

else could be meant. He had no doubt that all Member States, or at least those taking part in the debate, would wish to avoid any action which could be regarded as taking sides in the Chinese civil war or interfering in Chinese internal affairs. In Sir Terence's view, that principle, if accepted, would automatically preclude any suggestion of imposing an economic blockade of the areas of China controlled by the communist régime.

22. He felt bound to deal with the third operative paragraph of the Chinese draft in some detail, in view of the fact that the Chinese representative had implied that the United Kingdom Government would be prepared to sacrifice the Chinese people in an effort to preserve British commercial interests in China. That was an entirely unjust and unwarranted allegation. Sir Terence would not say anything at that time about his Government's intentions regarding recognition of the communist régime in China, which, as had been pointed out, was a matter to be decided by individual Member States. He could say something, however, about the principles on which the decision as regards recognition would be based. The primary consideration was that the decision should conform to the facts of the situation. If the Government in question was in effective control of the whole country or the greater part of it, there was at least a *prima facie* case for recognition. While other considerations must be taken into account, the decision must rest on fact rather than sentiment. That view was supported by the very passage from Professor Lauterpacht's book quoted at the previous meeting by Mr. Tsiang. Recognition did not imply any moral judgment, and did not constitute approval of the Government recognized.

23. His delegation had the utmost sympathy for the people of China, who were the chief sufferers in the struggle, and would certainly not

wish any action to increase that people's hardships. He fully shared the New Zealand representative's view that the Chinese people deserved well of the world. However, he could not agree that recognition or non-recognition of the communist régime would necessarily exercise a major influence for good or ill on the lives of the vast majority of the Chinese people. It was certainly not true that such recognition would be a betrayal, and it could be argued that if the communist régime controlled the destinies of the majority of the people of China, normal diplomatic and commercial relations could be established with advantage to that people. Though he did not wish to overweigh that single aspect of a most complex problem, for those reasons his delegation could not agree that Member States should bind themselves for an indefinite period to withhold recognition from the communist régime.

24. In conclusion, Sir Terence said that if the vote was taken paragraph by paragraph, his delegation would vote against each paragraph of the Chinese draft resolution, in accordance with the principle, which it had always supported, that a Committee should only recommend one resolution to the General Assembly where one was divergent from, or precluded, another.

25. Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa) said that, while the Chinese delegation need have no doubts as to where the sympathies of his delegation lay, in the absence of instructions from his Government, he must abstain from voting on both draft resolutions. He hoped to have received instructions by the time the item reached the General Assembly.

26. At the request of Mr. TSIANG (China), the CHAIRMAN stated that the vote on the draft resolutions before the Committee would be postponed until Monday, 5 December.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.

THREE HUNDRED AND FORTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Monday, 5 December 1949, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Selim SARPER (Turkey).

Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of China and to the peace of the Far East, resulting from Soviet violations of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Alliance of 14 August 1945, and from Soviet violations of the Charter of the United Nations (*continued*)

1. The CHAIRMAN stated that a new joint draft resolution submitted by Cuba, Ecuador and Peru (A/C.1/553) was now being distributed.

2. Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador) said that the proposal submitted by his delegation, together with the delegations of Cuba and Peru, constituted the real solution of the problem before the General Assembly. The delegation of China had made certain well-founded accusations which the First Committee had been unable to consider as they deserved. Without an exhaustive study of the problem, however, the United Nations could not

carry out its duty towards China, which had sacrificed itself in the struggle against Japan, in defence of democratic principles, and whose present difficulties, it had been contended, were largely the legacy of events that had taken place during the war.

3. The third paragraph of the Chinese draft resolution (A/C.1/551), which dealt with aid provided by the Soviet Union to the Chinese Communists, revealed the similarity of that problem to the Greek question. The United Nations could therefore scarcely adopt different attitudes in the two cases. That would be a disastrous precedent which might prove fatal to the prestige of the United Nations. Was it thought that the Chinese question was less important than the Greek question? A tendency had, indeed, become apparent to avoid detailed discussion, as if the Committee were in a hurry to end the session or afraid of what a thorough examination might reveal. In order, however, to make a decision based on full knowledge of the facts, the First

Committee should have at its disposal a carefully drawn up report like the one which the Interim Committee would have to submit to the next session of the General Assembly, if the draft resolution submitted jointly by Cuba, Ecuador and Peru were adopted.

