

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

Friday, 14 April 1961,  
at 11.15 a.m.

New York

## CONTENTS

Agenda item 21:

The Korean question: report of the United Nations  
Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation  
of Korea (*continued*)..... 47

Chairman: Mr. Karel KURKA (Czechoslovakia).

## AGENDA ITEM 21

**The Korean question: report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (A/4466 and Add.1, A/C.1/827, A/C.1/830, A/C.1/832, A/C.1/833, A/C.1/834, A/C.1/835, A/C.1/836, A/C.1/837, A/C.1/L.266, A/C.1/L.269) (*continued*)**

1. Mr. MATSUDAIRA (Japan) recalled that at the 1146th meeting, on 12 April, the Committee had adopted a resolution (A/C.1/837) inviting the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate, without the right to vote, in the debate. He hoped that the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would give a favourable reply to that invitation. Every effort must be made, however, to speed up the discussion of the Korean question, since the peace and stability of the Far East were at stake. His delegation therefore proposed—and asked the Chairman to give a ruling on the matter—that, in conformity with the resolution he had mentioned, the representative of the Republic of Korea should be seated immediately. It was the hope of his delegation that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would also be represented shortly.

2. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, in its resolution, the Committee had decided to invite simultaneously the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. In view of that decision, he could not now invite the representative of only one of the two parties to be seated at the Committee table.

3. Mr. MATSUDAIRA (Japan) did not think that, according to the Committee's resolution, the representatives of the two Governments had to be admitted to participate in the debate simultaneously. As soon as one of the parties had accepted the invitation, it should be authorized to take its place. His delegation could not, therefore, accept the Chairman's decision. If the latter maintained his ruling, he would submit a formal proposal and ask that it be put to the vote.

4. Mr. BITSIOS (Greece) said he understood that the representative of Japan had appealed against the ruling of the Chairman. Under rule 114 of the rules of procedure, that appeal should be immediately put to the vote.

5. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the representative of Japan had indicated that he would only appeal

against the ruling of the Chairman if the latter maintained that ruling.

6. Mr. MATSUDAIRA (Japan) said that he was submitting a formal proposal which he would like to be put to the vote immediately.

7. The CHAIRMAN asked whether the representative of Japan was appealing the ruling of the Chair.

8. Mr. MATSUDAIRA (Japan) stressed that he was asking for a vote on his proposal that the representative of the Republic of Korea be seated immediately.

9. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) asked what was the point of seating the delegation of the Republic of Korea immediately, when the Committee was not discussing the substance of the Korean question.

10. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) thought that since the Committee had invited the representative of the Republic of Korea, that representative should be seated. It was merely a question of putting into effect a decision already taken.

11. Mr. ADEEL (Sudan) said he saw no reason why the representative of the Republic of Korea should be seated while the Committee was not discussing the Korean question.

12. Mr. CAMPBELL (United Kingdom) thought that, since the representative of Japan had appealed against the Chairman's ruling, rule 114 of the rules of procedure should be applied.

13. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the representative of Japan had stated that he was asking for a vote on his proposal for the immediate seating of the representative of the Republic of Korea.

14. Mr. MATSUDAIRA (Japan) pointed out that he was appealing against the Chairman's ruling in conformity with rule 114 of the rules of procedure.

15. Mr. WIRJOPRANOTO (Indonesia) moved the adjournment of the meeting.

16. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the motion for adjournment of the meeting.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Honduras, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ghana, Guinea.

*Against:* Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United

States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Haiti.

*Abstaining:* Iran, Ireland, Mexico, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Somalia, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, Venezuela, Austria, Burma, Cameroun, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Finland.

*The motion was rejected by 38 votes to 24, with 17 abstentions.*

17. Mr. YOST (United States of America) stressed that under rule 114 of the rules of procedure the appeal of the representative of Japan should be immediately put to the vote.

18. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that the proposal made by his delegation at the 1147th meeting for the postponement of the debate on the Korean question until the sixteenth session obviously took priority over the proposal of Japan. In fact, if the Afghan proposal was adopted, the Committee would have to wait until the sixteenth session to seat the delegation of the Republic of Korea.

19. Mr. BITSIOS (Greece) pointed out that the Chairman had not invoked the Afghan proposal when he agreed to give a ruling on the proposal of the representative of Japan. In those circumstances, rule 114 of the rules of procedure was applicable.

20. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia) asked the Chairman to withdraw his ruling so that the representative of Japan could withdraw his appeal. The discussion could then be resumed on a less confused basis.

