

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



Tuesday, 13 February 1951, at 3 p.m.

Lake Success, New York

CONTENTS

	Page
Consideration of the agenda of the meeting.....	697
Complaint by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics regarding aggression against China by the United States of America: report of the First Committee (A/1773)	698
Complaint by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics regarding the violation of Chinese air space by the Air Force of the United States of America and the machine-gunning and bombing of Chinese territory by that air force, and against the bombardment and illegal inspection of a merchant ship of the People's Republic of China by a military vessel of the United States: report of the First Committee (A/1774)	705
Place of meeting of the sixth session of the General Assembly: report of the Secretary-General (A/1778)	705

President: Mr. Nasrollah ENTEZAM (Iran).

Consideration of the agenda of the meeting

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The first item on the agenda of the meeting is the report of the First Committee [A/1773] on the complaint by the Soviet Union regarding aggression against China by the United States.

2. It will be noted that the USSR delegation submitted to the First Committee a draft resolution which was rejected. Consequently the Committee's report does not contain any recommendation to the General Assembly. The Assembly does not have to take a decision.

3. The delegation of the Soviet Union, however, has just submitted a draft resolution [A/1776]. Before I ask the General Assembly whether it wishes to debate the draft resolution, I shall call upon the USSR representative to introduce his draft.

4. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Before making a statement on the draft resolution submitted by the USSR delegation, I should like to clear up a point of procedure. The agenda of today's meeting has not yet been adopted. There are three items on our agenda. It seems to me that we should begin by discussing the procedural question, that is, by approving the agenda, and only then proceed to discuss the three items it contains

5. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): That is Security Council procedure. Before opening a discussion, it is the custom of the Security Council to adopt its agenda. That is not the General Assembly's practice. The General Assembly approves its agenda at the very beginning of the session. When an item appears on the agenda of the Assembly, it is referred to the appropriate Committee for consideration. When the Committee submits its report, the item is already on the agenda and no special decision need be taken by the Assembly to determine whether or not it shall be discussed. The General Assembly's decision was taken at the beginning of the session.

6. The USSR representative has the floor to introduce his draft resolution.

7. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I cannot agree with the President's explanation. He is correct in saying that the agenda of the General Assembly has already been approved. With regard to the third item on today's agenda, however, the General Assembly has already taken a decision; it took that decision on 14 December 1950 [324th meeting].

8. Rule 82 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly provides that "when a proposal has been adopted or rejected it may not be reconsidered at the

same session unless the General Assembly . . . so decides”.

9. The item in question has already been disposed of and a special decision on the part of the General Assembly is therefore necessary before it can be placed on the agenda of the General Assembly. That is why this question, in my view, requires our consideration, and why we have to examine our agenda. In my opinion, it is not in order to include this item in our agenda.

10. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I would request the representative of the Soviet Union to give close attention to what I am going to say. If he has any objection to my ruling, I shall put it to the vote, although I do not believe it can be questioned.

11. We are now discussing the first item on the agenda of the meeting. When we come to the third item, the USSR representative may bring up any objections he has, and I shall then reply. However, as he has raised this question, I shall answer him immediately, in order to save time.

12. It is true that the General Assembly decided to leave it to the Secretary-General and myself to determine where, in Europe, the sixth session of the General Assembly should be held in September 1951. That decision was taken on the assumption that the fifth session of the General Assembly would be closed by the end of December 1950. Hence our investigation was to have been carried out at a time when the Assembly was no longer in session. But in view of the fact that the Assembly is still in session, the Secretary-General and I thought it our duty to submit to it a report on the results of our investigation. For the moment, however, we are not discussing that point. When we come to it, we shall take it up again.

13. The USSR representative has the floor, to introduce his draft resolution.

14. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The USSR delegation still believes that there are absolutely no grounds for placing this item on our agenda. The General Assembly adopted a single and unambiguous decision on the question, namely, that the sixth session was to be held in Europe. That is all. There was no question of submitting a report to the General Assembly or of reconsidering that decision. The delegation of the Soviet Union therefore objects to the inclusion of this item in our agenda; it objects to the raising of the question at all and considers that it is out of order to raise it.

15. The General Assembly adopted a completely clear and unqualified decision, namely, that the sixth session of the General Assembly was to be held in Europe, and it did not ask for any report on the matter. That is even more obvious from what the President himself has just told us, namely, that the report had been submitted because the Assembly had not yet concluded its session. If the session had been completed in December, there would have been no report and the question would not have been raised in the General Assembly at all.

16. It is thus perfectly clear that this question was raised at the fifth session of the General Assembly

for ulterior motives. The USSR delegation protests against the inclusion of this item in the agenda.

17. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The USSR representative has challenged my ruling. Therefore, in accordance with the rules of procedure, I must put it to the vote.

18. I shall put to the vote my ruling to the effect that the question of the place of the sixth session should be included in the agenda and discussed, it being understood that any delegation will be able to raise whatever objections it wishes at the time of the discussion.

19. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): Point of order.

20. The PRESIDENT: No point of order may be raised during the vote.

The President's ruling was upheld by 47 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

21. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): As I stated at the beginning of the meeting, when we come to this item of the agenda, each delegation will be able to express its view as to whether this is a reconsideration of the General Assembly's decision.

22. For the moment, we are discussing the first item on the agenda of the meeting. The USSR representative has the floor to introduce his draft resolution [A/1776].

23. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I must still point out that what the President should have put to the vote was not his ruling but the question whether the proposal for reconsidering the General Assembly resolution should have been placed on our agenda. Under rule 82 of the rules of procedure, that decision would have required a two-thirds majority. The vote on the President's ruling was another departure from the rules of procedure and normal practice.

24. I shall now proceed to the draft resolutions submitted by the Soviet Union.

25. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Before you come to those draft resolutions, I would point out that my ruling was in complete conformity with all the precedents established in the General Assembly.

Complaint by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics regarding aggression against China by the United States of America: report of the First Committee (A/1773)

[Agenda item 70]

26. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The USSR delegation has submitted for the consideration of the General Assembly two draft resolutions, one [A/1776] on the complaint by the Soviet Union regarding aggression against China by the United States, and the second [A/1777] on the complaint by the Soviet Union regarding the violation of Chinese air space by the United States Air Force and the machine-gunning and bombing of Chinese territory by that air force.