4. The joint draft resolution of Australia, Mexico, Pakistan, the Philippines and the United States (A/C.1/552), on the other hand, gave expression to noble principles, but ended disappointingly by evading the question. The adoption of that text would therefore amount to an acceptance of the *fait accompli*. That would be the very negation of the moral and legal principles on which the Charter was based. The three delegations of Cuba, Ecuador and Peru had therefore considered that, although the First Committee did not have the necessary data on which to condemn or absolve, it should nevertheless not evade its task. Those delegations therefore proposed that the solution of the problem should be deferred, so that the United Nations might be able to consider it more thoroughly, and that a decision in accordance with the facts might be taken at the following session of the General Assembly.

5. Mr. DE MARCOS (Cuba) recalled that Mr. Jessup had rightly stressed (339th meeting) that the Chinese problem was originally a moral problem. That was also how the matter had presented itself to the Cuban delegation. Of the two texts before the Committee, one was of merely verbal significance, whilst some aspects of the Chinese draft resolution was likely to provoke the opposition of certain delegations, particularly in regard to diplomatic recognition. To remedy that situation the three delegations had endeavoured to establish a new text, so that, instead of turning away from the problem, the United Nations might study it exhaustively and apply the solution best calculated to maintain the Organization's prestige and support the interests of humanity.

6. Mr. BELAÚNDE (Peru) recalled that during the general discussion (340th meeting) his delegation had stated that it was morally convinced that the Chinese draft resolution was well founded. Peru had declared, however, that it would be unable to vote for the Chinese proposal (A/C.1/551) for technical reasons. The Peruvian delegation had also pointed out that it would vote for the draft resolution submitted by the five delegations (A/C.1/552), although it considered the draft to be inadequate. The problem should be approached from the point of view of the part to be played by the General Assembly as a moral authority. It would, therefore, be improper if, after having paid a tribute in words to the contribution made by China, the General Assembly were to reject that delegation's proposal. There was no doubt about the violation of the Charter by the Soviet Union, and whatever the extent of the revolutionary movement in China, it would never have grown to such a point without foreign aid.

7. The three delegations of Cuba, Ecuador and Peru had therefore concluded that the specific charges brought against the USSR should be duly examined, in order to avoid a position in which some delegations would have to vote contrary to their profound convictions by appearing to waive, for technical reasons, charges which they considered to be justified. Those delegations therefore proposed that the Interim Committee should ex-

amine the evidence so that the General Assembly might be able to pronounce a final opinion as a veritable jury.

8. Mr. TSIANG (China) thanked the representatives of Cuba, Ecuador and Peru, on behalf of his delegation, for the spirit in which they had made their contribution to the study of the question.

9. The Chinese delegation had clearly stated that the Soviet Union violated both the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Alliance and the Charter of the United Nations. China therefore requested that no Member of the United Nations should provide the Chinese Communists with any kind of assistance, or grant diplomatic recognition to any régime organized by them, and that all Members should refrain from taking advantage of the present situation. The Chinese delegation maintained its attitude on all those points.

10. Nevertheless, two facts were undeniable. In the first place, sympathy for China was general. The Assembly, however, had been unable adequately to study the infinitely complex antecedents of the present situation. Convinced that its position would be all the stronger if the General Assembly proceeded to make a more exhaustive study, the Chinese delegation accepted the draft resolution submitted by Cuba, Ecuador and Peru (A/C.1/553).

11. The Chinese delegation had been greatly impressed by the Ecuadorean representative's suggestion that the Chinese question and the Greek question were very similar. Moreover, Mr. McCormick, majority leader in the United States House of Representatives, had also declared that the United States, which had taken effective steps to resist attacks in Europe upon the principles on which its way of life was based, should act in the same way in the East. It was quite true that if it was intended to maintain universal peace, it was impossible to take action in one half of the world only.

