

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

PLENARY MEETING

SEVENTH SESSION

Thursday, 18 December 1952, at 4.30 p.m.

Official Records

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

	Page
The Conciliation Commission for Palestine and its work in the light of the resolutions of the United Nations: reports of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Political Committee (A/2310) and the Fifth Committee (A/2311) (<i>concluded</i>)	407
Organization of the work of the General Assembly: report of the General Committee (A/2329)	417
Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the seventh session: report of the General Committee (A/2330)	418

President: Mr. Lester B. PEARSON (Canada).

The Conciliatory Commission for Palestine and its work in the light of the resolutions of the United Nations: reports of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee (A/2310) and the Fifth Committee (A/2311) (*concluded*)

[Agenda item 67]

1. The PRESIDENT: The general discussion on this item has been completed, and we have reached the point of explaining votes.

2. Mr. JESSUP (United States of America): In order to explain the view of the delegation of the United States and the vote which we shall cast on the draft resolution of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee [A/2310] and the amendment of the Philippines [A/L.134] which are before us, it is necessary very briefly to indicate the point of view of the United States delegation concerning the role of the General Assembly in this Palestine question which is now under consideration.

3. It seems to us that the interest and purpose of the General Assembly in considering this question is to aid, in so far as it can, towards the achievement of a solution of this difficult problem. Until this problem is solved, the peace and prosperity of that great area of the Middle East cannot be assured, and until that is assured, the whole structure of international peace cannot be considered firm and permanent. Therefore it has seemed to my delegation that each step taken by the General Assembly, each vote passed in the General Assembly, must be influenced by this conclusion: whether that step, whether that vote, will contribute towards the achievement of a solution of the Palestine question.

4. When the General Assembly, five years ago, began its consideration of the Palestine question, it recommended definite substantive solutions for various ele-

ments of the problem. But it became generally apparent that solutions could not be imposed upon the parties.

5. Just four years ago last Thursday, on 11 December 1948, Mr. John Foster Dulles, speaking for the delegation of the United States at the third session of the General Assembly, in Paris, on this question, remarked: "This General Assembly does not have the power to command" the parties "or to lay upon them precise injunctions".¹ Since that is true, it becomes obvious that any solution must be an agreed solution, and, in the last year or so, the General Assembly, having taken that into account, has not sought to determine the actual substantive solution of elements of the problem in Palestine, but rather has recommended to the parties methods and procedures by which they themselves might agree upon some such solution. And that is the course which the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee has followed this year in its consideration of this question.

6. Both in the Committee and in the plenary meetings of the General Assembly we have all made an earnest effort to agree upon some recommendation which might be unanimously accepted, and, particularly, might be accepted by the States directly concerned with the problem. Unfortunately, this year it is apparent that that happy result is not going to be attained. In those circumstances, the General Assembly must exercise its best judgment on the propositions laid before it as to what course will be most helpful, having in mind our ultimate objective. We must proceed, by the processes defined for the General Assembly, to express that judgment; and it is precisely that which the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee has done in recommending to the General Assembly the draft resolution which is before it.

¹ This quotation is taken from the verbatim record of the 184th plenary meeting (A/PV.184) which is a mimeographed document only.

7. When this draft resolution was first introduced in the Committee, by eight delegations, its language was very simple. In connexion with the chief issue which has developed in the debates, it is well to recall this—that the draft resolution as originally introduced simply called upon the parties to enter into direct negotiations.

8. In the course of the Committee's consideration, various changes were made in the draft resolution in order to meet the objections which were advanced to it in its original form. It was argued that this simple appeal for direct negotiations would constitute an impairment of the rights of some of the parties, that it would prejudice their rights. Accordingly, we now find in the draft resolution, as it comes to us, the express words that the entering into direct negotiations shall be "without prejudice to their respective rights and claims". It was argued in the Committee that the simple form of the draft ignored the previous resolutions of the General Assembly, as if they were being repealed, or as if they were lost sight of and deemed to be of no account. Accordingly, in the course of the debates, additional words were inserted to provide that in these direct negotiations the parties should be advised to bear in mind the resolutions, as well as the principal objectives, of the United Nations on the Palestine question. It was also suggested that, in connexion with the problem of the Holy Places in Palestine, there were interests of third parties which should also be borne in mind, and language was adopted in the draft resolution now before us which would take that into account.

9. It seems to me quite clear that in the draft resolution as it comes to us with the recommendations of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, there is no surrender or impairment of rights suggested. On behalf of the delegation of the United States, I pointed out in the Committee, and I reaffirm it here on behalf of my delegation, that the language of this draft resolution does not mean that the parties, in undertaking direct negotiations, should first abandon what they consider to be their legitimate rights and interests, or cast aside the expressions of the General Assembly's views that have been set forth in its various resolutions on Palestine. We believe that direct negotiations should be direct and unconditional, that the parties on the one hand and on the other should enter into these direct negotiations uncontrolled by any prior assertion or prior condition, that it should be a free and open negotiation.

10. As we entered into our discussion of this question in plenary meeting of the General Assembly, we were confronted with an amendment introduced by the Philippine delegation. I think that our consideration of that amendment must again be guided by our answer to the question: will the adoption of this amendment help in serving our fundamental purposes? As I have already stated it seems to me clear, and the representative of Panama has pointed this out [405th meeting], that the adoption of this amendment would not succeed in securing that unanimity which we all would so much like to see. Therefore we must examine it in its particular parts to see the utility and effect of each part of the amendment.

11. As we examine it, it is quite clear, at least to my delegation, that it introduces no new concept which

is not already to be found in the draft resolution which comes to us from the Committee. In the first place the amendment suggests that the words "bearing in mind" should be replaced by the words "on the basis of". It might seem to one who has not followed the debates that this is an innocent and meaningless change of language, but to those who have followed these discussions through long and sometimes weary hours in the Committee it is well known that this question of the exact expression to be used in this context engaged the attention of the Committee over a very considerable period of time and that various formulae were suggested. I believe that, in the light of that discussion, one is forced to the conclusion that the inclusion of these words "on the basis of" would result in the conclusion, in some minds at least, that the negotiations were to be based upon certain conditions; in other words, that we should be back at the conditional type of negotiation, which my delegation does not think the proper approach to direct negotiations. We believe, therefore, that the original language in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, on this point, should be maintained.

12. Secondly, there is a suggestion that we should add at the end of paragraph 4 the words "and, in particular, the principle of the internationalization of Jerusalem". It seems to me that that would not be a wise addition to the draft resolution.

13. In the first place, the specific example which is here proposed for inclusion in the draft resolution, namely, the question of the internationalization of Jerusalem, is precisely that one task which cannot be accomplished merely by the direct negotiations of the parties. The parties may facilitate the result, but the internationalization of Jerusalem, as has been apparent from all the previous debates of the General Assembly, is an international task and not a task which is confided solely to the negotiations of the parties.