27. When, towards the end of November 1950, the First Committee began to discuss the question of the United States aggression against China,¹ Mr. Vyshinsky, the head of the USSR delegation to the fifth session of the General Assembly, explained the grounds of the Soviet Union complaint and supported it with a large number of facts and documents.

28. From the discussion which took place on those two questions in the First Committee from 2 to 7 February, it is clear that the United States has done everything possible to prevent the detailed consideration of the question of the United States aggression against China and the question of the bombardment of Chinese territory by United States aircraft, and to prevent the United Nations from taking any decision on these matters.

29. This has been made particularly clear from the conspiracy of silence woven around these two questions in the First Committee. Those tactics are very understandable; they are explained by the fact that the United States delegation was unable to refute the charges, backed by facts and documents, made in the USSR draft resolutions and in the statements of a number of delegations. It was therefore decided simply to refrain from any discussion of these questions.

30. The draft resolutions submitted by the USSR charged the United States with aggression against China. Enough facts have already been adduced here to back these charges. It has been shown that the United States aggression against China was not fortuitous, that it had long been planned by the United States ruling circles, and that the United States military authorities and High Command in the Far East had been entrusted with the actual preparation and carrying out of the aggression.

31. The United States aggression against China has taken shape in a number of ways including, among others, those which I shall now enumerate.

32. In the first place, on 27 June 1950, the President of the United States ordered the United States Seventh Fleet to proceed to the waters of Taiwan and the Taiwan Straits for the purpose of preventing the People's Republic of China from exercising its sovereign rights over that inalienable part of Chinese territory. Together with those naval units, United States air force units and other detachments were dispatched to Taiwan to occupy the island *de facto*, that is, to establish *de facto* United States control over that part of Chinese territory.

33. Secondly, the United States has interfered in the domestic affairs of China by furnishing armed assistance and other kinds of assistance to the remnants of the reactionary Kuomintang clique which, having been put to rout by the Chinese people, has now found a temporary refuge on the island of Taiwan under the protection of the United States armed forces.

34. Thirdly, at the end of August 1950, United States air force units began to violate the air space of the People's Republic of China and to bomb Chinese territory.

35. These facts concerning the United States aggression against China cannot be denied.

36. It is impossible, in this connexion, not to express surprise at the reasons given for their votes by a number of representatives in the First Committee, who explained that they had voted against the USSR draft resolutions because it had not been established that the United States had committed aggression against China.

37. What further proofs of United States aggression are needed, when we are confronted by the acts of aggression committed against China by the United States armed forces which, on the instructions of their Government, have occupied Taiwan and are blockading the coast in order to prevent the Government of the People's Republic of China from exercising authority in the island of Taiwan, which is a part of Chinese territory? Such acts not only constitute direct armed intervention by the United States in China's domestic affairs, but in addition they violate China's sovereign rights to the island of Taiwan, infringe the principle of China's territorial integrity and are a flagrant contravention of the fundamental provisions of the United Nations Charter.

38. We all know that the aggressive acts of the United States against China are not confined to the island of Taiwan. Since the end of August 1950, units of the United States air force have been systematically violating Chinese air space in the region of the frontier between Korea and Manchuria, and have bombed, bombarded and machine-gunned Chinese territory, causing the loss of many lives and considerable material damage to the People's Republic of China.

39. The representatives of the United States in the United Nations have acknowledged these violations of Chinese air frontiers and the bombardment of Chinese territory. Mr. Austin, the United States representative, made an official statement on the subject.

40. What further evidence of United States aggression is needed, then, by those who have declared here that the United States aggression against China has not been proved?

41. It has already been stated here that, in the last months of 1950, more than 1,500 violations of Chinese air space by United States military aircraft took place, accompanied by the machine-gunning and bombing of populated areas, bridges, aerodromes, railway installations, rolling stock and dwelling houses, and that those attacks caused the deaths of Chinese citizens and the destruction of material resources belonging to the Chinese State and to Chinese citizens.

42. In its statement of 11 November 1950,² the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China declared:

"These crimes committed by the United States armed forces, which are violating the territorial sovereignty of China and threatening its security, have alarmed the whole Chinese people . . . Facts have shown that the aim of the United States aggression in Korea is not only Korea itself but also the extension of aggression to China . . . As a result of the invasion of Korea and of Chinese Taiwan

¹ For the discussion on this subject in the First Committee, see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, First Committee*, 405th to 409th and 439th to 441st meetings inclusive.

² See document S/1902.

by the American imperialists, and as a result of the bombing raids on north-east China, the security of China has been placed in peril."

43. The Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China has made repeated protests to the United Nations concerning the United States aggression against China, and has called upon the Security Council and the General Assembly to take the necessary steps to put an end to that aggression. These statements and protests by the Government of the People's Republic of China demand the most serious attention of the United Nations.

44. The acts of aggression committed by the United States against China are so flagrant, they so grossly violate the sovereignty and threaten the security and interests of China, and so grossly violate the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter, that the General Assembly cannot possibly ignore them. It is the duty of the Assembly to take the necessary action to put an end to the United States aggression against China. In doing so it will help to restore peace in the Far East and to promote the security not only of the Chinese people but also of the other peoples of Asia.

45. The USSR delegation therefore strongly urges the Assembly to adopt the two draft resolutions it has submitted on the questions of United States aggression against China and the violation of Chinese air space by the United States Air Force and the machine-gunning and bombing of Chinese territory by that air force.

46. The first draft resolution submitted by the USSR delegation [A/1776] reads as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"Having considered the question of the aggression against China by the United States of America,

"Having heard the statement on this question by the delegation of the People's Republic of China and the explanation given by the delegation of the United States of America,

"Having considered the facts of the infringement of China's territorial integrity and the inviolability of its frontiers by naval and air units of the United States of America, as witnessed by:

"(a) The invasion by United States armed forces of the island of Taiwan which, as recognized in the three-Power Cairo agreement of 1 December 1943 among the United States of America, the United Kingdom and China, is an inalienable part of Chinese territory, and the consequent intervention by the Government of the United States of America in the domestic affairs of China, and

"(b) The blockade of the coast of the island of Taiwan by the United States Seventh Fleet for the hostile purpose of barring the island to the armed forces and authorities of the People's Republic of China,

"Requests the Security Council to take the necessary steps to ensure the immediate cessation of aggression against China by the United States of America."

