

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

Friday, 19 September 1958,  
at 10.45 a.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
Consideration of the agenda of the thirteenth session and allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General	
Item 63.....	9

**Chairman: Mr. Charles MALIK (Lebanon).**

**Consideration of the agenda of the thirteenth session and allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/148 and Add.1/Rev.1) (continued)**

## ITEM 63

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at its previous meeting the General Committee had postponed consideration of the question of including item 63 in the agenda until its next meeting. The time had now come for the Committee to take a decision.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Krishna Menon (India) took a seat at the Committee table.

2. Mr. Krishna MENON (India) recalled that on 15 July 1958 the Indian delegation had proposed the inclusion in the agenda of the thirteenth session of the General Assembly of an item entitled "Question of the representation of China in the United Nations" (A/3851). In support of its proposal, the Indian delegation had attached an explanatory memorandum setting forth the reasons which had led it to propose the inclusion of that question in the agenda.

3. He briefly reviewed the background of the question, which had been the subject of much controversy. In connexion with the question of recognition by the United Nations of the representation of a Member State, the General Assembly had adopted resolution 396 (V), which applied exactly to the case in point. The Assembly recommended in that resolution that whenever more than one authority claimed to be the Government entitled to represent a Member State in the United Nations and the question became the subject of controversy in the United Nations, it should be considered in the light of the purposes and principles of the Charter and the circumstances of each case. The Assembly had further recommended that when any such question arose it should be considered by the General Assembly, or by the Interim Committee if the General Assembly was not in session. Thus, by the very terms of the resolution it had adopted, the Assembly was bound to consider the question of the representation of China and in order to do so it must of course include the question in its agenda.

4. The Indian delegation was now for the third time requesting the inclusion of the question in the agenda. On both previous occasions, the Assembly had evaded

the problem by adopting a temporary measure which amounted to a moratorium.

5. The Assembly could not persist in that attitude without disregarding its obligations under the Charter. All Member States had the right to discuss the question, one of paramount importance which affected 600 million human beings. Incidentally, the question would be raised during the conversations which were now taking place at Warsaw. Surely then it could be raised before the United Nations General Assembly.

6. It had been said that in the interests of peace controversial questions should not be raised in the United Nations. But all the questions considered by the United Nations were in fact controversial. The right to submit questions for the consideration of the international community was one which the United Nations could not deny without gravely jeopardizing its prestige. By rejecting the request for inclusion of the question of the representation of China in the agenda, the General Assembly would deny that right and violate not only the principle of the representation of sovereign States but the principles set forth in the Charter.

7. It had been said that the question of the representation of a Member State was the responsibility of the Credentials Committee. That was no doubt true in the case of a mere individual. But the question of the representation of China was not a personal matter; it was a political issue, which was altogether outside the competence of the Credentials Committee.

8. Twenty-seven States, representing more than 1,000 million inhabitants, maintained diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China, and sixty-eight countries had established normal commercial relations with it. The United Nations could surely not in those circumstances logically persist in refusing to face realities and recognize the representation of China. Moreover, by voting for the inclusion of the question of the representation of China in the agenda, the Members of the General Assembly would in no way be committing themselves to any policy with respect to China.

9. He hoped that the good sense of the members of the Committee would prevail and that the question of the representation of China in the United Nations could be freely and openly discussed at the current session of the General Assembly.

10. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) said he would avoid dealing with the substance of the question and would confine himself to stating the reasons which led the Government of the United States to believe that the question of the representation of China should once again be left off the agenda. At the twelfth session, on the proposal of the United States, the Committee had recommended the General Assembly to reject the request for inclusion of the item submitted by India. Since the circumstances had not changed, the United

States considered that the Assembly should reject the Indian proposal at the current session, as it had done at the last. To that end, the United States delegation proposed that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the following draft resolution, which was identical with the one it had adopted at the twelfth session:

"The General Assembly,

"1. Decides to reject the request of India for the inclusion in the agenda of its thirteenth regular session of the item entitled 'Question of the representation of China in the United Nations',

"2. Decides not to consider, at its thirteenth regular session, any proposal to exclude the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China or to seat representatives of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China."

