



Thursday, 19 October 1950, at 3 p.m.

Lake Success, New York

CONTENTS

	Page
United action for peace (<i>continued</i>)	159

Chairman: Mr. Roberto URDANETA ARBELÁEZ (Colombia).

United action for peace (*continued*)

[Item 68]*

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS AND AMENDMENTS (*continued*)

Voting on the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/576/Rev.1) and amendments (concluded)

1. Mr. YOUNGER (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the seven co-sponsors of the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/576/Rev.1), proposed that the peace observation commission referred to in paragraph 3 of that draft resolution should be composed of representatives of the following fourteen States: China, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Iraq, Israel, New Zealand, Pakistan, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Uruguay.

2. He proposed that the collective measures committee should be composed of the representatives of the following fourteen States: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Egypt, France, Mexico, Philippines, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

3. The suggested composition of those two bodies took into account the principle of equitable geographical distribution and the suggestions which had been made for the inclusion of various States in the peace observation commission.

4. Mr. DULLES (United States of America) recalled his government's view that the peace observation commission would be more impartial if it did not include the representatives of the five States which were permanent members of the Security Council. The United States delegation had given way on that point in order to obtain more general agreement, but it still considered that the groups of observers to be sent out by the

commission for field work should consist of persons who could not be suspected of any bias.

5. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) submitted an amendment to the proposal on the composition of the peace observation commission. He wished the name of China to be replaced by that of the People's Republic of China. The USSR delegation considered that the real government of China was the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. Such an important body as the peace observation commission should be composed of the representatives of governments which held not only *de jure*, but also *de facto*, power.

6. Mr. YOUNGER (United Kingdom) asked the USSR representative to withdraw his amendment. The question of China's representation was a procedural one, which he hoped would be settled in the near future. Meanwhile, it was enough to mention that China would be represented on the commission, without deciding in advance upon the government which would represent that State.

7. Mr. TSIANG (China) objected to the USSR amendment on the grounds that the party in China which was supported by the Government of the USSR had risen to power exclusively through aggression and foreign interference; it was not based upon the freely-expressed will of the people and did not represent China.

8. Sir Mohammed ZAFRULLA KHAN (Pakistan) supported the United Kingdom representative's request that the representative of the USSR should withdraw his amendment. If the question of China's representation were thus raised indirectly, many delegations would be placed in a difficult position. There was no precedent for specifying what government would be represented on a commission; members of commissions were always States, not governments. It was self-evident that, when the question of China's representation had been settled by the United Nations, the decision would apply to all the commissions on which China was

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

represented. If the USSR representative maintained his amendment, Pakistan would be obliged to abstain from voting.

9. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt unable to meet the United Kingdom representative's request, since a question of principle was at stake. Although the United Nations could not interfere in the internal affairs of a State, it could not fail to be aware which were the real governments of Member States.

10. Mr. YOUNGER (United Kingdom) regretted that the USSR representative maintained his amendment. The United Kingdom delegation agreed that the question of the representation of China was a matter of principle, but considered that the time had not yet come to raise that question.

11. Mr. Maurice SCHUMANN (France) asked that a vote should be taken on the admissibility of the USSR amendment, which raised a question which the First Committee was not competent to settle. It was merely an organ of the General Assembly and could not anticipate the Assembly's decisions.

12. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the question of the admissibility of the USSR amendment.

The USSR amendment was declared inadmissible by 40 votes to 7, with 10 abstentions.

13. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) considered that the principle of equitable geographical distribution had not been observed in the case of the peace observation commission. Although the twenty Latin-American Republics represented one-third of the Member States, only two of them had been selected to serve on a commission of fourteen members. It would have been preferable to include three Latin-American States, as in the case of the collective measures committee.

14. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal presented by the United Kingdom representative on the composition of the peace observation commission.

The proposal was approved by 50 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

15. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that he had voted for the proposal on the understanding that the reference to China applied to the People's Republic of China.

16. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) stated that he had abstained from voting because a State which his government had not yet recognized was proposed as a member.

17. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal presented by the United Kingdom representative on the composition of the collective measures committee.

The proposal was approved by 50 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

18. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that he had not taken part in the vote because he objected in principle to the committee.