47. The second draft resolution [A/1777], on the violation of Chinese air space by the United States

Air Force and the machine-gunning and bombing of Chinese territory by that air force, reads as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"Having considered the complaint by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics regarding the violation of Chinese air space by the Air Force of the United States of America and the machine-gunning and bombing of Chinese territory by that air force, and against the bombardment and illegal inspection of a merchant ship of the People's Republic of China by a military vessel of the United States,

"Noting the communications of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations concerning:

"(a) The infringement of the inviolability of Chinese air space in the region of the Korean-Manchurian frontier by the United States Air Force and the bombing and machine-gunning of Chinese territory by United States military aircraft, causing loss of life and material damage to the People's Republic of China, and

"(b) The bombardment, detention and inspection of a Chinese merchant ship by a military vessel of the United States,

"Having heard the statement on these questions by the delegation of the People's Republic of China and the explanation given by the delegation of the United States of America,

"Condemns these illegal acts by the Government of the United States and places on the said government full responsibility for them and for all damages caused to the People's Republic of China and for any consequences which may ensue from such acts;

"Recommends the Security Council to take immediately, in conformity with Article 11, paragraph 2 of the Charter, the necessary action to prevent illegal acts by the United States Government, violating the sovereignty of China and causing damage to the People's Republic of China and the peaceful population of China."

48. The USSR delegation considers that it is the duty of the General Assembly to give the question its most careful consideration. The Assembly should condemn the United States aggression against China and adopt the decisions proposed in the draft resolutions of the Soviet Union. Only by taking the necessary action against the United States aggression will the General Assembly be able to help to put an end to that aggression and restore peace in the Far East.

49. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Before putting the first draft resolution submitted by the USSR delegation to the vote, I would ask the General Assembly whether it wishes to engage in a debate on the question.

It was decided, by 39 votes to 5, with 11 abstentions, not to debate the question.

50. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): After the first draft resolution of the Soviet Union has been put to the vote, I shall call upon those who wish to explain their votes. I would ask those who wish to do so to place their names on the list of speakers. The representatives of Poland, Czechoslo-

vakia, the Byelorussian SSR, the Ukrainian SSR, the United States, India and Iraq have already done so.

51. I put the first USSR draft resolution [A/1776] to the vote.

The draft resolution was rejected by 48 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

52. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): As the representative of the Soviet Union submitted both draft resolutions in the course of his statement, there would seem to be no reason why the members of the Assembly who wish to explain their votes on the two draft resolutions should not do so now.

53. I call upon the representative of Poland. The time limit for speeches is seven minutes.

54. Mr. SZYMANOWSKI (Poland): My delegation supported the two draft resolutions now before us when they were voted upon in the First Committee and supports them again here in the Assembly. We are confronted with acts of aggression which are definite and undeniable. We cannot fail to recognize them as such and, in logic, we cannot fail to condemn them and to recommend the necessary measures for bringing these brutal and illegal acts of aggression to an end.

55. It is clear that the acts of aggression specified in the draft resolutions contained in documents A/1776 and A/1777 are interrelated and inseparable. They represent two aspects of United States policy: aggression against the People's Republic of China and spreading war in the Far East. Hundreds of instances of violation of the Chinese border, the violation of Chinese sovereignty in the air and on the sea, the bombardment of the Chinese mainland, the losses in human life and the material damage done—these are the stubborn facts which the majority in the First Committee chose to brush aside. Vital and tragic as they are in themselves, their full significance can be grasped only when they are viewed in the context of the over-all drive of United States imperialism to dominate and control the continent of Asia, to dominate and control the world.

56. As regards the question of Taiwan, the facts stand out and they accuse the aggressor more strongly than words could. On the one hand, we have the unshakable fact that Taiwan is an integral part of China, a fact not only stated unambiguously in the Cairo and Potsdam agreements but formally recognized by the United States Government. On the other hand, we have the fact of the invasion and blockading of the island of Taiwan by the armed forces of the United States, in spite of solemn pledges and declarations.

57. As far back as June 1950, the attention of the Security Council was called to those facts. No one has succeeded in explaining by what authority or under what rule of law the United States naval and land forces have occupied Taiwan. They are there in defiance of the only legal authority—that of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. They are there in violation of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations. They are engaged in a flagrant and overt act of aggression which must be duly branded as such. Talk of neutralization, of preventing the spread of war and so forth by the

representative of the United States seems without validity since it is the people of China alone who can determine the status of Taiwan.

58. Let me also state at this point that, in the firm belief of my delegation, the so-called problem of the future status of Taiwan is non-existent. It is a sheer fabrication. By creating the appearance that something remains to be decided about a portion of the territory of one of the Member States of the United Nations, an attempt is being made to confuse the issue and to cover up the United States aggression against Taiwan. This, in itself, is a grave breach of our Charter.

59. Almost six months have passed since these questions were first brought before the General Assembly. For the cause of peace, this has been time wasted; but this time has been most resourcefully used by the advocates of war and aggression. The manoeuvres with regard to the most serious issues, the postponement and pushing aside of these questions, in complete disregard of our Organization's responsibilities, have not changed the essence of the situation in the slightest; they have only added to the gravity and urgency of the situation.

60. The United States representative—most reluctantly—finally admitted the existence of the incriminating facts. I am referring particularly to Mr. Austin's statement in the First Committee on 2 February. Mr. Austin failed to convince us, however, that acts of aggression had not been committed. The issue of the alleged aggression of the People's Republic of China was introduced in a deliberate attempt to confuse the very clear picture of the events which had taken place. It should most emphatically be pointed out that the actual aggression which we are now discussing took place prior to the alleged Chinese intervention in the Korean war. It must also be stated that, when the representatives of the Central People's Government arrived at Lake Success, they were not given a proper opportunity to discuss these most vital incidents. We continue to deal with them today in the absence of the party most directly interested in the problem, without the representatives of the Chinese people.