14. In the second place, we know that there are several points which are of major concern in a final settlement on Palestine. They were mentioned by various representatives this morning [405th meeting], and they include particularly the territorial question and the question of refugees, but these are not specifically called to mind. The question arises, why should we call to mind one question and not the others?

15. Moreover, it seems to me that we are all highly conscious of the fact that this question of the internationalization of Jerusalem has a very deep and sacred meaning for many peoples throughout the world and for peoples of many faiths. I cast no doubt at all upon the motives of the representative of the Philippines who introduced this amendment, nor upon the motives of those who support it, but I do fear that the introduction of this idea in this form at the last moment of our considerations might lead, in some minds, to a suspicion that it is an element thrown into the parliamentary consideration of the question for some parliamentary reason, and not solely on the basis of the deep religious concern which so many of us have in the ultimate solution of this problem.

16. More broadly, the question which concerns the General Assembly in voting on this amendment and on this draft resolution is this. We are not being asked to vote for or against resolutions passed by the General Assembly in 1947 or in 1948 or in 1949 or in

any other year. We are being asked to vote on a specific draft resolution recommended to us by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and upon a specific amendment to that draft resolution. We must make up our minds as to the wisdom of the adoption of the particular amendment to that draft resolution recommended to us. It is impossible to say that when one votes on the question of substituting words one is, on the basis of that, expressing a fundamental opinion as to the soundness or wisdom of this or that paragraph of a resolution of the General Assembly adopted some four or five years ago. Similarly, when one votes on the question of adding some words referring to the internationalization of Jerusalem, one is not being asked to indicate by a vote whether one favours internationalization or whether one believes that is the way to protect the Holy Places and to settle that part of the whole Palestine question. That is not the issue upon which we are going to vote, and anyone who votes against the addition of this phrase is not saying he does not believe in the internationalization of Jerusalem. We are considering, as I have said, the addition of particular words to a particular draft resolution, looked at from the point of view of the total result which this Assembly will produce in the expression of its opinion on the issues which are now before us for decision at this stage of the perennial discussion of the Palestine question.

17. Finally, in closing, I should like to remind my fellow representatives that many of us have been through a number of debates on this Palestine question at a number of different sessions of the General Assembly. Many of us remember that at previous sessions of the General Assembly we found that in the course of our debates we were conscious of very strong differences of opinion as to the wisest course to follow in the framing of a resolution. I am very happy to recall that on previous occasions, when the sound of eloquent arguments no longer echoed in our ears and when we proceeded to deal realistically with situations which practically confronted us as governments, we were able to go forward again in unity and in harmony in our common effort to solve the problem.

18. On behalf of the United States delegation, I wish to assure the General Assembly, and particularly those States concerned with this problem, that, as a member of the Palestine Conciliation Commission, the United States remains ready to offer all assistance in its power to the parties in any efforts they may make towards the solution of this problem.

19. For the reasons I have given, the United States delegation will oppose the Philippine amendment and will maintain its vote for the draft resolution in the original form in which it came to us from the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

20. Mr. MUNRO (New Zealand): My delegation supports the draft resolution which, after long discussion and most careful consideration of the wording in the principal paragraph of the operative part, was adopted in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

21. During the successive revisions of the draft resolution, account was taken of various points of view, and the wording finally arrived at, in our opinion, most nearly represented the opinion of the majority in the Committee. The Philippine amendment, in the view of my delegation, would disturb that balance.

While we are concerned that the United Nations position in regard to the protection of religious interests in Jerusalem, particularly of course in the Holy Places, should be safeguarded, we feel that this is achieved in the existing draft resolution.

22. The addition of a vague reference to the principle of internationalization, which obviously can mean very different things to different people, does not seem to us to clarify or to improve the existing reference to the protection of religious interests. Indeed, we feel that the amendment adds nothing except an element of confusion which would divide those supporting the present draft resolution.

23. I associate myself with the representative of the United States, who said that he was not in any way impugning the motives of the Philippine delegation in introducing this amendment. I associate myself with that remark, but I say this: that the effect of that amendment is calculated to create confusion and to divide those who, in my judgment, rightly voted for the eight-Power draft resolution in committee. My delegation, consequently, will vote against the Philippine amendment.

24. Mr. SALAZAR (Dominican Republic) (*translated from Spanish*): The delegation of the Dominican Republic has had occasion to express its views before on the serious problem of Palestine. In the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee we stated, and I repeat what we said at that time, that, without prejudice to the merits of the case presented by the two parties, we were ready to support any decision which would recognize direct negotiations as the most satisfactory method of settling international disputes, because not only were they the best and the most normal way of conducting relations between States, but they also involved the encouragement of friendship, understanding and good will, which were unquestionably fundamental bases of harmony and peace. We therefore based our action in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee on such considerations.

25. These same convictions would lead us to support any draft resolution in which the General Assembly expressed that idea. However, we are sorry to state that, given the trend of the discussion on this subject—and this has been suggested by a number of delegations—there are grounds to believe that a mere invitation to begin direct negotiations, without any reference point, might be taken to be a complete repudiation of the principles and directives established by the United Nations in connexion with this problem, which principles, we know, have never successfully been challenged.

26. Consequently, because we believe that it can and should be accepted by the parties directly concerned, we shall vote in favour of the amendment [A/L.134] submitted by the Philippine delegation, or any other which, like that amendment, meets this interpretation of the draft resolution which we are going to adopt and which guarantees loyally and securely, in a most satisfactory manner for all parties and interests concerned, the backing which we must give to the corresponding decisions of the United Nations, whose basic principles must and surely will constitute the higher precepts on which negotiations will be based—negotiations which we all hope will be undertaken without any further delay.

27. I should like to place very clearly on record that in intervening in this question my delegation is prompted solely by an unshakable desire to offer its full co-operation towards the re-establishment of normal peaceful relations between the countries of the Middle East; we merely wish to show our unbounded friendship for the countries involved, our sympathetic understanding of the problem and of the desire of both parties to secure permanent peace in the area, and to help the peoples concerned to achieve a prosperous and happy future.

28. These same considerations will lead us to abstain from the vote on the draft resolution recommended by the Committee, if an amendment such as that proposed by the Philippines is rejected. In addition to the circumstances mentioned, we cannot but bear in mind the persistent and definite refusal by one of the parties of the invitation to negotiate directly, a fact which will prevent the United Nations from obtaining any result from the decision which it approves and which, we feel, will detract dangerously from the effectiveness and, possibly, even the moral significance of the action which our Organization is undertaking in this connexion.