11. The Indian representative had quoted General Assembly resolution 396 (V) in support of the request for inclusion of the item in the agenda of the current session. But, contrary to what the Indian representative had stated, that resolution did not impose on the General Assembly any obligation to consider the question of the representation of China at the current session and in no way prohibited the postponement of such consideration. Moreover, the General Assembly had had full knowledge of that resolution when it adopted resolution 1135 (XII) at its twelfth session. The United States draft resolution was therefore perfectly compatible with Assembly resolution 396 (V), and his delegation hoped that the Committee would recommend the Assembly to adopt that draft, which was identical in wording with the resolution adopted at the twelfth session.

12. Mr. TSIANG (China) said that he would oppose inclusion of the question in the agenda for obvious reasons. It would amount to the introduction of a procedure for the expulsion of the present Chinese delegation in order to open the way for the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. A debate on the question would only serve the interests of Communist China and encourage it to pursue its policy of internal repression and external aggression. Furthermore, the inclusion in the agenda of the question of the representation of China would be both immoral and politically imprudent.

13. The Government of the Republic of China was one of the founding Members of the United Nations. Since the San Francisco Conference the Republic of China had taken part continuously in the work of the United Nations and had always fulfilled its obligations as a Member State. The right of the Government of the Republic of China to sit in the United Nations could not therefore be challenged.

14. The Indian representative had made several references to the 600 million inhabitants of China. The crux of the matter was what those 600 million inhabitants desired. The Chinese delegation had already shown that the Communist régime established in China was the indirect product of Soviet aggression and that it was imposed on the Chinese people against its will and despite its resistance. The latent revolt of the Chinese people was brutally suppressed by the Communist régime, which had exterminated more than 20 million Chinese patriots and now held more than

5 million in its prisons. The 14,000 Chinese prisoners who had requested repatriation to the Republic of China after the Korean armistice were a living proof of the real feelings of the Chinese people. There was little need to recall that the Chinese Communist régime had been designated as the aggressor in Korea, and there was no place for that régime among peace-loving nations. A debate on the question of the representation of China and on the possibility of seating the representatives of the Chinese Communist régime would undermine the morale of the Members of the United Nations. His delegation hoped that the Committee would recommend that the General Assembly once again reject the request for the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

15. Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia) strongly supported the Indian proposal. The question affected the maintenance of international peace and its importance was self-evident. So long as it remained unsettled, there could be no stability in the world; it was one of the causes of international tension and had already led the world to the brink of war. It had been said that the question divided the Members of the United Nations and that, consequently, international wisdom indicated that it should be ignored. That argument was fallacious and dangerous. To recognize it as valid would mean that no controversial question could be discussed by the United Nations, which had been established precisely in order to provide nations with a means of bringing their efforts to achieve their common goals with harmony. The prestige of the United Nations was at stake. The question had been discussed in a number of organizations and in the world Press, and the United Nations could not escape the necessity of discussing it as well. No question affecting the maintenance of international peace, particularly the question of disarmament, could be settled without the participation of the People's Republic of China. To disregard that fact was to turn a blind eye to reality. By refusing to discuss the question of the representation of China, the United Nations would be flouting the wishes of the 600 million inhabitants of China. As a country belonging to a troubled area of the world, Indonesia expressed its people's concern regarding the military build-up in the Far East. It was essential to provide the General Assembly with an opportunity to examine that situation, and it could do so only with the participation of the People's Republic of China. For those reasons, the Indonesian delegation would vote in favour of the inclusion in the agenda of the question of the representation of China.

16. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom) recalled that at previous sessions of the General Assembly the United Kingdom delegation had voted in favour of resolutions to postpone consideration of the question of the representation of China in the United Nations, because it felt that, owing to the wide differences of view on the question, any discussion might prove harmful to the Organization. It had since been weighing the question whether circumstances had changed in such a way as to enable it to reconsider its position; in reaching a decision, it had borne in mind the fact that the United Kingdom recognized the People's Republic of China and that the inclusion of the question of the representation of China was being proposed by a country with which the United Kingdom had close ties. Unfortunately, the United Kingdom delegation could not help but feel that the reasons underlying its previous

attitude were still valid. Consequently, it maintained its stand and would vote in favour of the United States draft resolution.

17. Mr. SHAHA (Nepal) said it was high time that the General Assembly accepted the consequences of a public debate on the representation of China, a question of major importance for international peace. The representative of India had made a very convincing plea for the inclusion of the item in the Assembly's agenda. As the representative of a country having a common frontier with the People's Republic of China, he too would like to present his Government's views on the question. They were well known; Nepal recognized the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China as the only legal Government of that country. It had been established on the mainland of China for nine years and was exercising control over 600 million people. That was a fact, take it or leave it. To deny that Government the right to be represented in the United Nations was to deny the benefits of the work of the United Nations to those 600 million people. It was perfectly clear that there could be no lasting peace in the Far East and no agreement on disarmament without the consent and participation of the People's Republic of China. Moreover, the United Nations could not disregard the fact that twenty-seven Member States had diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China and that sixty-eight countries had developed normal commercial relations with that Government. The admission of the People's Republic of China would constitute a significant step forward for the United Nations because the more clearly it was aware of the realities of the world today, the more effective its action would be. For those reasons, the delegation of Nepal would support the inclusion in the agenda of the question of the representation of China, which would pave the way for the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations. It was still hopeful that the United States would consider the question with all the political wisdom it demanded.

18. Mr. CASEY (Australia) said that his delegation considered the moment particularly ill-chosen for a debate on the question of the representation of China in the United Nations. Public debate at the present juncture would merely embitter relations among the various Governments and make the negotiations taking place in Warsaw more difficult. It was true, as the representative of India recalled in his explanatory memorandum, that the Australian representative had told the General Assembly at its twelfth session that a disarmament agreement which did not impose suitable obligations on the People's Republic of China would not be of much use; but that did not mean that the time had come to enter into lengthy debate. The most urgent task was to make Communist China realize that territorial questions should not be settled by force. The People's Republic of China was not behaving like a peaceful State at the moment. The Australian delegation would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the United States.

19. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) supported the Indian proposal. Consideration of the question was urgent. For nearly ten years, the only Government truly representative of the Chinese people had been denied the right to participate in the activities of the United Nations. Such a policy was contrary to the spirit of the Charter and harmful to the prestige of the United

Nations. It was an incontrovertible fact that no progress could be made towards a solution of international problems without the participation of the People's Republic of China. The United Nations could not fly in the face of facts.

20. The United States draft resolution was outside the competence of the General Committee as defined in rules 40 and 41 of the rules of procedure, which empowered the General Committee only to make recommendations concerning the inclusion of items in the agenda, the rejection of requests for inclusion or the inclusion of items in the provisional agenda of future sessions. The Czechoslovak delegation therefore considered that the United States draft resolution was out of order.

21. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) recalled that at the twelfth session his delegation had outlined the reasons for not considering the proposed item. The political situation had not developed in a manner that showed Communist China in a more favourable light. The delegation of El Salvador would therefore vote against the inclusion of the item in the agenda. The Indian representative had tried to convince the Committee of the need for discussing the question by invoking General Assembly resolution 396 (V). However, in that resolution, operative paragraph 3 derived from the third paragraph of the preamble and merely meant that Member States should take account of the view of the Assembly if the question of the representation of a Member State arose. The resolution in no way altered the rules of procedure, under which the General Committee could recommend the inclusion of an item or the rejection of a request for inclusion. With regard to the United States draft resolution also, the delegation of El Salvador maintained its previous position. It would vote in favour of paragraph 1 but abstain on paragraph 2 which, in its opinion, went beyond the competence of the General Committee as defined in the rules of procedure.