61. The question before us is much too serious for the Assembly merely to wave it away after months and months of unfair and harmful stalling. It is our duty to point to the real aggressor in the Far East, to unmask the true face of those who claim to be friends of China while engaging in overt acts of aggression upon it. To place the bare fact of armed aggression before the peoples of the United Nations, to denounce United States imperialism and its schemes for world domination—these are the motives which have led us to support the draft resolutions submitted by the Soviet Union delegation.

62. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia): The Czechoslovak delegation supported the draft resolutions submitted by the Soviet Union in documents A/1776 and A/1777. Both are based on irrefutable facts; they appeal to the United Nations to live up to its principles.

63. The first draft resolution is motivated by the fact that United States armed forces invaded the island of Taiwan. In the Cairo agreement concluded on 1 December 1943 among the United States, the United Kingdom and China, Taiwan is recognized to be an

inalienable part of Chinese territory. The first draft resolution is also motivated by the fact that the United States Seventh Fleet undertook a blockade of the coast of Taiwan for the hostile purpose of barring the island to the armed forces and authorities of the People's Republic of China.

64. The second draft resolution is based on communications from the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations, concerning the infringement of the inviolability of Chinese air space in the region of the frontier between Korea and Manchuria by the United States Air Force and the bombing and machine-gunning of Chinese territory by United States military aircraft, causing loss of life and material damage to the People's Republic of China, and also concerning the bombardment, detention and inspection of a Chinese merchant ship by a military vessel of the United States.

65. During the debate in the First Committee, Mr. Austin, the representative of the United States, attempted by the use of false and hypocritical words about the friendly feeling which the United States had for China to conceal the fact that the United States ruling circles had committed and continued to commit aggression upon the People's Republic of China and that the military aircraft of the United States, through barbarous bombing of Chinese territory, had killed Chinese civilians. The unsatisfactory nature of Mr. Austin's statement was proved by many speakers in the First Committee. In speaking to the First Committee of the friendly feeling which the United States had for China, the United States representative stated that his country had no aggressive political, military or other designs upon Taiwan.

66. What, however, is the reality? The facts are concealed behind the words of the representative of the United States. What are the intentions of the United States ruling circles? I should like to quote from the statement of the representative of the People's Republic of China, General Wu Hsiu-chuan, which was circulated as document A/C.1/661. That statement reads, in part, as follows:

"In accordance with a premeditated plan, the United States ruling circles directed their puppet, Syngman Rhee, to launch an attack on the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, thus unleashing the civil war in Korea. Under the pretext of intervening in the civil war in Korea, the United States ruling circles further launched simultaneously the aggression against Taiwan and Korea. While its aggression upon China's territory, Taiwan, is an act of outright and naked aggression which is completely unjustified, its aggression on Korea is equally inexcusable. The arguments put forward by the United States Government to justify its aggression against Korea will not bear examination. The United States Government has attempted to cover up its armed intervention in Korea under the mantle of the United Nations, but its efforts are in vain."

67. Earlier in the same document we find the following:

"The United States Government has built up a vast network of military bases in the Pacific. This network runs from the United States military base

in Alaska through the Aleutian islands, Japan, the Ryukyu islands, Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, Vietnam and Thailand. Everyone can see that this network of bases forms an encirclement of the new China. In fact, General MacArthur has openly admitted that this network of bases is aimed at China and the Soviet Union as its objects for encirclement and targets for attack. The simultaneous armed aggression against China's territory, Taiwan, and China's neighbour, Korea, is not only the inevitable consequence of the consistent American imperialist aggression against China, but also a premeditated step for a further total attack against the People's Republic of China. The aim of the United States Government in its aggression on Taiwan is to convert Taiwan into a springboard for the American imperialists to attack the Chinese mainland. Similarly, the armed aggression against Korea is also aimed at converting Korea into another springboard for the American imperialists to attack China's mainland."

68. I should also like to quote from today's *New York Times*. On page 24, we find the following proof of the friendly feeling which the United States has towards China:

"Representative Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Republican leader of the House, called last night for the opening of a second front in Asia now by the 800,000 Nationalist Chinese troops of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek . . . Mr. Martin said there was 'good reason' to believe that General of the Army Douglas MacArthur and 'responsible military opinion' favoured such an operation."

69. I believe that Mr. Martin's statement is a characteristic commentary on statements made in the United Nations by representatives of the United States.

70. In the First Committee, the Czechoslovak delegation supported both draft resolutions submitted by the Soviet Union and voted in favour of them. These draft resolutions take into account the fact that the United States has committed and is committing aggression against the People's Republic of China and that it has violated the territorial integrity of China. They request that the United Nations should meet its obligations under the Charter. For these reasons, the Czechoslovak delegation supported the USSR draft resolutions.

71. Mr. SHVETSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): During the discussion on this question in the First Committee, irrefutable evidence was produced to show that the United States had committed acts of aggression against the People's Republic of China.

72. This aggression has taken the following forms: first, the invasion by United States armed forces of the island of Taiwan, an inalienable part of the territory of the People's Republic of China; secondly, the blockade of the coast of Taiwan by United States naval forces for the purpose of barring the island to the armed forces and authorities of the lawful government of the People's Republic of China; thirdly, the armed intervention of the United States ruling circles in the domestic affairs of China, which constitutes a gross violation of China's national sovereignty; fourthly, the systematic violation of the air space of the People's Republic of China and the bombing and machine-

gunning of its territory, causing material damage and loss of life or injury to its citizens; lastly, the illegal bombardment and inspection of a merchant vessel of the Chinese People's Republic by a United States warship.

73. These various acts of aggression were proved in documents submitted by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China³; they were substantiated by voluminous factual evidence exposing the aggressive policy of the United States in the Far East; they were also substantiated by the facts and figures given in statements made by the representative of the People's Republic of China⁴ and quoted in the statements made by the representatives of the USSR and various other delegations.