29. Mr. HUDICOURT (Haiti) (*translated from French*): The delegation of Haiti has not taken an active part in the discussions on the Palestine Conciliation Commission, since our country is not directly concerned. Nevertheless, in order to safeguard certain general principles, and especially the principle of conciliation, and because of the urgent need to find a solution which will satisfy the parties concerned, and in order to ensure the observance of the previous General Assembly resolutions, particularly the provisions relating to the internationalization of Jerusalem, my delegation joined four other Latin-American countries in submitting an amendment, in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, to the eight-Power draft resolution which the Committee has now submitted to the General Assembly. That amendment was designed to safeguard the previous General Assembly resolutions and called for the insertion, in paragraph 4 of the operative part, of the phrase "within the framework of the previous General Assembly resolutions".

30. The many formal and informal exchanges of views which took place during the discussions led the Haitian delegation to accept the words "bearing in mind previous resolutions" which, if I am not mistaken, were suggested by the representative of Mexico. Ultimately, the text was further amended in terms which, while less explicit, were easier to interpret.

31. My delegation voted in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee in favour of the draft resolution before the General Assembly, in the belief that the previous General Assembly resolutions would be respected, especially those relating to the internationalization of Jerusalem. We began to doubt this, however, when we read the report in *The New York Times* reproducing the statement of Mr. Ben-Gurion, the Prime Minister of Israel. The statements made here by the representative of Israel have not dispelled those doubts. The delegation of Haiti accordingly intended to abstain in the vote on paragraph 4 of the operative part of the draft resolution and, if that paragraph were adopted, to abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

32. The amendment submitted by the Philippine representative, suggesting the insertion of the phrase "on the basis of", approximates closely to the words "within the framework of", which appeared in the original amendment submitted jointly by Haiti and four other Powers. It enables the delegation of Haiti to state its position on this question quite clearly: that position is that, quite apart from the question of conciliation, it is understood that any direct negotiations will respect the previous resolutions of the General Assembly, especially those relating to the internationalization of Jerusalem.

33. Haiti is a Catholic country, and my delegation feels that this draft resolution should be retained until such time as negotiations between the parties lead to an agreement which would give the parties concerned more adequate guarantees.

34. The delegation of Haiti will therefore support the Philippine amendment and, if that is adopted, will vote in favour of the joint draft resolution as a whole. On the other hand, if the Philippine amendment is rejected, my delegation will abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

35. Mr. SHAW (Australia): In a very brief explanation of vote, I wish to say simply that the Australian delegation will vote against the Philippine amendment. We shall do so because it is our belief that we should not at this late stage upset a draft resolution which has emerged from such lengthy discussion with such a wide measure of compromise. We shall support the draft resolution if presented in its original form.

36. We also wish to make it clear that any vote cast on this question by the Australian delegation is not to be considered in any way as prejudicing our views concerning appropriate measures for the protection of the Holy Places.

37. Mr. LYNDEN (Belgium) (*translated from French*): The Belgian delegation will support the Philippine amendment, since the wording of paragraph 4 of the operative part proposed in that text is in our view superior to that contained in the eight-Power draft resolution approved by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

38. A reference to the General Assembly resolutions would appear to be the logical starting point for direct negotiations. The phrase "on the basis of" the resolutions gives due weight to the previous resolutions, without requiring the parties concerned to apply them to the last letter. It invites the parties to consider the spirit of those resolutions and not to interpret them literally.

39. Furthermore, the reference in the Philippine amendment to the principle of the internationalization of the Holy Places is more explicit and satisfactory than the simple reference to the religious interests of third parties contained in the text approved by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. The Holy Places have always been a matter of special concern to the Belgian delegation, and its position in that connexion has been stated too often in this Assembly to need any further repetition.

40. These are the two reasons why I shall support the Philippine amendment when it is put to the vote.

41. On the other hand, as my delegation stated in committee, no resolution, however satisfactory, can be effective if it is rejected by one of the parties. The Arab States definitely oppose the eight-Power draft resolution. That is why I abstained from voting on it in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and why I shall abstain once again in the plenary meeting. As the Israel representative objects to the text proposed by the Philippine delegation, I shall be compelled, much as I approve of that text, to abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole if the Philippine amendment is incorporated in it. The Belgian delegation feels that conciliation cannot be imposed and therefore considers it useless and futile to support a draft resolution which is rejected by one of the parties.

42. Mr. Juan B. DE LAVALLE (Peru) (*translated from Spanish*): The Peruvian delegation still holds the position which it has maintained consistently since the Palestine question was referred to the first special session of the General Assembly in 1947. We have stated from the outset of the discussions in the General Assembly that Peru has no political or economic interest in the matter, that fundamentally it is animated only by a spiritual interest, based on its faith and tradition as a Catholic country, which also dictates the position of the Peruvian Government and the Peruvian delegation.

43. Peru had the honour to be elected a member of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine set up by the special session of the Assembly in 1947 [resolution 106 (S-1)], and it served that body with the sense of responsibility demanded by so signal a mark of confidence. Today, at the seventh regular session, we still maintain our original position, inspired by the Catholic faith and tradition of Peru. As a Member of the United Nations, Peru is second to none in its desire for peace in Palestine. It reiterates its sincere friendship for the parties directly concerned and its deep respect for their rights and interests, and reaffirms its hope that a peaceful settlement of the differences still outstanding in this complex and delicate problem may be reached.

44. In the debate in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee we made clear our views concerning the validity of the General Assembly resolutions and the authority of the General Assembly with regard to this problem, in which it has shown such consistent interest. We stated our opinion that from the legal point of view the resolutions in question must necessarily remain in force so long as they have not been revised, amended or annulled by the Assembly itself. There is no reason why the content of those resolutions should not be reaffirmed now, just as it was reaffirmed and reiterated in the resolution [512 (VI)] adopted at our sixth session. We are not disposed to weaken the content of the resolutions by means of any equivocal or ambiguous terminology or expression. Therefore, with a view to reaffirming the validity of the General Assembly resolutions, we proposed, in the Committee, an amendment to paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution which was then under consideration [A/AC.6/L.28]. Our amendment was drafted in the same terms as those of the previously mentioned resolution adopted at the sixth session. We were obliged to abstain from voting on the draft resolution as we did not consider its wording satisfactory.

45. The delegation of the Philippines, our sister country in culture, tradition and faith, has proposed an amendment [A/L.134] which, in our opinion, unequivocally recognizes the validity and authority of the United Nations resolutions as well as our religious interest in the question. We cannot fail to support the appeal that it contains and we therefore state that we consider that amendment satisfactory and shall vote in favour of it.