21. Mr. ADEEL (Sudan) supported that suggestion. The proposal of the representative of Japan should not have been made while the Afghan proposal was before the Committee.

22. The CHAIRMAN explained that under rule 120 of the rules of procedure he should give priority to the proposal of Afghanistan.

23. Mr. MENEMENCIOGLU (Turkey) pointed out that rule 120 began with the words "subject to rule 114". Consequently, it was the motion submitted under rule 114 which should be voted upon first.

24. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the representatives of Saudi Arabia and the Sudan that it was desirable for the Chairman to withdraw his ruling, since that would cancel out the appeal of the representative of Japan. The Committee would then only have before it the proposal of Afghanistan.

25. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) said that the Chairman had in fact made two rulings: the first was that which had been challenged by the representative of Japan, and the second required representatives asking to take the floor on a point of order to speak only on the vote to be taken on the appeal of the representative of Japan. It must be made clear which ruling the Chairman was being asked to withdraw. Moreover, it seemed that in the stage matters had now reached the only solution was to take a vote.

26. The CHAIRMAN thought it was difficult for him to withdraw a ruling once it had been challenged. He could only do so if the representative of Japan agreed to withdraw his appeal.

27. Mr. MATSUDAIRA (Japan) accepted the solution, provided that the withdrawal of the Chairman's

ruling meant that the representative of the Republic of Korea would be allowed to take his seat.

28. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) felt that the representative of Japan, by his interpretation, was trying to prejudice that of the Chairman.

29. Mr. CHORFI (Morocco) considered that the Committee ought not to have considered any proposal until it had voted on the Afghan proposal for the adjournment of the debate on the Korean question. The Committee should therefore revert to that proposal.

30. Mr. WYZNER (Poland) also thought that the Chairman should withdraw his ruling.

31. Mr. MATSUDAIRA (Japan) requested the immediate application of rule 114.

32. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) maintained that his proposal for adjournment of the debate took priority over a proposal which was in fact aimed at a continuation of the debate.

33. Mr. KADI (Iraq) said that rule 114 related to points of order. The proposal of Japan, however, could not be regarded as a point of order. Rule 114 was therefore inapplicable. And in any case, the Afghan proposal took priority.

34. Mr. KUNTOH (Ghana) requested that the Chairman should at least suspend his ruling, which would thus stand if the proposal of Afghanistan were rejected. Similarly, he appealed to the representative of Japan not to invoke rule 114.

35. Mr. BRUCAN (Romania) also asked the Chairman to accept the suggestion of the representative of Saudi Arabia which, in any case, would not affect the merit of the Chairman's ruling.

36. The CHAIRMAN admitted that a procedural error had occurred at the outset of the meeting and said he was ready to withdraw his ruling if the representative of Japan was prepared to withdraw his appeal.

37. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) said that if the Chairman withdrew his ruling, the appeal would automatically lapse.

38. Mr. YOST (United States of America) thought that there had been no error and that the procedure followed in regard to the intervention by Japan had been quite in order, since it was a question of implementing a resolution of the Committee (A/C.1/837). Rule 114 should therefore be applied.

39. Mr. MATSUDAIRA (Japan) said he was unable to withdraw his challenge. Moreover, he doubted whether it was possible, under rule 114, for the Chairman to withdraw his ruling.

40. Mr. HAKIM (Lebanon) said he did not see how the challenge by Japan could remain if the Chairman withdrew his ruling. He therefore asked the Committee to vote first on the proposal by Afghanistan.

41. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) considered that, in view of the many different views expressed on the question of procedure, the Chairman should ask the Office of Legal Affairs for its views on the matter.

42. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia) also thought that the representative of Japan could not challenge a ruling which no longer existed, particularly as no vote had yet taken place. In any case, the Committee was free to determine its own procedure, since the rules of procedure were for expediting its work and not for impeding the same.

43. The CHAIRMAN said he would withdraw his ruling in order to facilitate the work of the Committee.

44. Mr. IFEAGWU (Nigeria) said he doubted whether the Committee could do any fruitful work in the prevailing charged atmosphere. He therefore moved that the meeting be adjourned under rule 119 of the rules of procedure.

45. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the motion for adjournment of the meeting.

*At the request of the United States of America, the vote was taken by roll-call.*

*The Federation of Malaya, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia.

*Against:* Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador.

*Abstaining:* Finland, Iran, Ireland, Madagascar, Mexico, Pakistan, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, Austria, Cameroun, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Ecuador.