22. Mr. CORREA (Ecuador) pointed out that his delegation had unreservedly supported the principle that the General Assembly should not refuse to discuss any item which a Member State had requested for inclusion in the agenda, with the proviso that if, after the item had been placed on the agenda, it was considered advisable to postpone the examination of that item or to refrain from adopting a resolution, the appropriate provisions of the rules of procedure should be applied. That principle had led to the quasi-automatic inclusion of items proposed. However, with regard to the question of the representation of China, account should be taken of the fact that at various previous sessions, the Assembly had adopted on the recommendation of the General Committee resolutions identical with the draft submitted by the United States. That draft resolution was the expression of the policy adopted by the General Assembly with respect to the representation of China. Since there had been no change in the basic features of the problem either in China or in the Assembly, it would not be advisable for the latter to alter its position even with regard to procedure. In view of that policy consideration, which took precedence over any other consideration, the delegation of Ecuador, without expressing any view on the substance of the question of the representation of China, and with due regard to the principle enunciated above and to its procedural reservations,

would vote in favour of the United States draft resolution.

23. Mr. CASTAÑEDA (Mexico) agreed that the right of Member States to have an item included in the agenda of the General Assembly must be respected, even if the request for inclusion were subsequently rejected. Although the rules of procedure authorized the General Committee to recommend the inclusion or rejection of an item, yet that authorization could have dangerous consequences. It might create a situation in which the General Assembly would consider only questions supported by a majority and that would be tantamount to depriving Member States of the right to propose items. Care must therefore be taken to prevent a majority from being able to obstruct the discussion of proposed items. Nevertheless, in reaching its decisions, the Committee should bear circumstances in mind. In the case of the representation of China the international situation was such that the debate would be violent and would not help to clear the international atmosphere. It was unlikely that it would have the happy results anticipated by India.

24. In those circumstances, his delegation would abstain from voting on paragraph 1 of the United States draft resolution. With regard to paragraph 2, it believed that in adopting such a decision the Committee would be going beyond the powers vested in it by rules 40 and 41 of the rules of procedure. The point at issue involved not only the inclusion, rejection or postponement of an item but also a substantive question of a political nature that only the General Assembly and its main committees were competent to consider. Accordingly, his delegation would also abstain from voting on paragraph 2.

25. Sir Claude COREA (Ceylon) said that his delegation maintained the point of view it had stated clearly at previous sessions. It attached great importance to the principle that items proposed by Member States should be included in the agenda of the General Assembly. Some representatives had expressed the view that the question of the representation of China was too controversial to be considered at present. In fact, however, most of the items the inclusion of which the Committee had already recommended were also controversial to a greater or lesser degree. It had also been argued that the issue involved the modification of the structure of the United Nations. That would indeed appear to be one of the reasons why the question should be discussed. The United Nations dealt with matters of the greatest importance. If the structure of the United Nations was defective it should be modified. It was, moreover, inevitable that divergencies of opinion should exist in an organization composed of many States with differing views on economic and political matters. It was the General Assembly's function to reconcile those views and it had at times done so successfully, in the case of Lebanon and Jordan, for instance.

26. Another argument that had been advanced was that a decision to include the question of the representation of China in the agenda would have a bad effect on the peoples of Asia, as they would have the impression that they had been abandoned by the democratic countries. That was a mistaken idea. The discussion of the question would, on the contrary, enhance the respect which the peoples of Asia felt for the United Nations and strengthen the cause of

democracy in that region of the world. If the item was not included in the agenda, the democratic peoples of Asia would be unable to understand the reasons for a decision, contrary to democratic traditions, in which the United Nations would continue to ignore part of the Asian population. It would therefore be helpful to the United Nations and the whole world to give the General Assembly an opportunity to discuss the question of the representation of China. He did not see why such a discussion would, as some representatives had implied, react adversely on the Warsaw negotiations. In view of these considerations, his delegation would support the Indian proposal.

