



C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Requests for the inclusion of additional items in the agenda of the ninth session:	
(a) Complaint of acts of aggression against the People's Republic of China and responsibility of the United States Navy for those acts: item proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (<i>continued</i>)....	25
(b) Complaint of violation of the freedom of navigation in the area of the China seas: item proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (<i>continued</i>)....	25
Progress report on the work of the ninth session.....	26

Chairman: Mr. Eelco N. VAN KLEFFENS
 (Netherlands).

Requests for the inclusion of additional items in the agenda of the ninth session:

(a) *Complaint of acts of aggression against the People's Republic of China and responsibility of the United States Navy for those acts: item proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (A/2756) (continued)*

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the General Committee had decided at its 96th meeting to adjourn for fourteen days consideration of the question of the inclusion of the two new items proposed by the USSR.

2. He asked speakers to confine their remarks in the first instance to the question of the inclusion of the items in the agenda, leaving the matter of their allocation, if recommended for inclusion, for subsequent discussion.

3. Mr. TSIANG (China) said that his delegation had already stated its position in regard to the inclusion of the item proposed by the USSR. That position had not changed: his delegation was opposed to the inclusion of the item in the General Assembly's agenda because the USSR's complaint was frivolous and without foundation.

4. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom) pointed out that it had been on the proposal of the United Kingdom delegation that the Committee had postponed for fourteen days its decision regarding the inclusion of the item. The United Kingdom delegation had felt that acrimonious debate on a cold war item might disturb the favourable atmosphere in which the discussion of the disarmament proposal was proceeding in the First Committee and should be avoided. The debate on disarmament having been concluded, there was no reason to postpone the inclusion of the item proposed by the USSR. The United Kingdom delegation had no objection to its inclusion

5. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America) recalled that at the last General Committee meeting the United Kingdom representative had suggested that the question be postponed since the disarmament question was being discussed at that time in the First Committee. Sensing that the United Kingdom proposal was in accord with the views of the other members of the General Committee, his delegation had not objected to it. Then as now, however, the United States had no objection to full discussion of the Soviet charges. The United States was confident that the discussion as it developed in the Committee would completely and clearly resolve the subject matter that had been raised. The true motive behind the Soviet proposal could only be a matter for conjecture. A debate on the question would be the only fair way of evaluating the Soviet charges in the light of truth.

6. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the USSR's complaint had nothing to do with either the cold war or disarmament. In any case, the USSR was not a participant in the cold war. It was the victim. The object of the proposed item was in fact to bring to an end the systematic acts of aggression against the People's Republic of China and to prevent their recurrence, in order to remedy the dangerous situation which had been created in the Far East and which might have serious repercussions on peace in that area.

7. His delegation was gratified that there appeared to be no formal opposition on the part of members of the Committee to the inclusion of the item in the agenda. Consideration of the item would undoubtedly shed light on the situation, facilitate the settlement of certain problems that were still unsettled and would be favourable to the maintenance of peace.

The Committee decided without objection to recommend the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

(b) *Complaint of violation of the freedom of navigation in the area of the China seas: item proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (A/2741 and Add.1) (continued)*

8. Mr. TSIANG (China) pointed out that the Committee was discussing the inclusion of the item in the agenda for the third time. On two occasions already, the Chinese delegation had made its attitude clear. It thought that consideration of the item proposed by the USSR was not in line with the practice of the United Nations and, moreover, not at all necessary.

9. As was well known, France had offered its good offices to the interested parties with a view to settling the dispute over the Soviet tanker *Tuapse*. The French *chargé d'affaires* at Taipeh had recently submitted his report on his inquiry. The report showed that in general no member of the *Tuapse's* crew had complained of the coercion to which the explanatory memorandum

from the Soviet delegation (A/2741) said they had been subjected. Although the report dealt only with the *Tuapse* incident, its conclusions were applicable to the crews of all the ships seized. The Government of the Republic of China respected the rules of international law and was always ready to settle any international dispute by negotiation.