74. The United States representatives were unable to refute any of these facts or to deny any of the accusations made by the Central People's Government of China against the Government of the United States. They could do so neither in November 1950 in the Security Council nor in February 1951 in the First Committee. They cannot do so, because the facts of the United States aggression against China are irrefutable and because the general aggressive policy of the United States, which aims at unleashing war, is obvious to all. All the peoples of the world know about it, including the peoples of the countries whose representatives here, in the United Nations, try to cover up the criminal deeds of the United States aggressors with their speeches and votes.

75. Unless the United Nations has already become or wishes finally to become an instrument of United States aggressive policy, a policy which is contrary to all the principles and purposes of this Organization, it cannot and must not acquiesce in the flagrant and naked aggression of the United States against the People's Republic of China.

76. The United Nations—in this particular case, the General Assembly, as the principal organ of the Organization—must condemn such actions by the United States and take all the necessary measures to end the United States aggression against China.

77. That is the aim of the two draft resolutions [A/1776 and A/1777] submitted by the delegation of the USSR. These draft resolutions request the Security Council to take the necessary measures to ensure the immediate cessation of aggression against China by the United States and also recommend the Security Council to take immediately, in conformity with Article 11, paragraph 2 of the Charter, the necessary steps to prevent the United States Government from committing illegal action which violates the sovereignty of China and causes damage to the People's Republic of China and the civilian population of China.

78. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR voted for the first draft resolution of the Soviet Union; it will also vote in favour of the second one. The aim of these USSR proposals is to put an end to United States aggression against China. It is the duty of the United Nations to accept them because their aim is to restore

peace in the Far East and to preserve it throughout the world.

79. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): It was shown, during the debate in the First Committee, that the Government of the United States was guilty of aggression against China.

80. We know that on the order of the President of the United States, the armed forces of that country invaded the island of Taiwan which—as was recognized in the three-Power agreement concluded in Cairo among the United States, the United Kingdom and China—is an inalienable part of Chinese territory; by so doing they have violated China's territorial integrity and the inviolability of its frontiers and illegally intervened in its domestic affairs. At the same time, the United States Seventh Fleet established a blockade of the coast of the island of Taiwan for the hostile purpose of barring the island to the armed forces and authorities of the People's Republic of China.

81. After committing that act of aggression against China the United States committed others; its air force bombed and machine-gunned the territory of north-east China, causing loss of life and material damage to the People's Republic of China.

82. All these hostile acts of the United States Government against China constitute not only a gross intervention in China's domestic affairs and consequently a gross violation of the United Nations Charter, but also a direct infringement of China's territorial integrity and a direct act of aggression against the People's Republic of China. These hostile acts of the United States Government against China represent a gross violation of the most fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter, such as the principles of the territorial integrity and political independence of States; they constitute a serious threat to international peace and security and call for the adoption of urgent measures by the United Nations.

83. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR believes that the General Assembly should condemn these illegal acts by the United States Government and that it should place on that government full responsibility for them and for all damage caused to the People's Republic of China and for any consequences which may ensue from such acts. The General Assembly must recommend to the Security Council that it should take the necessary steps to ensure the immediate cessation of the aggression committed against China by the United States. That is the aim of the proposals contained in the draft resolutions which the USSR delegation has submitted to the General Assembly.

84. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR supports these proposals of the Soviet Union. It voted in favour of the first draft resolution and it will likewise vote in favour of the second.

85. Mr. GROSS (United States of America): The spokesmen for the Soviet Union—those who speak directly in its name and those who invariably follow its set line—have continued to reiterate charges made here again today that the United States has invaded the island of Formosa, has committed economic aggression there, and has intervened in the internal affairs of China. The vast majority of the members of the First

³ See documents A/1410, A/1415, S/1715, S/1722, S/1743, S/1808, S/1857, S/1870, S/1876 and S/1902.

⁴ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year*, Nos. 69, 70 and 72.

Committee have already found these charges to be baseless. My Government now again states plainly that these charges are false, a complete tissue of lies and distortions.

86. The President of the United States has repeatedly made it clear that the United States has no aggressive designs or ambitions—political, military or economic—with respect to Formosa. The United States Seventh Fleet was sent to the Straits of Formosa for only one purpose: to prevent the spread of armed conflict in the Far East. The extension of conflict in that area would obviously have threatened the success of the United Nations effort to repel aggression against the Republic of Korea. The Seventh Fleet was not sent to Formosan waters on this mission until after the Security Council had adopted its resolution of 25 June.⁵

87. It is, moreover, absurd to argue that the forty-nine officers and men of the United States armed services stationed in Formosa constitute an invasion of that island. Apart from the small numbers involved, they are there with the express authorization of the Government of the Republic of China.

88. The fact remains—and this is the basic fact, in our judgment—that Soviet spokesmen, in the First Committee and here in the General Assembly, have persisted in attacking the basis of American friendship for China and the Chinese people. I think that the memory of the Chinese people and any history of China not written in Moscow will be sufficient proof that American friendship for the Chinese people has been and continues to be sincere and fundamental. The nation—and the only nation—which controls many thousands of square miles of territory which were once Chinese is not the United States, but the Soviet Union.

89. Mr. Austin gave the First Committee facts disproving the Soviet charges that the United States had blockaded Formosa or had committed economic aggression there. The United States delegation took up Mr. Vyshinsky's claims about United States control of the natural resources of Formosa and showed in detail that they were completely unfounded. No such control exists. But I wonder what the Polish and Czechoslovak spokesmen here could say about economic aggression against their countries—and economic aggression by whom?

90. It has also been argued that the United States involves itself in aggression by continuing to recognize and deal with the Government of the Republic of China. I would only say to that that the reasons which impel us to continue recognizing that government are, we believe, honourable and in the best interests of the Chinese people. Moreover, the claimant to recognition has been named an aggressor by the United Nations and, until its aggression ceases, its claim can have no moral basis whatsoever with the peace-loving nations of the world.