19. Mr. VON BALLUSECK (Netherlands) pointed out that the Charter was a living document. Although its provisions had to be observed, its principles should be interpreted in the light of the developments which

had occurred since the date of its signature. It was strange that the champions of the letter of the Charter were the very persons who misunderstood its spirit. The maintenance of international peace and security required the voluntary co-operation of all States, if the Security Council proved unable to fulfil its functions. The seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/576/Rev.1) in no way hampered the operation of the Security Council. The General Assembly would only be called upon if the action of the Council was paralysed. The Netherlands delegation would therefore support the draft resolution, which represented a courageous interpretation of the Charter in the light of the needs of the time.

20. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was surprised that the Netherlands representative had spoken on the substance of the question when the general discussion had been closed.

21. Mr. JOOSTE (Union of South Africa) recalled that his delegation had voted for all parts of the draft resolution except section E, on which it had abstained from voting. It would vote for the draft resolution as a whole on the understanding that, in so far as the Union of South Africa was concerned, armed force would be used only in circumstances where armed aggression had taken place or was imminent and where the Security Council had been unable to take action. Moreover, in paragraph 1 (section A) the words "breach of the peace or act of aggression" signified exclusively a breach of the peace or an act of armed aggression between States.

22. Mr. UNDEN (Sweden) would vote for the resolution as a whole, but would maintain his reservation with regard to section C.

23. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation had objected to a number of clauses in the draft resolution which violated the Charter. The delegation of the USSR had submitted amendments which had not been adopted. Thus, the resolution as a whole constituted a flagrant violation of the provisions of the Charter. Indeed, radio stations in the United States had hastened to inform the whole world that the purpose of the resolution was to circumvent the rule of the unanimity of the five permanent members of the Security Council. For those reasons, the delegation of the USSR would vote against the draft resolution.

24. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote as a whole the draft resolution (A/C.1/576/Rev.1).

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Turkey, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, voted first.

In favour: Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Thailand.

Against: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland.

Abstaining: Argentina, India, Syria.

The draft resolution (A/C.1/576/Rev.1) was approved by 50 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

25. Mr. NAMBIAR (India) recalled that his delegation had voted in favour of sections A, B and E of the proposal, but had abstained from voting on sections C and D, since the delegation felt some doubt concerning the practical advantages of those sections. Moreover, their compatibility with the provisions of the Charter had been questioned by several delegations. The reason for India's main objection, however, was a more serious one: at a time when all the peoples of the world desired peace, that part of the resolution gave the impression that the United Nations was more concerned with perfecting its enforcement machinery than with promoting international co-operation and mutual good will.

26. As section C was the most important part of the draft resolution, the Indian delegation had abstained from voting on the proposal as a whole.

27. Mr. ARDALAN (Iran) recalled that, during the general discussion, the minority had expressed the view that the seven-Power draft resolution was illegal. The Iranian delegation, for its part, shared the opinion of the majority, which had demonstrated in detail that the text was in full conformity with both the spirit and the letter of the Charter, and could not fail to make the Charter more effective and thereby regain for the United Nations the confidence of the public.

28. International co-operation being the very basis of the Charter, there was nothing to be feared from provisions designed to strengthen it. Nor was there any fear of the Security Council's authority being weakened by the joint draft resolution, which rather emphasized its responsibilities.

29. Mr. PRICE-MARS (Haiti) observed that the First Committee was congratulating itself, after two weeks of discussion, upon having found in the draft resolution it had just adopted the solution to the problem of peace. However, the real and final solution could only consist in understanding between the five great Powers, as provided for in the Charter. Mutual recriminations would not prevent the occurrence of a catastrophe which might leave historians one day with the task of investigating the causes of the death of a civilization.

30. The delegation of Haiti, therefore, could not but approve the Syrian representative's statement (366th meeting), with its final appeal for understanding between the five great Powers. In the event of a war, the Caribbean area, the Panama Canal and the Middle East would all be equally threatened; all the nations which desired to maintain peace could only congratulate the United Nations for the fine effort to ensure peace which it had just made in approving the seven-Power draft resolution.

Voting on the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/579) and French amendment (A/C.1/591)

31. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation could not accept the French amendment (A/C.1/591). The USSR had based its own draft resolution on the provisions of the Charter, particularly those relating to international peace and security. Many of those provisions had not been reflected in the work of the Security Council. The purpose of the first operative paragraph of the USSR draft resolution, therefore, was to invite the Security Council to take the necessary steps to ensure implementation of the Articles of the Charter relating to threats to the peace and the pacific settlement of international disputes.

