

the strengthening of friendly relations between States. It could not be said that these objectives were being met if one State continued to deny the right of admission to other States which, by all tests, met the criteria laid down in the Charter. After referring to the action of the Soviet Union in vetoing the application of Ceylon in spite of the evidence given in proof of its independence, the New Zealand representative stated that Italy, Ireland, Portugal, and the other States named in the Australian resolutions had all given proof of their existence as States and of their absolute independence.

The Australian draft resolutions on the applications of the nine States which had obtained a majority in the Security Council were put to the vote, with the following results: Austria—adopted by 42 votes to 5 with 3 abstentions; Ceylon—adopted by 41 votes to 5 with 3 abstentions; Finland—adopted by 41 votes to 5 with 3 abstentions; Ireland—adopted by 40 votes to 5 with 3 abstentions; Italy—adopted by 41 votes to 6 with 3 abstentions. (Ethiopia voted against this resolution, on the ground that although under the peace treaty with Italy that State had renounced its African colonial possessions, Italy was at present maintaining claims to territories bordering on Ethiopia); Jordan—adopted by 40 votes to 5 with 4 abstentions; Republic of Korea—adopted by 37 votes to 6 with 8 abstentions; Portugal—adopted by 41 votes to 5 with 4 abstentions; Nepal—adopted by 41 votes to 5 with 4 abstentions. New Zealand voted in favour of each resolution. Following upon this action the Committee rejected the Soviet proposal for *en bloc* admission by 30 votes (N.Z.) to 9 with 16 abstentions; Sweden, Iraq, and Mexico joined the six Eastern European countries in voting for the proposal.

A considerable body of opinion in the Committee, however, felt that the action contemplated in the Australian resolution was not sufficient. The representative of *Argentina*, maintaining a thesis which he had developed in the past, proposed that certain questions concerning the admission of new members should be submitted to the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion. He claimed the General Assembly could decide to admit a State to membership in the United Nations even if the Security Council had made no recommendation for admission. This extremely involved problem was discussed at some length and it was clear that very few of the members of the Committee agreed with the Argentinian interpretation; there was, however, little opposition to a proposal to refer the question to the International Court for an opinion. Eventually the Committee adopted an amended version of the Argentinian proposal by a vote of 37 (N.Z.) to 9 with 8 abstentions. The question put to the International Court of Justice was as follows:

“ Can the admission of a State to membership in the United Nations, pursuant to Article 4, paragraph 2, of the Charter, be effected by a decision of the General Assembly when the Security Council has made