91. The second USSR draft resolution concerns an alleged violation of Chinese air space by United States aircraft and has been put forward here again by the very country which, by its veto, refused to allow an impartial investigation of its charges by the Security Council. Last autumn, the United States admitted in the Security Council⁶ that, through errors which all who are familiar with high-speed air war will recognize

as inevitable, attacks on Manchurian territory might have occurred. In order that the Council could know whether they actually had occurred, the United States proposed that a commission made up of representatives of India and Sweden, two countries in close diplomatic relationship with the Chinese communist régime, should be sent immediately to the site of the alleged attacks in order to make a thorough investigation.⁷ The Soviet Union vetoed that proposal.⁸

92. When the Soviet delegations continued to press their charges in the General Assembly, the United States representative in the First Committee, Mr. Dulles, showed by means of a map that the USSR representative himself did not assert that any bombs had fallen on the Manchurian side of the Yalu river. The map, based upon Mr. Vyshinsky's own statements, made it clear that, if any such attacks had occurred, they were solely against the bridges and river crossings where Chinese communist armies were pouring into Korea to subjugate the northern part of that country and carry out their aggression against the forces of the United Nations.

93. The USSR draft resolution, reintroduced here, must be appraised in the light of the fact that large Chinese communist armies are now attacking United Nations forces in Korea.

94. In time, perhaps, the Chinese communists will learn that armed aggression anywhere and at any time, is fraught with disaster for the aggressors. Certainly they may one day consider what nation urged upon them their present venture, and they may remember that it was the same nation which, by its veto, prevented the Security Council from taking action upon their original complaint about this so-called violation of the air space over China's border with Korea.

95. It is for the reasons which I have mentioned with regard to both resolutions that the Government of the United States has voted against the first and will vote against the second.

96. Mr. DAYAL (India): I should like to make a brief explanation of the vote which my delegation has cast and the vote which it will cast.

97. My delegation, along with eleven other delegations, recently sponsored a draft resolution which sought to bring the interested Powers together around a conference table in order to discuss the existing problems in the Far East with a view to a peaceful settlement. Among these problems is, of course, that of Taiwan. My Government's views regarding Taiwan are well known; it takes the view that the disposal of that island should be on the basis of the Cairo and Potsdam declarations. It was for the purpose of arriving at a peaceful settlement of this and other Far Eastern problems that my delegation co-sponsored the draft resolution which I have just mentioned.

98. Unfortunately, that draft resolution was not approved. But we still consider that the best way of solving all these problems is by negotiation. We have accordingly continued, and will continue, to do all we can to promote a negotiated settlement. Mutual recrimination merely destroys whatever chances there may yet be for fruitful negotiations. An exchange of charges of aggres-

⁵ *Ibid.*, No. 15.

⁶ *Ibid.*, No. 35.

⁷ *Ibid.*, No. 39.

⁸ *Ibid.*, No. 43.

sion is not, in our view, conducive to a peaceful settlement. On the contrary, it is likely to make a delicate international situation even more difficult.

99. For these reasons, my delegation voted against one of the USSR draft resolutions and will vote against the other.

100. Mr. ABBAS (Iraq): My delegation voted against the USSR draft resolution which appears in document A/1776. That vote, however, had no connexion with the substance of the question of the title of the Chinese State to the island of Taiwan.

101. Although my country was not a party to the Cairo or Potsdam declarations and is by no means committed to any particular policy, we recognize that the question of Formosa—or Taiwan—is one of the outstanding issues whose solution must await the implementation of the resolution introduced by the United States delegation in the First Committee and adopted by the General Assembly a few days ago [327th meeting]. Moreover, we think that this question is closely related to the question of the representation of China in the United Nations, and my country is a member of a committee which has not as yet acted on that question. The action of that committee may, at some future time, have an effect on the question before us. Finally, my Government has not recognized the new régime in Peiping, and the only Chinese government which it recognizes at the present time is the Nationalist Government of China, which happens to be in full control of the island of Taiwan. We are bound to note that that government has not raised any question of United States aggression against the island.

102. For these reasons, and without prejudice to the attitude of my Government in regard to any solution which may be adopted by the General Assembly in the future, we decided to cast our vote against the draft resolution of the Soviet Union.

Complaint by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics regarding the violation of Chinese air space by the Air Force of the United States of America and the machine-gunning and bombing of Chinese territory by that air force, and against the bombardment and illegal inspection of a merchant ship of the People's Republic of China by a military vessel of the United States: report of the First Committee (A/1774)

[Agenda item 75]

103. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We shall now take up the second item on the agenda of the meeting. This item has in fact been discussed in the statements we have just heard.

104. As the members of the Assembly can see, there is no recommendation in the First Committee report [A/1774]. However, the USSR delegation has submitted a draft resolution [A/1777] which has been read. I shall now put it to the vote.

The draft resolution was rejected by 51 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

Place of meeting of the sixth session of the General Assembly: report of the Secretary-General (A/1778)

105. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*):

We now come to the third item on the agenda of the meeting: the report of the Secretary-General on the place of meeting of the sixth session of the General Assembly [A/1778].

106. As I said at the beginning of the meeting, the Secretary-General and I thought it our duty to inform the General Assembly of the results of our inquiry and the difficulties which we had encountered. The report which is now before the Assembly is a factual statement, setting forth the results of the inquiry. However, the last paragraph of the report contains a kind of recommendation, and the ruling of the Chair is that approval of this recommendation would constitute a revision of the decision taken by the General Assembly on 14 December 1950 [324th meeting]. In order to be adopted, therefore, it must be approved by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. I think we are all agreed on that point. That is, of course, in conformity with the rules of procedure.

107. Mr. COSTA DU RELS (Bolivia) (*translated from French*): As one of the sponsors of the draft resolution providing that the meeting place of the next session of the General Assembly of the United Nations should be in Europe, I do not want to go into the substance of the report we are discussing. However, I think it my duty to inform the Assembly of a new event.

108. I have just heard from an authoritative source in Paris that a bill was recently submitted in the French National Assembly by a deputy, Mr. Bétolaud, proposing that the next session of the United Nations General Assembly should be held in Paris. The bill will be presented by another deputy, Mr. Jacques Bardoux, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the National Assembly will discuss it tomorrow.

109. If this information is accurate, I think that out of courtesy to the French National Assembly we should postpone any decision.

110. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Before calling upon the representative of Colombia, might I ask the representative of Bolivia for how long he suggests the discussion should be postponed? His proposal is in fact a motion for the adjournment of the discussion of this matter.