32. The second operative paragraph recommended the Security Council and the Military Staff Committee to arrange for armed forces to be placed at the disposal of the Security Council.

33. That was the text which the French delegation wished to link with draft resolution A/C.1/576/Rev.1 which had just been approved by the Committee, but on which some delegations had abstained from voting, or which, like the USSR, they had opposed. The link which the French delegation wished thus to establish was entirely artificial and the Soviet Union asked that its draft resolution should be put to the vote as presented (A/C.1/579):

"For the purpose of maintaining international peace and security, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and, in particular, with Chapters V, VI and VII of the Charter,

"The General Assembly

"Recommends to the Security Council

"That it should take the necessary steps to ensure that the action provided for under the Charter is taken with respect to threats to the peace or acts of aggression and the peaceful settlement of disputes or situations likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security;

"That it should devise measures for the earliest application of Articles 43, 45, 46 and 47 of the Charter of the United Nations regarding the placing of armed forces at the disposal of the Security Council by the States Members of the United Nations and the effective functioning of the Military Staff Committee."

34. Mr. Maurice SCHUMANN (France) hoped that the attitude of the USSR to the French amendment was not irrevocable. France hoped to be able to vote in favour of the draft resolution, but had to make its position quite clear in doing so. That could be done by the French amendment, which called for adding to the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/579) a final paragraph reading as follows (A/C.1/591):

"The above dispositions should in no manner prevent the General Assembly from fulfilling its functions under the resolution . . ."

35. Both the Security Council and the Military Staff Committee had been discussing for years the application of Articles 43 and 45 of the Charter, and the Gen-

eral Assembly's action in adopting the seven-Power draft resolution was the outcome of their failure to agree.

36. If that seven-Power text was in conformity with the Charter, as a large majority of the First Committee had pronounced it to be, so was the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/579), for it was based on the General Assembly's right, under Article 10, to make recommendations to the Security Council. Hence, the two proposals were equally legal and compatible with each other. Further, to eliminate any possibility of confusion, their compatibility should be expressly stated, inasmuch as the seven-Power resolution dealt with collective security within the terms of the Charter, whereas the USSR draft resolution emphasized the responsibility of the Security Council, and, in particular, of the great Powers.

37. Mr. SPENDER (Australia) was surprised that the delegation of the USSR should object to the adoption of the French amendment, which Australia, for its part, could not but approve. That attitude of the USSR appeared to indicate a hidden intention to suggest an inconsistency between the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/579) and a text (A/C.1/576/Rev.1) just approved by an overwhelming majority of the First Committee.

38. To adopt the USSR draft resolution without the French amendment might, in fact, give rise to the assertion that the Assembly was contradicting itself. Moreover, the "peace front" which sought to create a false sense of security in the minds of the peoples of the world, would serve to promote the idea that the Soviet Union was striving for peace and that those who voted against the draft resolution (A/C.1/579) were against peace.

39. The delegation of Australia, moreover, considered it unnecessary to summarize existing texts in a resolution and to reaffirm obligations which already figured in the Charter.

40. In the light of the curious contributions made by the USSR to the cause of peace, and the way in which it had thwarted action in the Security Council, the draft resolution (A/C.1/579) could not be considered as anything but a political manoeuvre.

41. The Australian delegation could not therefore vote for the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/579) unless the First Committee approved the French amendment (A/C.1/591), thus affirming that there was no inconsistency between the Soviet text and the seven-Power draft resolution.

42. Mr. YOUNGER (United Kingdom) supported the French amendment, without which his delegation could not accept the USSR draft resolution.

43. The USSR had claimed that its text had nothing to do with that of the seven Powers. If that was the case, the USSR delegation need not object to an amendment which made it clear that the two texts were not contradictory. If, on the other hand, there was some connexion between them, the Committee should know what it was.

44. It was to be hoped that the Soviet Union would provide the explanations that had been requested as to

the purpose of its draft resolution. For, as the representative of Australia had said, it would be superfluous to pick out a few Articles from the Charter and to make a draft resolution out of them. The procedure of Articles 43, 45, 46 and 47 existed and if the USSR, which was a member of the Military Staff Committee, really wanted progress to be made, it could have taken the necessary steps instead of resorting to the indirect procedure of proposing a resolution of the General Assembly, which on the face of it was unobjectionable.

45. The Military Staff Committee had been dormant for the past two years. The majority had been unable to place any question on the agenda because it knew that the USSR was likely to block any discussion; if the USSR had adopted a constructive attitude, it would not have had to submit that draft resolution.