12. Mr. BAKR (Iraq) said that the verdict of the United Nations on that problem was of great concern to hundreds of millions of human beings. There was no doubt that the statement made by the Chinese representative was heavily documented; but some points required verification. For its part, the Iraqi delegation was not in a position to decide on the substance of the matter. It therefore supported the draft resolution submitted by Cuba, Ecuador and Peru, and considered it fair that the General Assembly should be given time to make the necessary investigation.

13. Mr. JESSUP (United States of America) paid tribute to the spirit which had animated the three delegations in submitting a new draft resolution. That action had been a fresh manifestation of the sympathy and feelings of friendship towards China and its people to which Mr. Tsiang had referred. In particular, no nation had maintained closer ties with China than the United States.

14. The United States delegation had just had the new draft resolution communicated to it. The idea of submitting the problem to the Interim Committee had occurred to the authors of the draft resolution submitted by the five Powers (A/C.1/552). Those delegations, however, had not been of the opinion that the intervention of the Interim Committee could provide the ele-

ments of a solution. The statement by Mr. Tsiang on 25 November (338th meeting) had no doubt been long and detailed, but during the ten days that had just elapsed, the question had not been that of a particular analysis of details in that statement, but of finding the appropriate action to be taken.

15. Referring to the remarks made by Mr. Belaúnde (340th meeting) on the legal aspect of the problem, he said it was inaccurate to say that the joint draft resolution of the five delegations was a judgment acquitting the Soviet Union. That draft resolution was, however, a proper expression of the attitude which the General Assembly should adopt in the interests of China and the Chinese people.

16. The representative of Ecuador had referred to the Greek question, and his speech had given the impression that, in his view, some Powers had not attached the same importance to the Chinese problem as to European matters. In reality, however, anyone acquainted with the history of the United States could not doubt the interest always taken by that country in China and in Asia as a whole. Moreover, with regard to the moral aspects of the problem, to which the representatives of Cuba and Peru had referred, the United States had demonstrated by its acts its sympathy with the sufferings of the Chinese people.

17. The draft resolution submitted by the five delegations had an undeniable moral foundation and was an attempt to deal with the problem in a spirit of sympathy towards China and its people, and of fidelity to the obligations of the General Assembly. The United States delegation was, therefore, still in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Australia, the United States, Mexico, Pakistan and the Philippines (A/C.1/552), and would not support the draft resolution submitted by Cuba, Ecuador and Peru (A/C.1/553).

18. Mr. PLIMSOLL (Australia) said that most delegations understood the motives that inspired the Chinese representative and made him desire action going beyond that recommended in the draft resolution submitted by the five delegations. The First Committee, however, should not lose sight of its real competence or the extent to which its intervention was desirable and possible.

19. The Chinese delegation was asking the General Assembly to condemn the Soviet Union, and not to have any further dealings with the Chinese Communists or grant them diplomatic recognition. The Australian delegation for its part, although its attitude should not necessarily be interpreted as a contradiction of the Chinese delegation's assertions, could not vote for the Chinese draft resolution (A/C.1/551) and thought it would be inappropriate to adopt it. The First Committee could not condemn any Power, and in any case it did not need to pass judgment on it one way or the other. The factual elements must be considered, and it should be borne in mind that any action to be taken was part of a general policy.

20. The Australian delegation therefore considered that the appropriate attitude was that suggested by the five delegations, which proposed that all States should be called upon to respect the political independence of China, the right of the people of China to choose their own Government,

to respect existing treaties, and to refrain from seeking to obtain special privileges.

21. The Australian delegation could not accept the draft resolution submitted by Cuba, Ecuador and Peru (A/C.1/553) for the reasons already stated by the United States representative. In fact, contrary to what the representative of Ecuador had said, that resolution merely shifted the problem and did not solve it. On the one hand, the realities in China and the Far East were such that no useful purpose would be served by referring the problem for investigation and, on the other hand, the Interim Committee, by its membership and terms of reference, was not the appropriate body in such a case. Thus, in the interests of the Interim Committee itself, the question should not be vainly referred to it.

