

proposed that the remaining resolutions should not be put to the vote, but this proposal was rejected by a large majority. He then declared that he would oppose the remaining resolutions, which represented "a policy of favouritism," and infringed the prerogatives of the Security Council.

The *Belgian* resolution calling for the reconsideration of the applications of Italy and Finland was adopted by 29 votes to 9 with 12 abstentions. *New Zealand* abstained on this resolution in view of the fact that it intended to vote for the two relevant Australian resolutions which were wider in scope and would make the Belgian resolution superfluous.

The *Australian* resolutions on the applications of Portugal, Transjordan, Italy, Finland, Ireland, and the *United States* resolution on Austria were adopted by the following majorities: Portugal—29 in favour, 6 against, 1 abstention; Transjordan—35 in favour, 6 against, 2 abstentions; Italy—39 in favour, 8 against, 2 abstentions; Finland, Ireland and Austria—41 in favour, 6 against, 2 abstentions. The *New Zealand* delegation voted for all these resolutions, pointing out, in the case of Austria, that the resolution on this application, unlike the others, did not pronounce on Austria's ability to carry out its Charter obligations; New Zealand voted for the resolution on the understanding that this point was left to be considered by the Security Council.

The last resolution to be examined was that recommending the admission of Ceylon. In the general debate the representative of *New Zealand* had pointed out that Ceylon clearly fulfilled the Charter requirements for membership. Any lingering doubts as to Ceylon's independence should have been dispelled by the recent declaration by the Prime Ministers of the British Commonwealth that "Ceylon enjoys the same independent status as those self-governing countries of the British Commonwealth which are members of the United Nations." It was certainly permissible to ask questions about such matters, but it was not permissible to pay no attention to the answers. If the opposition to the admission of Ceylon were to continue indefinitely, it would be not only a reflection on the Commonwealth and on the peoples of Asia, but a manifest infringement of the Charter.

Before the resolution was put to the vote, the Committee acceded to a request made by the representative of *Australia* for a few days delay in order that conversations between representatives of Ceylon and the Soviet Union delegation might be completed. When the subject was resumed, it was decided after some discussion to set up a sub-committee consisting of the Chairman, Poland, and Australia to redraft the resolution in an endeavour to have it passed unanimously. The sub-committee reached agreement on a text which omitted reference to the Soviet Union's opposition in the Security Council and to the Advisory Opinion of the International Court.