27. Mrs. TSALDARIS (Greece) stressed the importance of the current negotiations which provided an opportunity of reaching an amicable and constructive solution. In order not to compromise those negotiations her delegation would abstain from voting on the proposals before the Committee.

28. Mr. MAGHERU (Romania) considered that the Committee could make a useful contribution to the Assembly's work by recommending the inclusion of the question of the representation of China, which was an even more important item than in the past. China was beyond all doubt a great world Power. Some people pretended to ignore reality and did not wish to acknowledge the status to which China was entitled by the size of its territory and its population and the part it played in the world economy. The People's Republic of China was a powerful factor for peace and stability in Asia. It maintained friendly relations with neighbouring countries and co-operated with them in many matters. Furthermore, without its participation none of the questions before the United Nations could be solved. Unfortunately the stand taken by the United States precluded any consideration of the representation of China with the result that that country was unable to take its proper place, a failure which detracted from the prestige of the United Nations.

29. As various speakers had pointed out, the United States draft resolution was contrary to rules 40 and 41 of the rules of procedure. Reference had been made to precedent, but if a mistake had been committed it was better not to persist in it. Although some circles wished to avoid any discussion about China they could not prevent the solution of that question one day in conformity with the wishes of the majority of mankind. His delegation appealed to all the members of the Committee to vote in favour of the inclusion of the item and thus make a decision which would be in keeping with the interests of the United Nations and safeguard international peace and security.

30. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation fully supported India's proposal to include in the agenda of the thirteenth session the question of the representation of China in the United Nations. It was manifestly absurd that a great Power, the People's Republic of China, inhabited by a fifth of the total world population, should be deprived of the possibility of taking part in the activities of the United Nations including the Security Council where China, alongside other permanent members of the Council, bore a special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The situation was aggravated by the fact that China's seat in the United Nations was unlawfully occupied by private individuals

who were nothing but the agents of a group of political bankrupts who had long ago been driven out by the Chinese people and who continued to exist only as a result of financial assistance from the United States and under the protection of American bayonets. More and more people in all countries, including the United States, were protesting against such an abnormal situation and demanding that the organs of the United Nations should take account of the inescapable reality that for the last nine years there had been a Government in China chosen by the Chinese people after its victorious revolution. The contention that the Government of China came to power as the result of indirect aggression by the Soviet Union was quite ridiculous, and the Chinese people gave its Government full and unanimous support of a kind never enjoyed by the successive governments in China in the course of centuries. The tremendous achievements of the People's Republic of China in all fields and particularly in economic matters were eloquent proof of that fact. But those achievements counted for nothing with the United States Government which had spent thousands of millions of dollars to maintain the puppet Government of Chiang Kai-shek. Ruling circles in the United States should understand, however, that they could not halt the irresistible force which is impelling the peoples of Asia and Africa to free themselves from the colonialist yoke and obtain their national independence, and that United States policy was isolating their country more and more each day. Despite the brutal pressure brought to bear on them many peoples were refusing to follow the United States in the course on which it had embarked.

31. China's prestige, on the other hand, was increasing constantly, owing to its policy of peace, as reflected in the principles of peaceful coexistence jointly agreed upon by the Chinese and Indian Governments. Those principles enjoyed the approval and support of all who sincerely desired peace. One could not fail also to mention a serious contribution to the cause of peace in the Far East on the part of the Government of the People's Republic of China which, guided by the desire to ensure a peaceful solution of the Korean problem, had withdrawn Chinese volunteers from Korea. The greater part of the world's population was aware that no important international question could be settled without the participation of the People's Republic of China. That was now recognized even by the Governments opposed to the consideration of the question of the representation of China at the present session of the Assembly, and the Australian representative had admitted that the problem of disarmament could not be solved without China.