46. Mr. JOHNSON (Canada): I wish to explain the vote of the Canadian delegation on the Philippine amendment [A/L.134].

47. Let me deal first with the first part of that amendment, which calls for the replacement of the words "bearing in mind" by the words "on the basis of" in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

48. My delegation considers that what is needed at this stage is a resolution of the General Assembly calling on the parties to bring their respective claims to the conference table, where they may be dealt with by persons fully acquainted with the conditions, the needs and the aspirations of the populations directly concerned. We believe also that the parties concerned should bear in mind, while they are dealing with these claims, the resolutions and the principle objectives of the United Nations on the Palestine question. As the draft resolution makes clear, this would mean that the parties would bear in mind the religious interests of third parties, as well as the other points covered in past United Nations resolutions.

49. We do not feel that the proposed negotiations should be limited by a stipulation that they must be conducted on the basis of past resolutions of the United Nations. This would mean, in effect, that no suggestions advanced by either of the parties might go beyond the provisions of past resolutions even if, by putting forward a new suggestion, either party could point the way to a settlement which the other party would accept.

50. We therefore believe it better to keep to the original wording of paragraph 4 of the draft resolution proposed by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. We shall thus vote against the first part of the Philippine amendment.

51. I wish now to say a special word about the second half of the Philippine amendment, which asks the negotiations should be based on the principle of the internationalization of Jerusalem.

52. My Government has always maintained, and still maintains, that international supervision of the Holy Places ought to be established—and, if the second part of the Philippine amendment were generally understood in this sense, my delegation would be able to vote for it. The phrase used in the Philippine amendment, however, has come to be closely associated with a particular plan for Jerusalem which has been found to be inoperable.

53. It is for this reason that we are obliged to abstain on the vote on the use of this phrase—although, as I wish to repeat, the Government of Canada continues to favour the principle of international supervision of the Holy Places.

54. Mr. Zafrulla KHAN (Pakistan): We have been reminded on this issue that it should be or is the policy

of the United Nations—or of the General Assembly, at least—that solutions should not be imposed. I shall not for the moment either question or endorse that statement as a principle. But I do wish to remind the General Assembly that the original decision from which all this trouble has flowed—and from which, it appears, a great deal more will continue to flow—was an imposed decision. The question of partition of Palestine was argued and debated in committee and in the Assembly, and it became absolutely clear before it reached a vote that the Arabs of Palestine as well as the Arab States and, in fact, all Asiatic States, were firmly opposed to partition. In fact, it became clear on the day on which everybody expected that the matter would come to the vote that partition would not be carried.

55. That was Thanksgiving Eve, and word was passed about that the voting would be postponed until after Thanksgiving. Mr. Al-Jamali of Iraq and I went to the President and protested. We were told that the President was helpless because the Secretary-General had informed him that the staff could not be expected to work on Thanksgiving Eve or on Thanksgiving Day and that therefore the matter must be postponed. So the adjournment took place. We found later that the staff quite cheerfully continued to work not only on Thanksgiving Eve but also on Thanksgiving Day.

56. The matter was postponed. I will not dwell upon what happened in the meantime. But the result was that, when the matter came to the actual voting after the adjournment, some of the States whose representatives had gone to the rostrum and announced in most indignant terms that the proposal before the General Assembly was a most inequitable one and that they would oppose it, tamely supported it, and the resolution was adopted.

57. It was an imposed decision, the principal share in the imposition of which was taken by certain States which it is not necessary to specify by name. It was an imposed decision to take away their country from a people who had inhabited a land for nearly 2,000 years and to hand it over to people who were coming from—and more of them were expected to come—from outside. That was the equity of it.

58. Warnings were given during the course of those debates that the obvious result of that decision would be that the Arabs would be pushed out of the proposed State of Israel and that the setting up of that State was being sought in order to find room for displaced Jews from Europe and other areas—on their part not only a laudable effort but a necessary one to find room for these displaced persons. I am not blaming them—but the necessary consequence would be that the Arabs living in the State of Israel would be pushed out. You cannot find room in a land which is already supporting the maximum population that it can possibly support without getting rid of some, so that others who come in should take their place. This decision was taken with that contingency repeatedly pointed out.

59. We may be sure or know that those who favoured the setting up of this State had given repeated assurances that that would not be permitted to happen; that only a few wealthy Arab landlords, oppressing, tyrannizing over the cultivator, might choose to go, but that there was such close friendship between the Zionists and the Arab cultivators that the latter were hoping

that the State would be established and that the benefits which had already accrued to them from association with Zionist activities would continue to be fostered, and that their well-being and prosperity would thereby be greatly improved. The States which brought about this decision either chose to believe these assurances in good faith or just ignored them.

60. I have submitted that it was an imposed decision. It was a most inequitable decision. These consequences have flowed from it. Thereafter the General Assembly adopted certain resolutions in order to resolve the most undesirable consequences that had flowed from the original decision.

61. We have now arrived at a stage where, step by step, the position is being surrendered, and today the General Assembly is told, "You will create confusion if you say that conciliation should be sought, and these differences resolved on the basis of the decisions taken by the General Assembly". The parties, it is said, can put on the table their respective rights and claims and they will be considered. At the time when each of these resolutions was adopted, the respective rights and claims were considered backwards and forwards and the resolutions were amended, and there were arguments, and so on. Eventually the General Assembly adopted those resolutions.

62. Let us now be absolutely frank about this thing that you propose to do. If States do not, and it appears that quite a large number of States do not, intend to adhere to the previous resolutions, let them say so. If an inequity or an injustice is to be committed, let us, at least, be honest about it. Let there be no hypocrisy. To impose a decision and then to say, "No, no, our policy should not be to impose decisions", is very much like the case set out in the words: "Having succeeded in killing me, he has proclaimed his repentance. How quickly has the tyrant been overtaken by remorse".

63. Our attitude on this matter is this, that the very least the General Assembly can do, if out of no other consideration than to retain some respect for the decisions arrived at by it, is to insist that a State which is the creation of the United Nations—and, therefore, as a condition of its very existence, is bound to carry out the decisions of the United Nations—shall carry out those decisions. Therefore, we shall vote in favour of the Philippine amendment. If it is carried, we shall vote for the draft resolution as a whole; if it fails, we shall oppose the draft resolution.

64. **THE PRESIDENT:** The list of members wishing to explain their votes before the vote is now exhausted. We shall proceed to a decision in regard to the draft resolution [A/2310], to which an amendment has been submitted by the delegation of the Philippines (A/L.134). It has been suggested, and the mover of the amendment has agreed, that probably the most logical and most satisfactory way to deal with the Philippine amendment would be to consider it as two separate amendments: one replacing the words "bearing in mind", in paragraph 4 of the operative part, by "on the basis of", and the other adding to that paragraph the words "and, in particular, the principle of the internationalization of Jerusalem". Therefore, if the Assembly agrees, a separate vote will be taken on each one in the order which I have just indicated.

65. It has also been proposed to me that this draft resolution and, of course, amendments to it should be considered as an important subject within the meaning of rule 84 of the rules of procedure. Therefore, if there is no objection, I shall consider it as such.