111. Mr. COSTA DU RELS (Bolivia) (*translated from French*): I should not like to set any date because it really depends on the discussion in the French National Assembly. I am simply informing the General Assembly of the United Nations of this new fact. Perhaps we might consider an adjournment of ten or fifteen days at the most. However, I am not sufficiently well acquainted with French parliamentary procedure to be able to set an exact date.

112. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The General Assembly has just heard a most interesting report from the representative of Bolivia. The Bolivian representative's proposal comes under rule 75 of the rules of procedure which lays down: "During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against,

the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote”.

113. I shall therefore call upon those who wish to speak on this matter, that is, two speakers in favour of an adjournment and two who are opposed to it.

114. Mr. ARANGO (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): I think the information just given us by the representative of Bolivia, Mr. Costa du Rels, makes it advisable for us to postpone for at least a week the reconsideration of the decision which the General Assembly took on 14 December 1950 [324th meeting]. It seems to me it would be a lack of courtesy towards France to take a decision before we know the fate of the bill which has been presented for the express purpose of enabling us to meet in Paris.

115. As the President has so aptly explained, we are now discussing the final paragraph of the Secretary-General's report, which implies a reconsideration of the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on this question. If the steps which are now being taken come to naught, we shall be the first to call for a reconsideration. But it seems to me that until their failure is certain and until we know the decision of the French National Assembly, we must wait. I agree with the President that, in accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure, we must set a time limit of not more than two or three weeks, because the Secretary-General is placed in an impossible position if, so short a time before the next session, he does not know where he is to send staff members or where, finally, to make his arrangements.

116. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): As I said at the very beginning of our meeting, the USSR delegation is opposed to a discussion on this question.

117. On 14 December 1950, the General Assembly adopted a resolution stating that, “considering that the building intended for the holding of the General Assembly will not be completed until 1952,”—consequently there will be no accommodation for the Assembly in New York—and “considering that in these circumstances there may arise technical difficulties liable to impede the normal functioning of the General Assembly and the convenience of its deliberations,” it “decides, in conformity with rule 3 of its rules of procedure, to convene its sixth regular session in Europe”. In the second paragraph of the operative part of the resolution, the General Assembly “instructs the President of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General to select the city most suitable for the above purpose and to make the necessary arrangements”.

118. That is a perfectly clear decision by the General Assembly. It contains no reservations and provides for no revision. The very fact that this question has now been raised shows that this is definitely a manoeuvre on the part of a certain delegation—the United States delegation—which is most anxious that the sixth session of the General Assembly should be held in the United States, that is, under the most propitious conditions for that delegation.

119. But the General Assembly has already adopted a resolution. That resolution was adopted by a majority and it must be carried out, however displeasing it may be to the United States, which simply cannot reconcile itself to the decision and has taken steps to have it

reversed. That, of course, is why a report has been submitted in which it is alleged that the General Assembly cannot meet anywhere in Europe and that the only place where it can meet is in the United States. This proposal for convening the sixth session of the General Assembly in New York is in contradiction with the resolution already adopted by the General Assembly. We must abide by our own decisions. Since the General Assembly decided to hold its sixth session in Europe, it must implement its decision.

120. It is perfectly obvious that the question of reconsidering the decision to hold the sixth session of the General Assembly in Europe has been raised for ulterior motives. There is absolutely no reason for us to review the decision. In the report submitted to the Assembly it is alleged that the accommodation and other facilities in Geneva are inadequate for the holding of a session of the General Assembly. In that connexion, however, attention must be drawn to a decision which for some reason or another has not been brought to the General Assembly's knowledge. The decision in question was taken by the General Council of the World Federation of United Nations Associations in Switzerland on 4 February. It states that the Geneva area is in a position to provide all the necessary accommodation and other facilities for holding the sixth session of the General Assembly in Geneva; it states that the General Assembly could hold its sixth session in Geneva if it cannot find another place.

121. The delegation of the Soviet Union is opposed to the revision of the General Assembly decision of 14 December 1950. If a review of that decision is insisted on here, rule 82 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly will have to be applied; under that rule a two-thirds majority is needed to reverse a previous decision of the General Assembly.

122. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): May I ask the representative of the Soviet Union whether he is in favour of or opposed to an adjournment? What we are now discussing is the question of an adjournment.

123. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Before raising the question of an adjournment, it is essential to decide what it is that you wish to adjourn.

124. Do you wish to adjourn the debate on the reconsideration of the General Assembly resolution? The USSR delegation is in any case opposed to a review of that decision. The delegation of the Soviet Union is in any case opposed to the raising of this question, because it sees no reason for raising the question of a reconsideration of the General Assembly resolution of 14 December 1950.

125. That being so, the USSR delegation cannot support the proposal for deferring a decision on the matter, since it holds that there should be no review of the resolution. The General Assembly adopted a decision to hold its sixth session in Europe and that decision must be implemented without any political machinations, intrigues, manoeuvres etc.

126. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): If you do not mind, let us leave aside such expressions as “manoeuvres” and “intrigues”. The Secretary-General has submitted a report to us. The question is whether

the Assembly is prepared to consider it. The Assembly instructed the Secretary-General to perform a certain duty. He now returns to the Assembly to inform it of the difficulties which he has encountered; I think that is a perfectly normal procedure.

127. On the other hand, the representative of Bolivia has asked us not to take any hasty decision on the matter, because it is possible that we shall not be obliged to alter our previous decision.

128. That is how the matter stands. I can, if you like, call for the vote on the question whether the Assembly is prepared to discuss it. That would settle the case. The first question is whether the Assembly agrees to take up the Secretary-General's report and to consider the difficulties which are pointed out in it. After that, I shall return to the original question.

129. I shall put to the vote, then, the inclusion of the item in the agenda of the meeting.

It was decided by 42 votes to 5, with 6 abstentions, to include the item in the agenda of the meeting.

130. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): In taking this decision, we have acted in accordance with rule 82 of the rules of procedure.

131. The representative of Bolivia has proposed that we should adjourn the study of this question. Two delegations have spoken in favour of the adjournment. Does any delegation wish to oppose it?