*The motion was rejected by 40 votes to 32, with 15 abstentions.*

46. Mr. VELLODI (India) said that the Committee had already decided to invite a representative of the Republic of Korea to take part in the debate on Korea. The only question to be decided immediately, therefore, was whether the debate was to begin at the present meeting, to be deferred until Monday, 17 April, as proposed by the United States, or to be adjourned until the sixteenth session as proposed by Afghanistan.

47. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) formally requested that no vote be taken before the Office of Legal Affairs had given its opinion.

48. Mr. RITCHIE (Canada) did not believe that the Chairman could withdraw his ruling on the grounds that a procedural mistake had been made earlier. He therefore requested that the Committee proceed to a vote under rule 114 of the rules of procedure.

49. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) felt that part of the confusion in the discussion was due to the temporary absence of some of the delegations, which did not have sufficient personnel to take part simultaneously in plenary meetings of the General Assembly and meetings of the First Committee. He asked the Chairman to bear that point in mind.

50. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel) thought that points of order should not be allowed to interrupt democratic procedure and prevent a decision being taken by a majority of votes. He therefore requested the Chairman

to put the appeal of the representative of Japan to the vote under rule 114.

51. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, since his ruling had been withdrawn, the appeal made by the representative of Japan had no further basis and rule 114 was no longer applicable.

52. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel) said that, in that case, the normal procedure would be to seat the representative of the Republic of Korea in accordance with the resolution adopted.

53. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) thought that a distinction had to be drawn between the application of resolutions of the Committee and the procedure to be applied to proposals before the Committee. The Chairman's ruling obviously concerned the application of a decision of the Committee and in no way aimed at postponing consideration of the Afghan proposal. In any case, since the Chairman had withdrawn his ruling, the proper next step was to vote on the Afghan proposal for adjournment of the debate.

54. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had before it a formal proposal by the representative of Afghanistan that the opinion of the Office of Legal Affairs be obtained.

55. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) considered that such consultation was unnecessary, since the Chairman had withdrawn his ruling.

56. Mr. HASAN (Pakistan) pointed out that in any case the Committee set its own procedure.

57. Mr. YOST (United States of America) agreed with the representative of Peru that the proposal of Afghanistan should be put to the vote immediately, despite the fact that the Committee had already, on 12 April, voted on a similar proposal submitted by India.

58. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) said that if his proposal was put to the vote first, he would not insist that the Committee seek the opinion of the Office of Legal Affairs.

59. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal of Afghanistan that the discussion on the Korean question should be postponed until the sixteenth session of the General Assembly.

*At the request of the United States of America, a vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Dahomey, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Finland, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia.

*Against:* Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Italy, Japan, Laos, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus.

*Abstaining:* Ghana, Ireland, Israel, Nigeria, Senegal, Somalia, Sweden, Tunisia, Austria, Burma, Cameroun, Chad.

*The proposal was rejected by 44 votes to 29, with 12 abstentions.*

60. Mr. MATSUDAIRA (Japan) considered that the Chairman was not entitled to withdraw his ruling; nevertheless, since he had done so, the Japanese delegation formally proposed that the representative of the Republic of Korea should be invited to take a seat immediately in accordance with resolution A/C.1/837, and asked that that proposal should be put to the vote forthwith.

61. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) failed to see why the representative of South Korea should take part in a discussion which did not deal with the substance of the question.

62. Mr. ADEEL (Sudan) suggested an amendment to the Japanese proposal, namely, that the representative of Korea should take a seat in the Committee "when the Korean question is being discussed".

63. Mr. PLIMSOLL (Australia) thought that the representative of the Republic of Korea should take his place at the Committee table whenever the Korean question was discussed.

64. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) said he would move the adjournment of the meeting if many representatives wished to speak on the Japanese proposal or on the Sudanese amendment.

65. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) pointed out that the Committee had not adopted two resolutions, one to seat North Korea and one to seat South Korea. To vote now on the Japanese proposal might therefore be a violation of the provisions of resolution A/C.1/837 and the Committee might perhaps need a two-thirds majority to change its earlier decision.

66. Mr. SHANAHAN (New Zealand) moved the closure of the debate, under rule 118 of the rules of procedure.

67. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) asked whether the New Zealand motion referred to closure of the debate on the Korean question or on the Japanese proposal—which, he pointed out, had not yet been debated. In any case, it seemed advisable to adjourn the meeting.