66. A roll-call vote has been requested in regard to the two Philippine amendments. We shall vote first on the amendment to replace the words "bearing in mind", in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution (A/2310), by the words "on the basis of".

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Iran, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, China, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Haiti, India, Indonesia.

Against: Israel, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Iceland.

Abstaining: Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Paraguay, Venezuela, Burma, Costa Rica, Greece Guatemala, Honduras.

The result of the vote was 26 in favour, 24 against, and 10 abstentions.

The amendment was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

67. The PRESIDENT: The second amendment of the Philippine delegation is to add the words "and, in particular, the principle of the internationalization of Jerusalem" to the end of paragraph 4 of the draft resolution (A/2310).

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Costa Rica, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Venezuela, Yemen, Afghanistan, Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia.

Against: Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Iceland, Israel, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Poland, Sweden, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Abstaining: France, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Nicaragua, Australia, Burma, Canada, China.

The result of the vote was 28 in favour, 20 against, and 12 abstentions.

The amendment was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

68. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Chile has asked permission to explain his vote after the vote on this amendment. This will take the place of an explanation of vote after the vote on the draft resolution as a whole. I know this is somewhat unusual but, if the Assembly agrees, I see no reason why it should not be done.

69. Mr. SOTO (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): The General Assembly has rejected the Philippine amendment. The Chilean delegation voted in favour of the second part of that amendment concerning the internationalization of Jerusalem. It might appear that the defeat of the amendment has radically altered the meaning of paragraph 4 of the draft resolution approved by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. But that is not the case. In effect, the Philippine amendment concerning Jerusalem was simply a means of drawing attention to a situation which was already contemplated in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution approved by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. The Chilean delegation voted for paragraph 4 in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee because it considered that the phrase "the religious interests of third parties" implied the safeguarding of the Holy Places—which is actually the case—even though it may not be guaranteed by a specific measure such as internationalization.

70. The draft resolution submitted by the Committee is complete in itself, and its preamble refers to former resolutions of the General Assembly; it follows inevitably then that it provides adequate guarantee of the protection of the Holy places, even if the form of such protection is not precisely indicated, because such protection is implied in the reference to former General Assembly resolutions and in the appeal to the interested parties not to lose sight, in the course of the negotiations, of the religious interests of third parties.

71. We feel that this is the only correct interpretation of the draft resolution, and it is in this spirit that we shall vote in favour of the text presented by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

72. I consider it my duty to address an earnest appeal to all those delegations which shared this point of view in the Committee not to set aside an interpretation that is clear in every respect and which, I believe, satisfies all those who are concerned with this problem.

73. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution which appears in the report of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee (A/2130). A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Australia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Iceland, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Sweden, Union of South Africa.

Against: Yemen, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Venezuela, Argentina, Belgium, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Liberia, Mexico, Peru, Philippines, Turkey.

The result of the vote was 24 in favour, 21 against, and 15 abstentions.

The draft resolution was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

74. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The USSR delegation deems it necessary to explain its vote on the draft resolution on the work of the Conciliation Commission for Palestine.

75. Several draft resolutions were submitted in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, including the one on which we have just voted, which was altered several times in the course of a lengthy debate and much lobbying. The USSR delegation abstained in committee when the vote was taken on the draft resolution.

76. The resolution contains a number of paragraphs on the Conciliation Commission for Palestine, against whose establishment and activities the USSR delegation has consistently protested. My delegation has frequently pointed out that this Conciliation Commission, set up on the initiative of the United States and directed by that country, does not and cannot serve the cause of peace in the Near and Middle East and cannot promote the settlement of disputes which have arisen between States in that region. On the contrary, the entire activities of the Commission have shown that it not only fails to promote the settlement of disputed points, but also aggravates the position and is contrary to the interests of the inhabitants of that area.

77. In view of the inclusion in the draft resolution of paragraphs concerning the Conciliation Commission which the USSR delegation could not accept, the whole draft became unacceptable to it, and it therefore voted against it.

78. Mr. SHUKAIRI (Syria): I interpret the acclamation just given by the General Assembly as an expression of its support for the just and democratic cause which we have been defending here and in committee.

79. All efforts have failed. The draft resolution has been defeated. We have voted against it, we have exerted all our endeavours to defeat it, because it deserved to be defeated.

80. The draft resolution recommended by the Committee bears in mind the resolutions of the General Assembly; it bears in mind the objectives of the United Nations; it bears in mind the religious interests in the Holy Land. In my humble submission, however, we are not members of a kindergarten class who can read only words: we must read what is between the words. The words say "bear in mind", but what is between the words is "bury in mind"—bury in mind the objectives of the United Nations, bury in mind the resolutions

of the General Assembly, bury in mind the religious interests in the Holy Land. That is why we have voted against and defeated the draft resolution.

81. In the defeat of that draft resolution, continents have been involved; minds and consciences have been at work. The refugees who are homeless, who are living in tents, who are experiencing great distress, turn with gratitude to those who have defeated the draft resolution.

82. I am not stating what is in the minds of the governments; I am stating what is in the minds of the people in the entire Arab world, from Casablanca to the Persian Gulf. That entire sub-continent, which was thrown into turmoil by the draft resolution approved by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, can rest now that it has been defeated by the General Assembly. They turn with gratitude to those members of the Latin-American bloc, of the Asian and African bloc, of the Soviet bloc who have defended the righteous cause of the people of Palestine.

83. The draft resolution which has just been defeated was—and I say this with all due respect—fraught with violations of the Charter, violations of human rights, violations of the inherent rights of the people of the country concerned. Those people have had their roots in the country for generations, but they have been driven out and have lived in exile for five years now. The draft resolution recommended by the Committee offered a life of exile for a life of exile, expatriation for expatriation. It offered Israel a capital, whereas the international community has decreed that that capital should remain an international *corpus separatum* under the effective control of the United Nations.

84. This defeat is a defeat of the campaign against the United Nations. It is a defeat of the attempts to lower the dignity and honour of the United Nations. It represents the General Assembly's desire to uphold the Charter and United Nations resolutions. The whole world, therefore, must be gratified at this just defeat of the draft resolution.

85. I should also like to single out another group for an expression of appreciation. I refer to the United States, the United Kingdom and France. These three States, so far as I recollect—and my memory as regards the Palestine question never fails me—supported the partition plan. In 1947, they brought to bear all pressure humanly possible in order to ensure the General Assembly's adoption of the partition plan. They succeeded. In 1948, they voted for the resolution [194 (III)] on the repatriation of the refugees. Every human being in the world has an inherent right to live in his home. The United Nations did not create that right. Everyone of us, from the President to any member of the audience here, everyone in the world, even persons living in the jungle, have the right to live at home, at peace. The people living in the Ice Age had that right. The home has been the basis of all freedoms in the world. What is liberty without a home? What is sovereignty without a home? What are freedom of worship and conscience without a home? The home, as I have said, is at the basis of all these freedoms. It is at the basis of our Charter. I therefore thank the delegations of the United Kingdom, the United States and France for having recognized, in 1948, the refugees' right to repatriation.