22. The Australian delegation therefore considered that the draft resolution submitted by the five delegations (A/C.1/552) was the only suitable method in the circumstances.

23. Mr. MARTÍNEZ MORENO (El Salvador) recalled that his delegation's feelings towards China were well known. El Salvador had in fact supported the Chinese draft resolution, convinced as it was that the Soviet Union had interfered in China in violation of the treaties and the undertakings that had been accepted, especially at Yalta.

24. The delegation of El Salvador had said, in particular (341st meeting), that it had appeared incomprehensible that the United Nations should adopt a specific attitude in the case of Greece and a different one in the case of China. The delegation of El Salvador was therefore gratified that the Ecuadorean delegation had taken up the same argument. In both cases the Charter had been violated, and to accept the draft resolution submitted by the five delegations would be tantamount to absolving the conduct of certain foreign countries in China, or passing it over in silence. It was true, moreover, that diplomatic recognition fell within the national sovereignty of the various States, and that the Chinese proposal consequently raised certain difficulties.

25. The delegation of El Salvador was therefore in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Cuba, Ecuador and Peru to the effect that the question should be further studied before any final decision was taken.

26. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) recalled that his delegation had stated to be in favour of the draft resolution submitted by China and regretted that it had not received the support of a majority. The facts it set forth could not be contested, particularly in a political body such as the First Committee.

27. The new draft resolution (A/C.1/553) had nevertheless two advantages. It would prevent the Assembly from being restricted to adopting the draft resolution of the five Powers, which was inadequate and could only arouse disappointment in the democratic world, which expected positive decisions from the United Nations when the safeguarding of the territorial integrity of countries or the defence of the right of the peoples to self-determination was involved. The new draft of the three Powers would also enable a general debate to take place on the question of China in the near future, which, in any event, would show world opinion that the States Members of the

United Nations were watchful before the danger that threatened them.

28. The objections to that proposal raised by the Australian delegation in regard to the membership of the Interim Committee were not convincing. In fact, the countries which refused to participate in its work had themselves chosen that attitude. If they did not take part, they could still keep themselves informed of its proceedings and subsequently express their opinions in the General Assembly. In regard to the terms of reference of the Interim Committee, it had to examine all the questions referred to it by the General Assembly, without taking final decisions. It would therefore merely submit its report to the following session of the Assembly.

29. In the circumstances, the Chilean delegation would vote for the draft resolution submitted jointly by the representatives of Cuba, Ecuador and Peru.

30. Mr. BELAÚNDE (Peru) thought that if the Committee voted against the Chinese draft resolution (A/C.1/551) as a whole, that vote might be taken to mean that the Committee considered the accusations unfounded. The fact was that the question raised by China had two separate aspects. The Chinese draft resolution contained a legal accusation. It was not possible, however, to judge that accusation without having previously studied the very full evidence submitted by the Chinese delegation. The second aspect of the Chinese question, as it appeared in the draft resolution submitted by the five Powers (A/C.1/522), was the stabilization of international relations in the Far East. That proposal and the new draft resolution (A/C.1/553) were not incompatible. The proposal by the five Powers gave a general definition of the principles that were likely to increase the stability of international relations in the Far East, without mentioning the accusations made by China. The new draft resolution, on the other hand, proposed that the Interim Committee should make a continuous study of those accusations. The adoption of the latter proposal would show that the Chinese Government deserved all the sympathy of Members, and that its accusations could not be declared inadmissible without prior study. The Soviet Union could, if it so desired, sit in the Interim Committee at any time. Moreover, the final decision would be taken by the General Assembly, in which the Soviet Union was represented.

31. Mr. RIDDELL (Canada) thought that there was general agreement in the Committee that the draft resolution by the five Powers represented the minimum that could be done for the time being. Moreover, the Committee seemed to find no contradiction between the Chinese draft resolution and that of the five Powers, or even the new draft resolution. The Committee should therefore express its opinion first on the draft submitted by the five Powers (A/C.1/552) and then—since the two texts were not incompatible—on the new draft resolution (A/C.1/553), although recourse to the Interim Committee did not appear very expedient in the case.

32. Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) thought that, far from being inadequate, the draft resolution submitted by the five Powers outlined a general rule of conduct which should be followed in the future and expressed principles similar to those

that had been approved almost unanimously when the United States and United Kingdom proposal entitled "Essentials of Peace" had been adopted.

33. The Mexican Government would not be able to vote for some parts of the Chinese draft resolution, which asked that the Soviet Union should be condemned for violating certain treaties, and that Members of the United Nations should undertake not to recognize some particular régime in China. The Mexican Government could not thus commit itself in advance to a pledge that concerned the sovereignty of the individual States.

34. The General Assembly should be inspired in its decisions by the desire to deal with disputes in a manner likely to lead to solutions, and should adopt a realistic attitude. The accusations made against the Soviet Union by China could obviously not be left unanswered, but the debate which had taken place on the subject should have given China satisfaction, for it must have convinced any Members that had not been previously convinced of the truth of the accusations. It did not seem necessary, in the circumstances, to set out those accusations in a formal resolution. When the Greek question had been considered, the Mexican delegation had opposed the adoption of certain provisions which it thought might be interpreted as condemnations, but it had supported every practical effort for a final solution of the problem. Likewise, in the case in point, it would support the draft resolution of the five Powers and hoped that it would be adopted unanimously, for it indicated a rule of conduct applicable to all States in their relations with the Far Eastern countries, and in particular China.

35. In the case of Greece, the General Assembly had set up a Special Committee. The joint draft resolution submitted by Cuba, Ecuador and Peru was that the Chinese question should be referred to the Interim Committee for further study. If the work of that Committee was to elucidate facts which had not yet been established, a commission of investigation should also be set up. The Interim Committee's terms of reference did not, however, provide for investigations being made in the territory of any State without its consent having first been obtained. However, without an investigation on the spot, and without some guarantee as to the outcome of such an investigation, there was no hope of the dispute being finally settled. No advantage was therefore to be gained by giving such a task to the Interim Committee. The Mexican delegation regretted that, under the circumstances, it could not support the draft resolution submitted by Cuba, Ecuador and Peru.

36. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) thought that the new joint draft resolution was not incompatible with any of the proposals dealing with the substance of the problem. The new draft suggested that the question should be referred to the Interim Committee, thus adjourning for the present session any decision on the subject. It raised, therefore, a prior question which would have to be decided by the First Committee before a vote was taken on the other two proposals. Since rule 120 of the rules of procedure laid down that, unless the First Committee decided otherwise, proposals should be put to the vote in the order in which they had been submitted, the representative of Chile formally proposed that the

draft resolution of Cuba, Ecuador and Peru should be put to the vote first.

37. Mr. STOLK (Venezuela) thought the new draft resolution incompatible with the Chinese proposal, but not with that of the five Powers. The best way of deciding the question would perhaps be to come to a decision first of all as regards the nature of the new draft resolution. It would otherwise be difficult to determine in what order the voting should take place. The representative of Peru had, moreover, thought that the new draft resolution might possibly be treated as amending or supplementing the five-Power proposal. If the Committee adopted both the five-Power draft resolution and that of Cuba, Ecuador and Peru—the latter in the form of an amendment—the General Assembly would have before it a single draft resolution on principle, addressed to all Member States of the United Nations and intended to promote the stability of international relations in the Far East. The draft resolution before the Assembly would, moreover, give a decision regarding the charges put forward by China, in that the Interim Committee would be called upon to study them and submit its conclusions thereon to the following session of the General Assembly.

38. Mr. BELAÚNDE (Peru) also thought that the new draft resolution was incompatible with the Chinese draft resolution. It was, in fact, a substitute for the latter, since it proposed that the concrete accusations made by China should be referred to the Interim Committee for study. The draft resolution submitted by Cuba, Ecuador and Peru, on the other hand, was not incompatible with that of the five Powers, inasmuch as the latter dealt only generally with the situation in the Far East by suggesting a line of conduct to be followed.