132. The representative of the Byelorussian SSR is asking for the floor. Does he wish to speak against the adjournment?

133. Mr. SHVETSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): I wish to speak against the adjournment.

134. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I shall call upon you to speak, but I should be glad if you would allow me first to call upon the representative of the Philippines. He wishes to obtain some information and the explanations which he receives may perhaps help you in making your own statement.

135. General ROMULO (Philippines): After listening to the representative of Bolivia, the Philippine delegation would like to know, before the Assembly votes on the motion for adjournment, whether it would not be possible to have a statement from the delegation of France. We are discussing Paris as a possible site and the Secretary-General's report quite clearly states that the Government of France has practically turned us down. It would seem proper, before we vote on the motion for adjournment, to inquire what the delegation of France here present has to say on the question.

136. As regards the other point raised by the representative of the Soviet Union, I should like as a matter of information to ask the Secretary-General whether he has inquired into the possibility of holding the next session of the General Assembly in Moscow.

137. These are the two pieces of information which the Philippine delegation would like to have.

138. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I am quite ready to call upon the representative of France and on the Secretary-General to answer those two questions. However, you have heard the represen-

tative of Bolivia tell us of a proposal at present before the French National Assembly. I do not want to put the representative of France in an embarrassing position by laying him open to the danger of saying anything, when he speaks as the representative of his Government, which might be interpreted as a criticism of, or a lack of courtesy towards, his own National Assembly. You know that the position of government representatives before parliaments is sometimes difficult. Let us try not to make that position any more difficult. However, if the representative of France wishes to speak, I shall gladly call upon him.

139. Mr. LACOSTE (France) (*translated from French*): I should like, first, to thank the President for the sensitive way in which he has handled a situation which could, indeed, be quite embarrassing.

140. I am rather less fortunate than the representative of Bolivia, since I have not been favoured by private messages from high parliamentary quarters informing me of what goes on in my country's National Assembly. I am not, therefore, in a position to confirm the information which the Assembly has just received from Mr. Costa du Rels regarding certain parliamentary business which is apparently in hand in Paris at the present time but of which I have no official knowledge. Nor can I, naturally, make any statement concerning the new prospects which such business may perhaps open. I do not see what additional information I could give.

141. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): As far as the second question is concerned, the Secretary-General tells me that he has not received any information from the USSR Government to indicate that the sixth session of the General Assembly might be held in Moscow.

142. I now call upon the representative of the Byelorussian SSR to speak against the adjournment.

143. Mr. SHVETSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR considers that the consideration of the Secretary-General's report on the place of meeting of the sixth session of the General Assembly is irregular and unwarranted.

144. At its 324th meeting, on 14 December 1950, the General Assembly decided to hold its sixth session in Europe. The President of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General were instructed to select the most suitable city for that purpose and to make the necessary arrangements for the holding of the sixth session of the General Assembly. The decision to hold the sixth session in Europe was absolutely definite and clear. The task of the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly was clearly defined. Now, for some reason, we are confronted with the Secretary-General's report in which we are informed that there is not a single place in Europe where the sixth session of the General Assembly can be held. We are therefore asked to reconsider the General Assembly resolution of 14 December 1950.

145. Why, it may be asked, are we suddenly required to reconsider this resolution? The explanations given in the Secretary-General's report do not hold water, and the Bolivian representative's statement that there is still a possibility of holding the sixth session in Paris, and that this matter is to be considered by the French

National Assembly, proves once again that there are no grounds for raising the question of reconsidering the resolution. It further proves that the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly have failed to fulfil in full the General Assembly resolution of 14 December 1950 and that they have not taken the necessary steps or exerted the necessary effort to find a suitable place, a suitable city, for the holding of the sixth session of the General Assembly.

146. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR therefore feels that the question of adjourning the debate on this report cannot even arise, since the General Assembly resolution of 14 December 1950 is still in force. The Bolivian representative's announcement and the decision referred to by the representative of the Soviet Union prove that the resolution of the General Assembly can be implemented. If the Secretary-General makes every effort—as it is his duty to do—to carry out the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 14 December 1950, there will be no need to reconsider that resolution.

147. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR therefore protests against a reconsideration of the General Assembly resolution of 14 December 1950 and against the adjournment of the discussion of this question.

148. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We have already heard two speakers, the representative of Bolivia and the representative of the Soviet Union, speak in favour of an adjournment. The representative of the Byelorussian SSR has spoken against the adjournment. I can therefore call upon only one more speaker who wishes to oppose an adjournment.

149. If nobody wishes to speak, I shall ask the General Assembly to vote. However, in order that you should know precisely when the Assembly will have to meet, this is how I suggest that the question should be put. I shall ask you to agree to holding a meeting of the Assembly on 10 March at the latest. If, in the meantime, we hear that the action initiated in Paris, to which the Bolivian representative has referred, has been successful, I can convene the Assembly before that date. I shall ask the representative of Bolivia whether he agrees to my putting the question in that way.

150. Mr. COSTA DU RELS (Bolivia) (*translated from French*): I am in complete agreement.

151. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I therefore put the adjournment of the debate—in the circumstances I have just described—to the vote.

It was decided by 39 votes to 5, with 11 abstentions, to adjourn the debate.

152. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The USSR delegation voted against the proposal for adjourning the debate because it considers that there are absolutely no grounds for reconsidering the General Assembly resolution of 14 December 1950.

153. The delegation of the Soviet Union believes that the sixth session of the General Assembly should be held in Europe. There is a decision of the General Assembly to that effect and it should be implemented.

154. That is why the USSR delegation voted against the proposal for an adjournment.

155. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The agenda for today is completed.

156. I do not expect the next meeting of the Assembly to be held very soon. We shall probably have two questions to discuss. With regard to the place of meeting of the sixth session, we have agreed that the Assembly should meet to decide the matter on 10 March at the latest. In addition, if the Committee of Good Offices or the other committee which the Assembly set up [327th meeting] should succeed in preparing any recommendations for submission to the General Assembly, those recommendations will be transmitted to the First Committee, which will be called by its Chairman. When the First Committee has discussed the question, it will be a simple matter to call a meeting of the General Assembly. It is therefore not necessary to set any date today to hear statements on that question.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.