46. In the circumstances, the only means of dispelling any suspicion of a contradiction in the minds of the authors of the draft resolution (A/C.1/579), who had not wished to explain why they had decided to present that draft, between the USSR text and that of the seven Powers, would be to accept the French amendment.

47. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation could not accept the amendment of France, which would give the USSR draft resolution the very aspect of illegality that impaired the seven-Power draft resolution, accepted in defiance of the provisions of the Charter concerning the placing of armed forces at the disposal of the Security Council and co-operation among the great Powers.

48. That would be all the more regrettable since the method advocated by the Soviet Union was the only legal one and the only one that was politically practicable.

49. Mr. Younger had been right in saying that the delegation of the USSR based itself on the Charter, but since the joint draft resolution was the very negation of it, no attempt should be made to combine two opposites, as the French delegation was trying to do.

50. The delegation of Poland was therefore in favour of adopting the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/579) in its original text.

51. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) had no intention of reading the minds of his colleagues. He would nevertheless ask the other permanent members of the Security Council, in particular the United Kingdom and France, whether, because the Security Council and the Military Staff Committee had not yet adopted the measures provided for in Article 43, it should be concluded that no further efforts should be made and that all hope of implementing the provisions of the Charter concerning the maintenance of peace and security should be renounced.

52. The delegation of the USSR, for its part, could not resign itself to that conclusion, and, rather than specify, as it could easily do, the responsibilities of those who had thwarted the action of those bodies, would continue to affirm the necessity of urging the Security Council and the Military Staff Committee to take action, by means of a resolution of the General Assembly that would revivify them.

53. The USSR, for its part, would not allow the failures of the past to discourage it in its effort to implement the provisions of the Charter, and to maintain peace and security. It regretted the unexpected opposition of the other permanent members of the Security Council to a draft based strictly on the Charter, particularly on Article 43. It was true that the seven Powers had adopted a different attitude and had deliberately turned away from the Charter. Mr. Younger himself appeared to boast of that; his scorn for resolutions based on the Charter, which he considered to be a waste of time, led to the conclusion that he preferred texts which were in violation of the Charter.

54. In reply to Mr. Younger's questions, the head of the delegation of the USSR had already stated (366th meeting) that his country would in no circumstances supply a blank cheque nor expect one from other countries.

55. The USSR draft resolution, based mainly on Article 43, was strictly legal and should encounter no opposition. Past disappointments should only be an incentive to find new methods with a view to constructive action in favour of peace. The best results could be expected if the Security Council and the Military Staff Committee were revived. But, to that end, the fate of a perfectly legal text should not be linked to that of the seven-Power resolution.

56. Mr. DULLES (United States of America) recalled that there had been eighteen meetings of the Military Staff Committee at which the representative of the USSR had not appeared. The United States of America, for its part, was willing to pledge to the General Assembly that it would be represented at the next meeting of that Committee; perhaps a similar declaration on the part of the USSR would accomplish more than the adoption of the draft resolution (A/C.1/579).

57. Mr. TSIANG (China) recalled that the work of the Military Staff Committee during its first three years, in the course of which China had submitted several proposals in a spirit of conciliation, had been succeeded by a sterile period. Nevertheless, the delegation of China had continued to attend the meetings; the same could not be said for the USSR.

58. The resumption of activity by the Military Staff Committee did not depend on a resolution of the General Assembly; any one of its members could convene it or submit new proposals.

59. The delegation of China considered that, unless the French amendment were accepted, the USSR draft resolution would not only be useless but would do a great deal of mischief.

60. Mr. Maurice SCHUMANN (France) pointed out to the representative of the USSR that, if he really sought to attain the objective expressed in his draft resolution, he could count on the French delegation. France's attitude in the Security Council and the Military Staff Committee could stand comparison with that of certain other Powers. France could not be accused of having hindered the action of the Security Council or the Military Staff Committee.

61. The question was to prevent the vote already cast by a great majority of the First Committee from being

disavowed under the pretence of applying the Charter. The optimism praised by the representative of the USSR consisted in going forward, and not in compromising the work accomplished. If, therefore, there was no contradiction between the seven-Power draft resolution and that of the USSR, it might be asked why that delegation was opposed to the French amendment.

62. Mr. HAJDU (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation would oppose an amendment which consisted in linking a text the illegality of which had been clearly proved, to the perfectly legal proposal of the USSR.