86. Again, in 1947, 1948 and 1949, moved by religious emotions and passions, this Assembly adopted resolutions which decreed that Jerusalem should be established as a *corpus separatum* under effective United Nations control. I should like to thank the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and France for their support of the principle of internationalization.

87. And again, when I referred in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee to the refugees' right to repatriation, I felt that the hearts of the representatives of those three States were going out to the people of Palestine. In the Committee, referring to the question of Jerusalem and the Holy Land, I said that under every stone in Palestine one could find history, a saint or a prophet. I said that the whole country was in itself a living museum, historical and religious. While I was addressing the Committee on these points, I gazed at the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and France. Again, I was certain that their hearts were going out to the principle of internationalization and that their tears were about to flow.

88. In the light of these circumstances, I may be asked: why is it that these three delegations voted against the principles which they seemed to support? It is not for me to answer that question; it is for those delegations to answer. Perhaps some delegations which are fond of the Shakespearian style will say: "I have come to bury Caesar, not to praise him" and "Brutus, after all, is an honourable man".

89. Mr. EBAN (Israel): The echoes of the distinguished Syrian representative hysterically gloating over the absence of peace in the Middle East do not seem, in the ears of my delegation, to form an adequate conclusion to a serious and earnest debate.

90. In view of the exhaustive discussion which we have conducted in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and in plenary meeting, and in the light of the deep and direct impact which this problem has upon the interests of Israel, I hope that the Assembly will bear with me for a few moments while I endeavour, in explaining my delegation's vote, to summarize the position in which Arab-Israel relations now find themselves.

91. The Assembly will remember that the item whose consideration we have just concluded was submitted by the delegations of six Arab States, and that it was accompanied by memoranda and draft resolutions which laid heavy accusations against the Government and the State of Israel and sought to secure international support for those accusations and for measures giving effect to them. We look back with the utmost satisfaction on the circumstance that not one of those complaints, and not one of those proposals or draft resolutions which sought to justify those complaints, has aroused any echo or received any response in any part of the General Assembly.

92. It seems to my delegation that the General Assembly of the United Nations has rejected and rebuked the initiative which brought this item before the Assembly in the context of militant and vigorous conflict. Neither the proposal to enlarge the Conciliation Commission, nor the proposal to impose upon the State of Israel those solutions which have been superseded through the opposition to them of the Arab States at the time when their implementation was possible, nor

any of the other unilateral solutions which the sponsors of item 67 of our agenda submitted for consideration, has received any approbation here.

93. I should like to explain briefly the motives which animated my delegation in the vote which it cast in favour of the draft resolution approved by a large majority of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. It seems to me that that vote requires explanation, for the draft resolution which was approved by the Committee, but which has failed to secure an adequate majority here, did not enter into the substance of any part of the problem of Arab-Israel relations. It neither vindicated nor refuted the position of the parties on any of the issues which separate them. It merely called upon them to seek pacific methods of settlement in conformity with the provisions and the procedures of the Charter, by assimilating their relations to the best levels of regional co-operation in our own age and in our own time.

94. The problem before us is that our relations are governed by armistice treaties achieved by the free consent of the parties, and that these agreements, while being responsible for such stability as now exists in the Middle East, nevertheless fall far short of the positive relations which ought to govern the intercourse of sovereign States. The task, then, is to develop these agreements resting on consent into new and more suitable and permanent relations, also to be achieved by processes of mutual consent. We know that that task will be difficult and that it will require great efforts by all parties concerned. It was therefore legitimate to hope that the General Assembly, without entering into the substance of the position of either party, would at least recommend these procedures which it has recommended in all other international conflicts and disputes.

95. The sole chance of success in this task lies in the recognition by the parties of their primary responsibility for reaching a settlement and of their sovereign right to reach whatever agreements can command their consent. Through the confrontation of their various views and ideas, their minds must range freely over the entire compass of alternative possibilities and solutions and not be rigidly bound by the limits of those solutions which have, unfortunately, failed to produce agreement in the past.

96. We note, notwithstanding the vote of the General Assembly, that there is a large body of doctrine within the United Nations in favour of the concept that Israel and the Arab States should develop their relations beyond their present point of tension in an effort to reach peaceful relations. We notice that the General Assembly, by its vote, has rejected the concept that the basis of an Arab-Israel agreement must be the resolutions of the past, and we notice that, both by its vote and by the great volume of opinion expressed in our discussions, the General Assembly regards the Governments of Israel and the Arab States as the agents and instruments of any new development in their relations. I hope that I would not be contradicted if I were to say that, in spite of the vote which has just been taken, the United Nations will not object if Israel and the Arab States freely negotiate a settlement of their outstanding differences in development of the armistice treaties which they have already achieved.

97. Thus the problem of Arab-Israel relations leaves the forum of the General Assembly and enters into the

domain of the direct interchange of influence and contact between Israel and the Arab States.

98. I cannot conclude without referring to the allusion in the draft resolution which came from the Committee to the religious interests of third parties, which my Government will in all circumstances respect. We notice the significance of the fact that the General Assembly has rejected the idea that the only manner in which those religious interests can be maintained is by the pursuit of a particular solution envisaged some time ago. But I should like to turn back from the past few weeks of controversy and discussion in order to reflect, in my closing words, upon the vistas of opportunity which open up before the parties.

99. The representative of one of the Arab States asked: "What is there for Israel and the Arab States to talk about? On what should they negotiate?"

100. They should negotiate about the restoration of security in their area; they should negotiate in an effort to secure guarantees of non-aggression; they should negotiate in order to achieve armaments agreements; they should negotiate in order to reduce tension upon their borders; they should negotiate in an effort to consult together for strengthening the defence of the area under the influence of the Charter of the United Nations; they should negotiate upon their boundaries in order to develop the existing territorial situation into a permanent territorial settlement offering assurance and stability to the relations among States of the Middle East; they should negotiate in order to accelerate a solution of the refugee problem, the solution of which by regional resettlement my Government is prepared to facilitate and to assist; they should negotiate for economic co-operation, for joint development, and for partnership in the utilization of water resources; they should negotiate in order to liberate the Near East from the paralysis which affects its communications, to open up its highways, its ports and its railways to the common use and welfare of the region as a whole; they should negotiate in order to establish habits of co-operation within the regional and technical agencies of the United Nations. They should co-operate in order to secure the maximum regional benefits from the technical aid programmes now operating in our midst. Finally, they should consolidate and express the results of these negotiations in peace treaties which should replace the present armistice agreements, in commercial treaties and in the conventions which usually operate in the relations between sovereign States.