32. China's absence from the United Nations not only meant a violation of the legitimate rights of the Chinese people but harmed the prestige of the United Nations, and impaired the efficacy of its work. In the circumstances, the USSR delegation gave its full support to the Indian proposal, the adoption of which would redress a great wrong. Only those who did not desire the diminution of international tension and the maintenance of peace and security could oppose such a proposal.

33. United States policy towards China showed that the United States Government was prepared to go to any lengths to reverse the course of history and reduce China once again to colonial status. From its military

base of Taiwan, where it supported Chiang Kai-shek's clique, the United States was engaging in the undisguised provocation of China. Naval and aviation forces from numerous military bases situated throughout the whole world—including the Philippines, Okinawa, the Mediterranean and other areas—were being openly deployed in the Taiwan area. United States ships and aircraft invaded the territorial waters and the air space of China in violation of international law. United States statesmen openly declared that they would use their armed forces to impede the actions of the People's Republic of China aimed at liberating its own territory—offshore islands many of which were situated at a distance of only two or three kilometers from the mainland. Such acts which increased international tension might be fraught with dire consequences for humanity. But the China of today was a great Power with all the necessary means for self-defence; it had many faithful friends in the world who would help it to repel foreign aggression.

34. It was evident to everybody that the aggressive actions of the United States against China in the Taiwan area were fraught with serious consequences for the cause of peace. The United Nations, for its part, was in duty bound to take the necessary steps to put an end to United States aggression against China and restore the legitimate rights of the Chinese people. That was the only way to relax international tension.

35. Turning to the United States draft resolution, he said that the draft, apart from being in contradiction to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and the United Nations Charter, was in fact aimed at undermining the United Nations. The United States showed, by its draft resolution, that it was afraid even of discussing the question of the representation of the People's Republic of China. It made a cowardly attempt to avoid discussing this question of which the overwhelming majority of mankind was interested in the solution. It was surprising that a great world Power was afraid of exposing its position for the consideration of the United Nations and world public opinion. That example showed the weakness of the United States position on this question. That position had been condemned by an overwhelming majority of the world's population who, as the Indian representative had rightly emphasized, supported the legitimate claim of the Chinese people. Moreover, that position was contrary to the rules of procedure and to the Charter and injurious to the interests of the United Nations.

36. He had been surprised by the argument that consideration in the United Nations of the question of the representation of China might endanger the Warsaw talks. The Governments of the People's Republic of China and of the United States had been conducting negotiations for three years and might continue to do so for a long time to come. The USSR delegation did not think that was a valid reason for postponing once again consideration of the question of the representation of China.

37. In his view, neither the United States representative nor the United Kingdom representative had put forward convincing arguments in support of their position. The attitude of the United Kingdom Government, which had voted against the inclusion of item 63 in the agenda although it maintained diplomatic relations with China, was altogether puzzling.

38. In conclusion, he urged the members of the Committee to vote against the United States draft resolution and for the inclusion of item 63 in the agenda of the thirteenth session.

39. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) remarked that the USSR representative, not content with infringing the rules of procedure by discussing the substance of the question, had also violated parliamentary rules by questioning the motives of other Member States. If he were to reply to the USSR representative in detail, he could make it clear to the Committee and to public opinion that the adoption of the Indian proposal would greatly exacerbate the international situation. Nevertheless, he himself would abide by the rules of procedure and would not follow that course. He would, however, make use of the right of reply after the vote if he deemed it necessary, as it was the duty of a representative to defend his Government whenever it was attacked.

40. Mr. Krishna MENON (India) said that he too had to defend his country against a direct or indirect accusation. It was surprising that the representative of a friendly country should have thought that his Government's proposal might heighten international tension. It was well known that India had always made every effort to reduce tension and to reconcile divergent views. The convening of the Geneva Conference had been partly due to India's efforts and India had always advocated direct discussions between States, such as those being held at Warsaw, as a means of settling international disputes. However, the fact that such negotiations were being held in no way precluded the United Nations from considering the question of the representation of China.