39. The delegation of Peru was therefore of opinion that the Committee ought to support both the draft resolution submitted by Cuba, Ecuador and Peru, and that of the five Powers.

40. Mr. TSIANG (China) thought that the joint draft resolution of Cuba, Ecuador and Peru, if adopted, would merely refer both the accusations made by his delegation, and his delegation's draft resolution as a whole, to the Interim Committee for study. The Chinese delegation would then submit fresh arguments and evidence to the Interim Committee. Thus there was no reason why the Chinese delegation should withdraw its draft resolution.

41. As the draft resolution of the three Powers was a procedural motion, in accordance with the rules of procedure, it should be put to the vote first. Since the sponsors of that draft resolution had expressed the opinion that it was compatible with the proposal of the five Powers, the representative of China emphasized that the only objection he himself had made to the draft resolution of the five Powers was that it was inadequate. To avoid misunderstanding he pointed out that, to his mind, that draft did not mean, or even imply, an acquittal of the Soviet Union. If there were divergent opinions on that subject, he hoped they would be brought to his notice.

42. Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) associated himself with the observations made by the representative of Peru; the draft resolution of Cuba, Ecuador and Peru was not in contradiction with

that submitted by the five delegations.

43. Indeed, the vote on the Chinese draft resolution and the referral of the question to the Interim Committee were two completely different matters. It was conceivable that a vote could be taken on the Chinese draft resolution, and that the Interim Committee should be called upon to undertake a study of the problem.

44. The five delegations sponsoring the joint draft resolution had proposed certain rules of conduct for the future and the need to come to a decision on that point could not be obviated by the adoption of the draft resolution submitted by Cuba, Ecuador and Peru, which in no way contradicted that of the five Powers.

45. It was, moreover, untrue to say that the procedural question was a prior question, since the First Committee or the General Assembly had often taken decisions of substance, without excluding the possibility of the problem being further examined by the appropriate body. The vote which had taken place on the question of substance had therefore not definitively closed the consideration of the subject.

46. A decision by the First Committee to make a more thorough study of the situation in China would not, therefore, preclude the possibility of the texts previously submitted being considered.

47. The representative of China seemed to have indicated that he would not press for a vote on his draft in the First Committee if the draft resolution of Cuba, Ecuador and Peru were adopted. As regards the text of the five delegations, however, the vote could not be postponed for reasons of procedure.

48. Mr. KYROU (Greece) recalled that some representatives had said that the Chinese question was similar to the Greek question. The representative of Greece had himself stated (339th meeting) that his country, having suffered for four years from foreign aggression, sympathized with the Chinese people. The Greek people, however, with the moral assistance of the United Nations and the help of their great allies, had been able to overcome attacks which, in the case of China, had on the contrary been pursued unsuccessfully.

49. Nevertheless, the fact remained that foreign intervention had taken place, and the United Nations was under a moral obligation to intervene. That was the very basis of the five-Power and the Chinese draft resolutions; it was not entirely true to say, as the representative of Australia had said, that the two draft resolutions were inconsistent. It would even appear, as the representative of Canada had pointed out, that there was no contradiction between the new draft submitted by Cuba, Ecuador and Peru and the other two.

50. Item 68 of the agenda had been submitted by the Chinese delegation, which had proposed that the General Assembly should take action at the current session; the draft resolution of the five delegations had the same end in view. But the draft submitted by Cuba, Ecuador and Peru did not ask for immediate steps to be taken; it merely asked that the question should be referred to the Interim Committee.

51. If the Chinese delegation, therefore, was prepared to accept the latter suggestion, there was surely no need for the Committee to be more royalist than the king.

52. The representative of Mexico had stated that the submission of the question to the Interim Committee would raise certain difficulties. But, as drafted, the draft resolution of the three Powers only asked the Interim Committee to report back, and there was no doubt but that the latter body which, under the chairmanship of Mr. Padilla Nervo, had always proceeded with the greatest caution, would carry out its task satisfactorily.