101. Is there not something frivolous in the question as to whether Israel and the Arab States have anything to negotiate about, have anything to do, have anything to contribute towards the peace of their region and, therefore, towards the stability and the welfare of the world as a whole?

102. In conclusion, I should like to express the deep appreciation of all those governments and elements in the Middle East which genuinely seek reconciliation to the governments of eight disinterested Powers which came together to advocate, in the form of a draft resolution, a procedure of pacific settlement of the Arab-Israel dispute. The initiative, the idealism and the resourcefulness which they have shown are not in vain, and the work which they have achieved in strengthening a sentiment for Arab-Israel peace has not been under-

mined in any sense by the arithmetical consequence of the vote which we have taken.

103. We interpret it to be the will of the General Assembly that Israel and the Arab States are alone confronting each other face to face, and that even if they are not under the injunctions of a specific resolution, they are now under the injunctions of the Charter of the United Nations, which calls upon them to harmonize their efforts for the welfare of their venerable region and for the strengthening of peace and security in the world.

104. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq): We all want peace. If we go to the cemetery we can find peace; we can stop there and think of peace. That is the peace of death. The peace we want in the Middle East is not the peace of a cemetery; it is the peace of honour and of justice. Honour, justice and right have been wounded in Palestine. The Arabs of Palestine are destitute, homeless. They want their homes; this is a fundamental human right which no one can deny to them. It is peace based on right that we want. For months we discussed the question of Korea, but peace was not concluded there because fundamental principles were not taken into consideration.

105. The United Nations has declared today that it still respects the principles of human rights and of the Charter. We want peace, but peace based on the recognition of the Arab's right to his homeland. Any diminution of those rights will not lead to peace. There can be no peace without respect for Arab rights. There can be no negotiations in the Middle East without first considering Arab rights. Peace cannot be imposed. People can be killed or crushed, but they cannot be made to want peace if they are not satisfied that their rights and their honour are protected.

106. Today we have a situation which is most unfortunate. From some representatives we heard expressions of anti-Arab sentiments which we cannot forget. An amendment was presented which did not please Israel; therefore, they said, this amendment will not lead to negotiations. But the same representatives did not object to voting on a draft resolution to which the Arabs did not agree. This is discrimination.

107. We feel that those who consider the Arabs and the Asiatics as inferior to those who come from the West entertain a mischievous sentiment which will not lead to peace in the world. We must be treated as equals. The Arabs must feel that the United Nations thinks of them as human beings with full rights.

108. Had that draft resolution been adopted, I can assure the General Assembly that there would have been no peace, no negotiations. It would only have added to the bitterness in the Middle East. In other words, those representatives who proposed that draft resolution would have discovered it for themselves. I wish that they had realized it in 1947. I wish they had realized to what tragedy their resolutions would lead.

109. We want justice for the Arabs. We want an honourable settlement. But an honourable settlement cannot be achieved on the basis of non-recognition of Arab rights. I must appeal to all those representatives who place the Arabs in a separate category to change their attitude and to treat the Arabs as brethren entitled to human rights and to the application of the prin-

ciples of the Charter. I appeal also to those Powers which brought the State of Israel into being and which continue to support Israel to change their attitude of partiality and to act in the interests of peace. If they really desire peace, they must be impartial. They must oblige Israel to yield proper rights to the Arabs; and the sooner they do that the better. The sooner Arab rights are recognized, the sooner will peace prevail in the Middle East.

110. It was astonishing to see those very Powers which supported the General Assembly resolutions [512 (VI) and 513 (VI)], adopted in Paris last year, attempt, at this session, to ignore them. Such a policy will not lead to stability or peace in the Middle East. And we are interested in world stability and world peace. It is to those Powers which do not recognize equality for the Arabs that I appeal to reverse their attitude so that we may have peace.

**Organization of the work of the General Assembly:
report of the General Committee (A/2329)
[Agenda item 7]**

111. The PRESIDENT: The report of the General Committee (A/2329) is divided into two paragraphs, which we shall consider and decide upon separately.

112. If there is no discussion of these recommendations, I shall put them to a vote.

113. The representative of the Soviet Union wishes to speak on a point of order.

114. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The President was in such a hurry to proceed to the vote that representatives have not even had time to ask for the floor. I have therefore been compelled to ask to speak after he has already begun to take the vote. I should like to be allowed to say a few words about my vote on the proposal submitted by the General Committee.

115. The USSR delegation considers that this part of the session should be brought to an end not later than 23 December 1952 and that the session should be resumed on 24 February 1953.

116. Nevertheless, the USSR delegation wishes to draw attention to the fact that the General Committee recommends in paragraph 1 (a), that the second part of the session should be convened on 24 February "or at an earlier date", and that that session should be convened "on the call of the President". The USSR delegation considers that the words "or at an earlier date" show that there is some intention to convene the second part of this session earlier, although it is not stated why it should be convened earlier, and no opening date is given for the second part of the session in that eventuality.

117. The USSR delegation explained before, in the General Committee, that it could not accept such a solution, because it would mean leaving the date of the opening of the second part of the session quite indefinite; moreover, it is proposed that a single individual, even should he be the President of the General Assembly, should decide as to that date. The USSR delegation considers that the General Assembly must decide such questions. If there are any reasons for convening

the second part of the session earlier, the new date could be decided now. The USSR delegation would not object to deciding on an earlier date, provided that this date is settled forthwith.

118. Moreover, the General Committee also recommends that two agenda items, the reports of the United Nations Agent General for Korean Reconstruction, which is on the agenda of the Second Committee, and item 70, concerning members of the Greek armed forces, should be reallocated to the First Committee. The USSR delegation considers that decision wrong, since it is quite possible for the General Assembly to discuss these items at this part of the session. As we know, the Third Committee has already completed its agenda, and all it still has to deal with is this item on members of the Greek armed forces. That item could still be discussed before the end of this part of the session. It would also be possible for the Second Committee to discuss the reports of the United Nations Agent General for Korean Reconstruction. We can see no reason for referring these items to the First Committee, which has serious political problems to deal with. The inclusion of such items in the agenda of the First Committee would merely result in overloading that committee with questions bearing no direct relation to the category of items which it has to discuss.

119. The USSR delegation will therefore vote against the recommendations contained in paragraph 1, subparagraphs (a) and (b) of the report of the General Committee, although, as I have said before, it is in favour of suspending this session on 23 December and reconvening it on 24 February.

120. The PRESIDENT: I want to express my regret to the delegation of the Soviet Union that I seem to have pressed too fast for a vote on this matter. Does any other representative desire to speak on the recommendations contained in paragraph 1?

121. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) (*translated from Spanish*): I wish to make a brief comment on the report [A/2329] which was handed to the delegations only this afternoon. It contains a proposal to suspend the meetings of the present session not later than 23 December and to resume them on 24 February, or at an earlier date if the President deems it advisable, in which case he would convene the General Assembly.

122. My delegation does not fully understand the conditions implied in the second part of this proposal. We would be willing to authorize the President to convene the Assembly when he considers the time opportune to deal with any matters which may arise. Accordingly, my delegation would like to know the reasons which led the General Committee to specify these two aspects of one and the same question. The report proposes that a date should be fixed and at the same time that the President should be authorized to convene the Assembly before that date if he deems it necessary; why would it not have been preferable simply to entrust the President with that responsibility?

123. My delegation has no comment to make regarding the date of conclusion of the first part of the session.

124. With respect to the proposal contained in the operative part of the draft resolution which has just

been distributed, I should like to make it clear that my delegation was ready and willing, even at the present session to study the question of a possible change in the opening date of the regular sessions of the General Assembly. My delegation was authorized and prepared to examine the matter at this session, but it has no objection to postpone such study until the next session. Our stand on this question is consistent with that which we stated yesterday in the Sixth Committee [353rd meeting], namely, that all matters relating to changes in the present rules of procedure should be given more thorough study and that final decision on them should be left to the next session of the General Assembly.

125. The PRESIDENT: If no other representative wishes to speak on the recommendations contained in paragraph 1 of the report [A/2329], I shall put those recommendations to the vote.

The recommendations were adopted by 50 votes to 6.

126. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution contained in paragraph 2 of the report.

The draft resolution was adopted by 56 votes to none.

127. Mr. GROSS (United States of America): I wish to explain my vote, because of the fact that there may be some misunderstandings which it might be of value to clear up.

128. With regard to the concluding clause of the paragraph 2 of the resolution which we have just voted, the study which the Secretary-General is requested to make relates to "the practical consequences of a change in the opening date . . . from the third Tuesday in September to another date earlier or later in the year"—in other words, a study of the practical consequences of any change in the opening date. It is somewhat absurdly stated as the result of an amendment suggested in the General Committee.

129. Our understanding of the resolution is that of course it does not mean that the Secretary-General is to consider the practical consequences of a change in the opening date to any one of 365 days in the year, or 366 days in leap-year. The original purpose of the draft resolution, as we understood it, was to consider the practical consequences of a change in the opening date from the third Tuesday in September to some time in April.

130. We did not wish to prejudge the question, and that is why we suggested that a study should be made. Therefore, in order to avoid a damaging interpretation of the rather ludicrous language in the resolution, I would respectfully suggest that the original intention be placed on the record, so that the viewpoint of my delegation at least is preserved.

131. Mr. HOPPENOT (France) (*translated from French*): I should like to explain that my delegation's interpretation of paragraph 2 of the resolution we have just adopted differs from that given by the United States representative.

132. The idea, of course, is to ask the Secretary-General to study the practical consequences, not of 365 changes in the opening date—or 366 changes in a leap-year—but merely of any substantial change in the opening date, whether in the month of April, as some

delegations recommend, or, for example, in October or November, as has been our practice in the last two years and as other delegations recommend.

133. In voting in favour of this paragraph of the resolution, therefore, my delegation's intention was not that the Secretary-General's study should be limited merely to the consequences of changing the opening date to April, but that it should cover any substantial change of date, any decision to change it to two, three or more months after 1 September, or to three or four months earlier.

Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the seventh session: report of the General Committee (A/2330)

[Agenda item 7]

134. The PRESIDENT: We are seized of another recommendation of the General Committee (A/2330) in which the General Committee recommends to the General Assembly the inclusion in the agenda of the seventh session of an item entitled "Report of the Secretary-General on personnel policy".

135. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): In connexion with the proposal that the General Assembly should include the question of a report of the Secretary-General on personnel policy in the agenda of this session, the USSR delegation considers it necessary to make the following comments.

136. The question of the Secretary-General's personnel policy requires discussion, since there have been many complaints and protests in connexion with the illegal action taken by the Administration of the Secretariat at the behest of the American police organs. Nevertheless, we should first have an exhaustive report from the Secretariat on the matter, and then decide on the measures to be taken by the General Assembly, on the basis of the facts and information contained in that report.

137. It would be quite unwarranted to include this item now, in haste, at the end of this part of the session. Moreover, the note submitted to the General Committee shows that the Secretary-General proposes to base his policy on the conclusions of a so-called panel of some unknown jurists, who were asked by Mr. Lie to prepare these conclusions. Neither this document nor other existing documents serve as an adequate or legitimate basis for the settlement of such questions and the USSR delegation considers the inclusion of such an item in the agenda on the eve of the conclusion of the first part of this session of the General Assembly to be absolutely unjustifiable. My delegation will vote against this proposal.

138. The PRESIDENT: I would call the attention of the General Assembly to rule 23 of our rules of procedure, which states:

"Debate on the inclusion of an item in the agenda, when that item has been recommended for inclusion by the General Committee, shall be limited to three speakers in favour of and three speakers against the inclusion . . ."

139. Mr. BIRECKI (Poland) (*translated from French*): We are being asked to place on the agenda

of the present session a new item concerning the policy enforced with respect to the Secretariat of the United Nations. The proposal to include that new item mentions a report—that is, a written document—which was to have been submitted to delegations beforehand. Nobody has received such a report.

140. With regard to the subject of the proposal—personnel policy in the Secretariat—the Polish delegation does not approve of that policy. We need only recall the reports which have appeared in the Press throughout the world during the current session of the Assembly to realize that the personnel policy applied by Mr. Lie is contrary to the principles of the United Nations as an international organization. Those reports, which have been published, as I said, in the course of the current session of the Assembly, prove that Mr. Lie, who illegally calls himself the Secretary-General, subordinates personnel policy to the requirements of the United States Government. Moreover, it is a reflection of his general policy, which is directed towards subordinating the entire United Nations to the State Department.

141. That personnel policy should be discussed by the General Assembly. That policy should be condemned

by the Assembly because it is contrary to the principles of the United Nations. Nevertheless, in order to be in a position to discuss the matter, the General Assembly should have before it an appropriate document. Such a debate cannot be brought about by a surprise manoeuvre.

142. In the circumstances, the Polish delegation considers that inclusion of the item in the agenda in view of the situation in which the General Assembly has been placed—that is, before an appropriate document has been circulated to delegations—is not acceptable.

143. For these reasons, the Polish delegation will vote against the proposal (A/2327).

144. The PRESIDENT: As there are no further speakers, the General Assembly will now vote on the recommendation of the General Committee (A/2330).

The recommendation was adopted by 49 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.