41. It had been argued that the Government of the Republic of China had signed the United Nations Charter. However, under Article 3 of the Charter, States, not Governments, were Members of the United Nations. Governments might change, but States remained. As far as the views of the Chinese people were concerned, it was not for the United Nations to ascertain the wishes of the people of a sovereign State.

42. It had also been argued that now was not the time to discuss the subject, but was there any choice in the matter and was such an assertion true? For example, an Australian newspaper reported that a Chinese trade delegation had just arrived in Australia.

43. International tension would not be reduced, as some seemed to think, if the question of the representation of China was not included in the agenda. On the contrary, ignoring the problem was likely to heighten tension.

44. If his delegation's proposal was rejected by the Committee, it would be submitted to the General Assembly for a final decision.

45. Mr. CASEY (Australia) said that he was not aware of the arrival of a Chinese trade delegation in Australia. Negotiations were perhaps taking place regarding private concerns.

46. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) said that he would vote against the Indian proposal. He requested a separate vote on each paragraph of the United States draft resolution. He would vote in favour of paragraph 1, although he did not consider it absolutely essential,

and would abstain on paragraph 2 for the reasons he had stated earlier. Should the draft resolution be put to the vote as a whole, he would vote in favour. He requested a vote by roll-call.

47. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to rule 122 of the rules of procedure, asked the Committee to vote on the question whether it was competent to take a decision on the United States draft resolution. For its part, the Soviet delegation felt that, under rules 40 and 41, the draft was inadmissible.

48. The CHAIRMAN observed that no objection had been raised to paragraph 1 of the United States draft resolution. In his view, paragraph 2 was covered implicitly by the second sentence of rule 40, under which a member could at any time propose the inclusion of an additional item for consideration by the General Committee. That implied that a member could at any time propose the non-inclusion of a particular question. Should the Committee not agree with his interpretation, he would put it to the vote.

49. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that the Chairman's interpretation of rule 40 was unduly broad and that he had failed to take into account the relationship between the first and second sentences of the rule. The Soviet delegation believed that rule 40 did not apply to the non-inclusion of an item.

50. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote his interpretation of rule 40 concerning the admissibility of paragraph 2 of the United States draft resolution.

The Chairman's interpretation was upheld by 10 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions.

51. The CHAIRMAN wished to make it clear that if he exercised his right to vote in the General Committee, he would be doing so not as Chairman of the Committee but pursuant to instructions received from the Government of Lebanon.

52. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) observed that, under the rules of procedure, proposals should be voted upon in the order in which they had been submitted.

53. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) moved that the United States draft resolution should be voted upon first.

54. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the motion that the Committee should vote first on the United States draft resolution.

The motion was adopted by 10 votes to 4, with 5 abstentions.

55. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 1 of the United States draft resolution.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Pakistan, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Pakistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, China, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Japan, Lebanon, Netherlands.

Against: Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, Ireland, Nepal.

Abstaining: Greece, Mexico.

The paragraph was adopted by 12 votes to 7, with 2 abstentions.

56. The President put to the vote paragraph 2 of the United States draft resolution.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, China, Ecuador, France, Japan, Lebanon, Netherlands, Pakistan.

Against: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, Ireland, Nepal, Romania.

Abstaining: El Salvador, Greece, Mexico.

The paragraph was adopted by 11 votes to 7, with 3 abstentions.

57. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United States draft resolution as a whole.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Mexico, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Netherlands, Pakistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, China, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Japan, Lebanon.

Against: Nepal, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, Ireland.

Abstaining: Greece, Mexico.

The draft resolution was adopted by 12 votes to 7, with 2 abstentions.

58. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) said that the Soviet representative's charges against the United States were so unwarranted and far from the truth that there was no point in replying to them.

59. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom) said that, in his delegation's view, the Committee was fully competent, under the rules of procedure, to take a decision on the United States draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 1.55 p.m.