63. The United Kingdom representative had claimed that it was not necessary to give instructions to the Security Council. It was strange that delegations which had given the Security Council's failure to take action as the reason for their draft resolution should refuse to transmit to the Council the recommendation formulated by the USSR.

64. Mr. PEARSON (Canada) said that the French amendment should be adopted, in order to avoid an interpretation of the USSR draft resolution that might delay or even prevent any action under the terms of the seven-Power draft resolution.

65. The Canadian delegation would vote in favour of the amended text of the USSR draft resolution. No delegation was opposed to the possible resumption of the activities of the Military Staff Committee or to any steps that might be taken by the Security Council in application of Article 43. The Canadian delegation, for its part, could only welcome such a prospect and it approved a text which advised the Security Council to take such action.

66. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would not stoop to reply to the remarks of the Kuomintang representative, whose presence on the Military Staff Committee had constituted an obstacle to the work of that Committee since September 1949. Obviously, the Committee could not function normally when a person who did not in any way represent China had a seat on it.

67. With regard to the French representative, if the vote he had cast in favour of the seven-Power draft resolution now prevented him from voting in favour of the USSR proposal, he could easily express a reservation or explain his vote. He should not, however, express his doubt in an amendment that was completely alien to the basic proposal.

68. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the French amendment (A/C.1/591) to the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/579).

The French amendment was approved by 50 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

69. Mr. ARMAND UGON (Uruguay) said that he had voted in favour of the French amendment, but that before the draft resolution as a whole was put to the vote, he wished to draw the Assembly's attention to the omission of the words "breaches of the peace" in the first operative paragraph of the draft resolution (A/C.1/579).

70. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) accepted the Uruguayan amendment. On the other

hand, he asked for separate votes on the original text of the USSR draft resolution and on the French amendment.

71. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would vote first on the first part of the text which ensued from the adoption of the French amendment, i.e., on the draft resolution (A/C.1/579) including the Uruguayan amendment; and second, on the draft resolution as a whole.

72. He put to the vote the first part of the text, consisting of the draft resolution A/C.1/579 together with the Uruguayan amendment to insert the words "breaches of the peace" between "threats to the peace" and "acts of aggression".

The text was approved by 54 votes with 5 abstentions.

73. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole, since an amendment to which his delegation was opposed had been incorporated in it.

74. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution (A/C.1/579) with the French amendment (A/C.1/591).

The draft resolution as amended was approved by 49 votes to none with 9 abstentions.

Voting on the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/580)

75. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by the USSR in the following terms (A/C.1/580):

"The General Assembly,

"Taking into account the particular importance of concerted action by the five permanent members of the Security Council in defending and strengthening peace and security among nations,

"Recommends that before armed forces are placed at the disposal of the Security Council under appropriate agreements concluded in accordance with Article 43 of the Charter, the five permanent members of the Security Council—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, the United Kingdom, China and France—should take steps to ensure the necessary implementation of Article 106 of the Charter providing for consultation between them, and that they should consult together in accordance with the said Article 106 of the Charter for the purpose of taking such joint action on behalf of the Organization as may prove to be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security."

The draft resolution was rejected by 34 votes to 6, with 18 abstentions.

Iraqi-Syrian draft resolution (A/C.1/585) and USSR amendment (A/C.1/588)

76. Mr. TSIANG (China) said that he had two comments to make on the joint draft resolution of Iraq and Syria (A/C.1/585). First, it had proved impossible to conduct negotiations between the great Powers, not because they had lacked means of entering into contact, but because there had been basic difficulties.

77. Second, although the preamble twice mentioned the permanent members of the Security Council, in the third and fourth paragraphs, there was no mention of China in the enacting clauses. Although the peace treaties with Austria and Germany concerned the four Powers mentioned in the text, the draft resolution also dealt with the problem of world peace. If certain responsibilities were to be conferred on the permanent members of the Security Council, all five Powers must be approached.

78. The delegation of China regarded the USSR amendment (A/C.1/588) as being as inadmissible as the one that it had submitted in connexion with the peace observation commission. The Committee ought therefore to discuss first the admissibility of that amendment.

79. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) recalled that he had recognized that, in the existing state of international tension, the collective measures envisaged by the seven Powers were necessary. Nevertheless, it would be deplorable, as the representative of India had declared, to give the impression that only armaments were being thought of. It was with that in mind that the delegations of Syria and Iraq, being convinced that peace and security depended above all on a state of mind favourable to mutual agreement, had wished to emphasize the importance of peaceful efforts at conciliation, i.e., of preventive measures.