68. The CHAIRMAN stated that the representative of New Zealand had moved the closure of the debate on the Japanese proposal.

69. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) said that the Japanese proposal was contrary to the provisions of resolution A/C.1/837. Under the rules of procedure, no proposal could as a general rule be discussed or put to the vote unless the text had been circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting. It seemed proper to apply that rule in the present instance.

70. The CHAIRMAN said that, if the Committee so wished, the Japanese proposal and the Sudanese amendment could be submitted in writing before the next meeting.

71. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) formally moved the adjournment of the meeting, under rule 119.

72. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the motion for adjournment of the meeting.

*At the request of the United States of America, a vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Honduras, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ghana.

*Against:* Honduras, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Laos, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti.

*Abstaining:* Iran, Ireland, Nigeria, Senegal, Somalia, Sweden, Tunisia, Austria, Burma, Cameroun, Chad, Ecuador, Finland.

*The motion was rejected by 40 votes to 29, with 13 abstentions.*

73. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the New Zealand motion to close the debate on the Japanese proposal.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Nicaragua, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Laos, Netherlands, New Zealand.

*Against:* Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Mali, Morocco.

*Abstaining:* Nigeria, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, Afghanistan, Burma, Cameroun, Ceylon, Chad, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, India, Iran, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Nepal.

*The motion was adopted by 46 votes to 18, with 19 abstentions.*

74. The CHAIRMAN asked whether, in view of the lateness of the hour, the Committee wished to continue its work.

75. Mr. YOST (United States of America) urged the Committee to proceed immediately to a vote on the Japanese proposal. That had been the purpose of the motion for closure submitted by the representative of New Zealand.

76. Mr. MATSUDAIRA (Japan) said he could not accept the Sudanese amendment.

77. Mr. POLYANICHKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) pointed out that, according to rule 121 of the rules of procedure, proposals and amendments should normally be introduced in writing. Accordingly, since an important issue was involved, his delegation proposed that the Committee should not vote at that meeting on either the Japanese proposal or the Sudanese amendment.

78. Mr. SHANAHAN (New Zealand) drew attention to the words "normally" and "as a general rule" in rule 121. All members of the Committee were familiar with the substance of the question and, since a motion for closure of the debate on the Japanese proposal had been adopted, it was evident that the Committee wished to proceed immediately to a vote on that proposal. Rule 121 allowed the Committee to use its discretion in the matter.

79. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) considered that in view of the decision already taken, the Chairman might, without consulting the Committee, invite the representative of South Korea to take a place at the Committee table. The same could be done in the case of the representative of North Korea, when he arrived in New York. It was merely a matter of carrying out a decision that had already been adopted.

80. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that originally the United States had proposed to invite only the representative of South Korea. When that proposal (A/C.1/L.268) had given rise to some criticism, the United States delegation had been obliged to submit a sub-amendment (A/C.1/L.273), thus retreating from its position. Now, under cover of procedure, an attempt was being made to have the Committee revoke its decision.

81. Mr. CAMPBELL (United Kingdom) observed that the representative of the Soviet Union was speaking on the substance of the question although the Committee had adopted a motion for the closure of the debate.

82. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he was speaking on a point of order: if the Committee wished to reverse a decision it had already taken, a two-thirds majority would be necessary.

83. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) said that the Committee should take into account the view of the United States delegation and proceed to vote—on the understanding that it would be voting on a proposal to amend the Committee's earlier decision.

84. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) feared that if the Committee rejected the Sudanese amendment, that rejection might imply a decision to seat the representative of South Korea when the question of Korea was not being discussed.

85. Mr. LIU (China) pointed out that North Korea would only be seated when the United Nations was satisfied that the North Korean régime had accepted the obligations specified in resolution A/C.1/837. The position of the Republic of Korea, which had accepted the competence and authority of the United Nations, was entirely different. Consequently, an invitation had already been extended to it, and had been accepted. That country's representative should be allowed to take a place at the Committee table forthwith.

86. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia) proposed that, in order to make the Sudanese amendment quite clear, it should be amended to state that the representative

of Korea would be seated "when the substance of the question of Korea is being discussed".

87. Mr. YOST (United States of America) said that it had been his understanding that the Committee's decision to close the debate applied to the discussion of the Sudanese amendment as well as to the proposal made by Japan. With regard to the Saudi Arabian sub-amendment, it had been the intention of those members of the Committee who had supported the Japanese proposal that the representative of the Republic of Korea should participate whenever the question of Korea was discussed. If such participation was to be allowed only during discussions of substance, the Committee's resolution would not be fully implemented. The United States delegation was therefore opposed to the Saudi Arabian sub-amendment.

88. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether an invitation had been sent to the Government of South Korea.

89. Mr. WIESCHHOFF (Secretary of the Committee) said that, since the representative of the Republic of Korea was in New York, no invitation had been sent to his Government.

90. Mr. BRUCAN (Romania) considered that the presence in the United States of representatives of South Korea was not sufficient reason to favour one party to the detriment of the other. Besides, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was probably in the process of considering the telegram from the Secretariat. He felt that the Committee should not give the impression that it was prejudiced against the Democratic People's Republic. That would be contrary to the spirit and the letter of the Committee's resolution of 12 April.

91. Mr. WIESCHHOFF (Secretary of the Committee) pointed out that the representative of the Republic of Korea in New York had observer status in the United Nations and consequently had access to the proceedings of the Committee.

92. Mr. VITSAXIS (Greece) remarked that, despite its decision to close the debate, the Committee was continuing to discuss the merits of the Japanese proposal.

93. The CHAIRMAN explained that a new situation had arisen since a sub-amendment had been submitted.

94. Mr. KUNTOH (Ghana) suggested that the meeting should be suspended to enable delegations that had submitted proposals and amendments to circulate them in writing.

95. Mr. BARRATT (Union of South Africa) inquired whether an amendment or a sub-amendment could be submitted after a decision had been taken to close the debate in accordance with rule 118.

96. The CHAIRMAN said that after the closure of the debate the Chairman could permit explanations of vote. It was in those circumstances that the representative of Saudi Arabia had submitted a sub-amendment. That procedure did not seem to conflict with the rules.

97. Mr. SHANAHAN (New Zealand) wished to know whether the representative of Sudan accepted the Saudi Arabian sub-amendment.

98. Mr. ADEEL (Sudan) said that he did.

99. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the proposal of the representative of the Ukrainian SSR concerning the application of rule 121 of the rules of procedure, which provided that, as a general

rule, no proposal should be discussed or put to the vote at any meeting of the Committee unless copies of it had been circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Turkey, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ghana, Hungary, Mali, Morocco, Poland, Romania.

*Against:* Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Laos, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand.

*Abstaining:* United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, Chad, Finland, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia.

*The proposal was rejected by 46 votes to 13, with 16 abstentions.*

100. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained his vote on the Japanese proposal, the Sudanese amendment and the Saudi Arabian sub-amendment. The proposal to seat the representatives of South Korea before the debate on Korea had even begun and before a reply had been received from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was contrary to the decision already taken by the First Committee and served only the political aim of perpetuating discrimination against the representatives of North Korea. Everything that had happened since the adoption of resolution A/C.1/837 confirmed the truth of the remarks made at the outset by the Soviet delegation. In reality, neither the United States nor Japan wanted the two States of the Korean peninsula to participate in the debate. The Soviet delegation therefore opposed the Japanese proposal and insisted that, in voting on it, the two-thirds majority rule should be applied since it would entail revoking an earlier decision.

101. With regard to the Sudanese amendment and the Saudi Arabian sub-amendment, the Soviet delegation understood the motives of their sponsors but considered that, even with those changes, the Japanese proposal would, in substance, amount to reversing the decision previously taken. The USSR would therefore not be able to vote for any of those proposals.

102. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) pointed out that since the Japanese proposal would alter the meaning of the resolution of 12 April, a two-thirds majority would be necessary for its adoption. Moreover, the proposal was in fact intended to prevent the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from participating in the debate. Bulgaria would therefore vote against it.

103. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia) thought that it would be as well to suspend the meeting to give delegations time to consider matters before explaining their votes.

104. Mr. YOST (United States of America) suggested that the Committee should first take a vote. Explanations of vote could be given later.

105. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia) said that it was customary in the United Nations to allow explanations of vote before a vote was taken.

106. Mr. KUNTOH (Ghana) inquired whether the proposal made by the United States (1147th meeting) that the discussion of the Korean question should be adjourned until 17 April took precedence over the Japanese proposal, since it had been made first.

107. Mr. PLIMSOLL (Australia) felt that it would be difficult to start discussing the United States proposal since the Committee had already decided to close the debate on the Japanese proposal. The Australian delegation formally requested that a vote should be taken to decide when explanations of vote would be heard.

108. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said that he could see no difference between a discussion and a substantive discussion. He agreed with the Soviet representative that rule 124 of the rules of procedure applied to the present case.

