neither the veto nor Article 4 of the Charter was ever intended to keep out of the organization any independent state worthy of the name.

With reference to the Polish resolution the Canadian Representative said that he would vote against it because it was incomplete. Canada could not support the inclusion of Outer Mongolia while excluding Japan. He found it hard to understand why any permanent member should vote against an applicant which it admitted was qualified and which it even proposed for membership in a package deal.

The Special Committee on Admission of New Members held 11 meetings from March 3 to June 15, 1953. At its first meeting it asked the Secretary-General to prepare a factual and historical report on the question, going back to the origins of the problem in the San Francisco Conference. On receipt of this report the Committee met again on May 12 and after general discussion decided that the various proposals and suggestions referred to it by the Assembly or made in the Committee itself should be separated into two groups. Generally speaking, the proposals and suggestions in the first group envisaged a solution along the lines of an interpretation of the Charter based on the view that the veto power in the Security Council does not apply to the admission of new members. The discussion of this first group of proposals revealed, however, that such an approach was not generally acceptable, principally on the grounds that the unanimity rule in the Security Council does apply to the admission of new members and that the provisions of Article 4 do not allow the General Assembly to admit new members in the absence of a favourable recommendation by the Security Council.