10. Under rule 117 of the rules of procedure, the Chinese delegation had proposed at the 96th meeting that the Committee should postpone to a later date debate on the inclusion of that item in the agenda, for reasons which it had then given. It would not make a similar proposal at the present meeting and would accept the Committee's decision, not only because the item was connected with the one that the Committee had just recommended for inclusion in the Assembly's agenda, but also because the USSR delegation had urged that the question should be settled by the Assembly rather than by direct negotiation.

11. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the preceding speaker had attempted to replace by an entirely different item the item which the Soviet Union was proposing for inclusion in the Assembly's agenda.

12. The memorandum his delegation had submitted on 30 September was not primarily concerned with the ill-treatment of a particular group of persons. The problems it raised were much more serious; they related to acts of piracy and violations of the freedom of navigation in the area of the China seas, where merchant vessels of various countries had been seized and attacked by Kuomintang naval vessels.

13. The previous speaker had not said a word about all that. He had confined himself to stating that his Government had not committed acts of violence, as though the seizure of vessels and the imprisonment of their crews were not in themselves acts of violence. Those were flagrant crimes, and it was for precisely that reason that his delegation had asked the Assembly to include the item in its agenda.

14. It had been proposed fourteen days previously that consideration of the request should be deferred in order to avoid complicating the task of the French Government, which had offered its good offices with a view to settling the case of the Soviet tanker *Tuapse* and its crew, detained by the Kuomintang authorities. The General Committee had accepted (96th meeting) that proposal and had agreed to wait. Nothing had changed, however, since its last meeting: the tanker was still in the hands of the Kuomintang and its crew was still in prison.

15. It was therefore essential to include the item in the Assembly's agenda.

The General Committee decided without objection to recommend the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

16. After a brief exchange of views with Sir Douglas COPLAND (Australia), the CHAIRMAN proposed that the General Committee should recommend to the Assembly that it should refer the two items to the First Committee, on the understanding that, if that Committee's agenda should prove to be overburdened, the items could be transferred to the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. It was necessary in any event that the two

items, which were undoubtedly interrelated, should be considered by one and the same committee.

It was so decided.

Progress report on the work of the ninth session

17. The CHAIRMAN recalled that under rule 42 of the Assembly's rules of procedure the General Committee was required to meet periodically to review the progress of the Assembly and its Committees.

18. Taking 10 December, the closing date, as a basis, the first half of the session was over. It was desirable therefore to review what had been done and what remained to be done. The Assembly had given due time to the general debate. Some Committees had begun consideration of the items before them without awaiting the end of the general debate. Others, like the First Committee and the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, had not been able to begin their work until later. Broadly speaking, between two-thirds and three-quarters of the work remained to be completed.

19. By comparison with previous sessions, the situation might be called normal. Methods of expediting the Assembly's work must, however, be considered at once. While the Assembly itself and some Committees had so far held the usual number of meetings, it could now be foreseen that some other Committees would have difficulty in completing their work by 10 December.

20. He therefore asked members of the Committee for their views on measures to expedite the Assembly's work.

21. Mr. ASHA (Syria) said that, notwithstanding the diligence with which it had worked, the Fourth Committee, of which he was Chairman, had not been able to complete a single one of the items on its agenda. It hoped to be able to dispose of two of them by the coming week. But its agenda was heavy. It had to grant more than ten hearings and it still had to consider the Trusteeship Council's report, a very important item.

22. He felt, therefore, that the Committee should meet on Saturdays, thereby setting an example for other Committees which might also be behindhand.

23. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it was for the Fourth Committee itself to decide whether or not it would meet on Saturdays. The General Committee could not rule on that matter.

24. It was to be noted, however, that committees had an annoying tendency to delay the consideration of the items which had been referred to them. That situation could be remedied by drawing up the time table of meetings more carefully and more rationally. For example, although the First Committee had completed its consideration of collective measures and its agenda included other items, there had been no meeting for two days. Instead of meeting on Saturdays it would be preferable to make better use of the normal working days.

25. The CHAIRMAN asked the Chairmen of Committees to inform the members of their Committees of the exchange of views which had just taken place and to ask them to organize their work accordingly.

The meeting rose at 3.30 p.m.