53. Mr. STOLK (Venezuela) reminded the meeting that, under rule 109 of the rules of procedure, proposals could only be put to the vote if copies had been circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting.

54. The Venezuelan delegation considered therefore, that it was better not to put the draft reso-

lution of Cuba, Ecuador and Peru to the vote that same day. In any case, a decision ought to be taken immediately on that point.

55. The CHAIRMAN recalled that rule 109 also laid down that the Chairman could always permit the discussion and consideration of texts that had not yet been circulated. It was nevertheless true, as a general rule, that before being discussed and put to the vote a text should have been circulated not later than the day preceding the meeting.

56. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) proposed that the Committee should adjourn until the following morning.

There being no objection, it was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.

THREE HUNDRED AND FORTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Tuesday, 6 December 1949, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Selim SARPER (Turkey).

Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of China and to the peace of the Far East, resulting from Soviet violations of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Alliance of 14 August 1945, and from Soviet violations of the Charter of the United Nations (continued)

1. Mr. ARCE (Argentina) said that a question of procedure was involved. The draft resolution submitted by Cuba, Ecuador and Peru (A/C.1/553) had precedence because it implied the adjournment of the debate on item 68 of the agenda. If that draft resolution was adopted, the Chinese draft resolution (A/C.1/551) would no longer have any point, since the question would be referred to the Interim Committee.

2. Mr. Arce considered that the sponsors of the five-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/552) were entitled to request that it should be voted on after the draft resolution of the three Powers, with which it was not incompatible.

3. The Argentine delegation wished to request that a vote should be taken on the various drafts before the Committee paragraph by paragraph.

4. Mr. TSIANG (China) said he had asked for the floor in order to reply to what the representative of Mexico had said at the previous meeting. The statement made by the representative of Argentina had, however, served to clear up the misunderstanding. The Chinese delegation fully agreed with the Argentine delegation that the draft resolution submitted by Cuba, Ecuador and Peru should be voted on first; if that resolution was adopted, the Chinese delegation's draft resolution and statements should be referred to the Interim Committee, on the understanding that the First Committee might then proceed to a vote on the five-Power draft resolution.

5. Mr. DOMÍNGUEZ CÁMPORA (Uruguay) said that his delegation whole-heartedly supported the proposal put forward by Ecuador, Cuba and Peru. The General Assembly was in fact confronted by accusations of exceptional gravity to the effect that

the political independence and territorial integrity of a Member of the United Nations were being jeopardized by violations of human rights. The United Nations, had, however, been created precisely to organize collective security with a view to safeguarding the independence of all its Members.

6. The problem was therefore as follows: confronted with such imputations, it was essential that the General Assembly should establish the facts. If it lacked the time to do so, it had an elementary duty as the guardian of the political independence and the territorial integrity of the nations as to avoid superficial treatment of the question and to refer it to the appropriate organ.

7. Even though there was no definition of aggression which was universally accepted, certain effective formulae had been established in particular by the Treaty of London and by a number of treaties to which the Soviet Union had adhered. If, therefore, the General Assembly should prove powerless to confront aggression, it would be futile to place any further hopes in the United Nations. For those reasons, the delegation of Uruguay had submitted an amendment (A/C.1/555) to the draft resolution of the three delegations (A/C.1/553), providing that the question might be referred to the Security Council by the Interim Committee should immediate action be required to defend the political independence of a Member of the Organization.

8. Mr. LÓPEZ (Philippines) said that his delegation had listened with great interest to the arguments in favour of referring the question to the Interim Committee and had reached the conclusion that it might be advantageous to do so. His delegation had therefore submitted an amendment (A/C.1/554) to the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/553), which, without differing substantially from the latter text, attempted to relate it to that of the five Powers (A/C.1/552).

9. If the First Committee was to consider two separate texts, it was desirable that there should be some kind of connecting link between them. As the five-Power draft was a statement of general principles, it might be advisable to relate the