109. Mr. BOHIADI (Chad) pointed out that it had in any event already been proposed that consideration of the Korean question should be deferred until 17 April.

110. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) again moved the adjournment of the meeting in view of the lateness of the hour and the fact that there were other meetings previously scheduled. No representative could be prevented from explaining his vote before the vote. He appealed to those delegations which were insisting on taking a vote to reconsider the situation, since to prolong the meeting would not help.

111. Mr. YOST (United States of America) pointed out that the Committee had not taken a decision on the Australian proposal.

112. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the Afghan motion for adjournment of the meeting.

*At the request of the United States of America, a vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Liberia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Libya, Mali, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan.

*Against:* Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos.

*Abstaining:* Mexico, Somalia, Sweden, Tunisia, Austria, Cameroun, Ecuador, Finland, Iran, Ireland.

*The motion was rejected by 42 votes to 28, with 10 abstentions.*



113. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) asked to be allowed to explain his vote before the vote was taken.

114. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia) expressed surprise at the Australian proposal that a vote should be taken on whether explanations of votes should be offered before or after the voting. If the proposal was put to the vote, his delegation would request a roll-call.

115. Mr. PLIMSOLL (Australia) proposed that the vote should be taken immediately and that the Committee should then hear explanations of votes. He added that the question of substance before the Committee did not involve reconsidering a decision of the Committee, but merely interpreting a decision already taken.

116. Mr. ADEEL (Sudan) said that in order to save time he was prepared to withdraw his amendment.

117. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan), explaining his vote on the Japanese proposal, said that he would have voted in favour of the amendment, had it not been withdrawn. In any case, he would have abstained in the vote on the Japanese proposal.

118. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia) said that the method proposed by Japan would not promote a solution of the problem, at least at the current session; on the contrary, it would lead to still greater tension. Saudi Arabia had no commitments to either North or South Korea. However, as a Member of the United Nations devoted to the principle of self-determination and the equal rights of peoples, it was opposed to granting one part of Korea a right not granted to the other part. He could not accept the contention that North Korea had insulted the United Nations or its Member States; the majority in the United Nations had sometimes committed injustices towards a minority, and the States which had been the victims of majority decisions had never considered themselves to have been insulted by the United Nations. Having said that, he hoped that in the future the special interests which certain Powers had in various parts of the world would be forgotten, and that the United Nations would act on principle and not out of political expediency. It would be sad if the United Nations made the Korean question a propaganda issue. However, in view of the circumstances, Saudi Arabia would not vote against the Japanese proposal, and would abstain in the vote.

119. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the question of whether rule 124 of the rules of procedure applied to the Japanese proposal.

*At the request of the United States of America, a vote was taken by roll-call.*

*The Central African Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Mali, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

*Against:* Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Haiti, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada.

*Abstaining:* Finland, Ghana, India, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia.

*By 44 votes to 16, with 13 abstentions, it was decided that rule 124 did not apply.*

120. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Japanese proposal that the representative of Korea should be seated immediately.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Dahomey, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Haiti, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus.

*Against:* Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia.

*Abstaining:* Finland, Ghana, India, Jordan, Libya, Mali, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia.

*The proposal was adopted by 44 votes to 15, with 18 abstentions.*

*At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Yil Hyung Chyung, representative of the Republic of Korea, took a place at the Committee table.*

121. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) explained his vote on the Japanese proposal. His delegation had interpreted resolution A/C.1/837 to mean that North Korea would be able to inform the Committee within a reasonable period of time whether it accepted the condition attached to the invitation sent to it, on the understanding that if it did, its representatives would be seated in the Committee at the same time and on the same footing as those of the Republic of Korea. However, the resolution had been interpreted as permitting the South Korean delegation to be seated before North Korea had had time to reply. In those circumstances, his delegation had found it necessary to abstain in the vote on the Japanese proposal.

122. Mr. SANTISO GALVEZ (Guatemala) said that his delegation had been absent during the vote; otherwise it would have voted for the Japanese proposal.

123. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Netherlands representative had proposed (1143rd meeting) that the representative of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea should be invited to take a place at the Committee table.

*It was so decided.*

124. Mr. CHYUNG (Republic of Korea) thanked the Committee for having invited his delegation to participate in the discussion of the Korean question. He hoped that after the long procedural discussion which had just taken place, the Committee would direct its efforts towards seeking a constructive solution to the Korean problem.

The meeting rose at 3.55 p.m.