80. More particularly, the great Powers ought to negotiate openly, in the spirit of tolerance and conciliation proper to the Charter.

81. The comment of the representative of China was, in principle, justified, and there was no question of leaving that country out of the negotiations. However, since one of the problems to be discussed was the Chinese question, the temporary absence of that delegation had seemed advisable from the practical point of view.

82. Lastly, the amendment of the USSR was open to the same objections as the claim of the Chinese delegation; it concerned one of the very problems that would have to be discussed. The USSR amendment called for the insertion in the first operative paragraph of the Iraqi-Syrian draft resolution (A/C.1/585) "Recommends to the Governments of France, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics . . ." of the words "the People's Republic of China" following "United States of America" (A/C.1/588).

83. The delegation of Iraq hoped that fresh efforts by the permanent members of the Security Council would lead to some result; to give way to discouragement was unthinkable.

84. Mr. HAJDU (Czechoslovakia) said that it would be deplorable if the First Committee were to persist in closing its eyes to the evidence of the facts and to bow to the demands of a representative representing nobody but himself.

85. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the fact of voting on whether or not an amendment was admissible could lead the Committee very far astray. The rule was that all proposals and all

amendments should be put to the vote, even though delegations could express their disapproval openly by a negative vote, instead of resorting to indirect manoeuvres.

86. It was true that the Kuomintang representative, far from being interested in the maintenance of peace, placed his last hope in a deterioration of the international situation. The First Committee ought not to follow, in that direction, a person without any status as a representative.

87. The CHAIRMAN said that he would put to the vote the Chinese motion regarding the admissibility of the USSR amendment (A/C.1/588).

88. Mr. BARANOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) recalled that the rules of procedure did not impose any prior conditions on the putting to the vote of an amendment. Any other procedure would be absolutely irregular.

89. Mr. YOUNGER (United Kingdom) said that, although it had been correct in a preceding case to vote on the admissibility of a USSR amendment, the present situation was much more complicated. It would be advisable for the Committee to have an opportunity for reflection, both on that point of procedure and on the substance of the draft resolution submitted by Iraq and Syria, and of the USSR amendment.

90. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, in a similar case, the First Committee had declared itself to have no jurisdiction because the Chinese question was already before another body.

91. In the present circumstances, the Committee would have to decide by a vote what procedure it would adopt.

92. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) referred to rule 90 of the rules of procedure, which laid down the procedure to be followed in voting on amendments. Neither that rule nor any other of the rules of procedure raised the question whether an amendment should be put to the vote. The only authority for such a falsification of the rules of procedure was the doubtful one of the Kuomintang representative. However, the latter could profit from the fact that he was still sitting in the First Committee to vote against

the USSR amendment. The First Committee itself must respect rule 90 of the rules of procedure.

93. The CHAIRMAN stated that the delegations which insisted on voting on the USSR amendment must recognize that it was equally essential to vote on the Chinese motion.

94. Mr. COSTA DU RELS (Bolivia) requested the adjournment of the discussion under rule 115.

95. The CHAIRMAN said that two speakers would be allowed to speak for the motion to adjourn and two against.

96. Mr. QUEVEDO (Ecuador) said that the essence of the draft resolution of Iraq and Syria was a request to the permanent members of the Security Council to see among themselves whether it was possible to remedy the existing tension. However, the wording of that text and the problems with which it dealt might well give rise to lengthy discussion.

97. First, the USSR amendment (A/C.1/588) had given rise to an objection of inadmissibility. Whether the vote was taken on the Soviet amendment or on its admissibility, States which recognized the Nationalist Government of China would in any event cast negative votes.

98. With regard to the draft resolution itself, although some parts were acceptable, the third and fourth paragraphs of the preamble and the first operative paragraph, which failed to mention one of the permanent members of the Security Council, might provoke lengthy discussion, as might the text of sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) of the enacting clauses.

99. For those reasons, he was in favour of the proposal to adjourn the discussion.

100. Mr. COSTA DU RELS (Bolivia) said that, although he had referred to rule 115, he had also had in mind rule 117, and he had meant to propose the adjournment of the meeting as well as of the discussion.

101. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal to adjourn the meeting.

The proposal was adopted.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.