

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



Thursday, 8 November 1951, at 5.45 p.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

INDEX UNIT
14
M. MALIK
CONTENTS

	Page
Announcement by the Chairman.....	1
Organization of the sixth session of the General Assembly : Memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/125).....	1
Consideration of the agenda of the sixth session and allocation of items to Committees (A/1870, A/1900, A/1930, A/1938, A/1941, A/1943, A/1944, A/BUR/126, A/BUR/126/Corr.1)	1

Chairman : Mr. Luis PADILLA NERVO (Mexico).

Announcement by the Chairman

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that, following consultation with representatives of the Latin American countries who were members of the General Committee, he would conduct the business of the meeting in English in order to expedite the Committee's work.

Organization of the sixth session of the General Assembly : memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/125)

2. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should consider the memorandum by the Secretary-General on the organization of the sixth regular session of the General Assembly (A/BUR/125) paragraph by paragraph.

PARAGRAPHS 1 TO 4

Paragraphs 1 to 4 were adopted.

PARAGRAPH 5

On the proposal of Mr. Austin (United States of America) seconded by Mr. Stone (Canada), the General Committee decided to recommend that the Christmas recess should extend from 23 to 27 December inclusive, it being understood that 1 January 1952 would be a holiday.

PARAGRAPH 6

Paragraph 6 was adopted.

PARAGRAPHS 7 AND 8

3. Mr. JAMALI (Iraq) believed that it was essential to have verbatim records for the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee as well as for the First Committee.

4. The CHAIRMAN explained that it was a practical impossibility for both the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and the First Committee to have verbatim records although the questions dealt with by the two Committees were of equal importance. However, any verbatim

record required by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee would be provided from sound recordings.

Consideration of the agenda of the sixth regular session and allocation of items to Committees (A/1870, A/1900, A/1930, A/1938, A/1941, A/1943, A/1944, A/BUR/126, A/BUR/126/Corr.1)

5. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should deal first with the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/BUR/126). He proposed further that it should take note of the first four paragraphs of that memorandum and then pass on to the proposed agenda of the session, reviewing it item by item.

ITEMS 1 TO 22

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion of items 1 to 22.

ITEM 23

6. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that at the fourth and fifth sessions of the General Assembly, the USSR delegation had taken

The printed Official Records of the sixth session of the General Assembly are being published in fascicule form, that is, the record of each meeting will be issued separately as soon as possible. These will be so produced that they may eventually be bound into volumes, by organ and session. Pagination will therefore be continuous throughout each series of fascicules representing the records of a single body, and at the end of the session there will be issued, for each series, a prefatory fascicule containing a title page, table of contents, list of members attending, initial agenda, and other prefatory material. This prefatory fascicule should be placed in front of the record of the opening meeting, before binding. For ease of recognition the fascicules of the opening and closing meetings will be clearly identified as such in the mast-head.

After the close of the session, sets of fascicules, collated and bound, will be placed on sale for the general public.

exception to the inclusion of a similar item on the agenda of those sessions. Such an item was nothing more than a Kuomintang slander, the charges being wholly without foundation. Indeed, it was common knowledge that friendly relations were entertained by the Soviet Union with the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, which was the only legitimate government of China. The true threat of aggression could be found in the actions of the United States, which had been responsible for unleashing war in Korea and aggression in China, having seized Taiwan although it was an inalienable part of China.

7. The USSR representative saw no reason why, after the discussion held at its two previous sessions, the General Assembly should consider the item at its present session since it was clear that such action by the Kuomintang group, which did not represent China and had therefore no right to raise the matter in the United Nations, was of a provocative and spurious character. It would be recalled that the First Committee had refused to take any action on the question at the last session. Moreover, even the Interim Committee, which had been illegally set up, had refrained from discussing the Kuomintang proposal.

8. Mr. Malik said that he would therefore vote against the inclusion of item 23 in the agenda, since it would only serve to discredit the General Committee and the General Assembly as a whole.

9. Mr. TSIANG (China) said that he would confine his remarks to the procedural aspect of the question, since the General Committee was not called upon to discuss the substance of the items under consideration.

10. The Committee's members were aware that the item had been referred by the fifth session to the Interim Committee which, for technical reasons, had not met to discuss it. The item therefore constituted unfinished business of the General Assembly and, according to all rules, should be included in the agenda.

11. Mr. LACHS (Poland) believed that the purpose of the Kuomintang clique in submitting the item was to perpetrate a slanderous attack on one of the founders of the United Nations, the USSR. If the Assembly were to conduct its work successfully at the present session, it should eliminate any items which would only lead to fruitless discussion. Clearly, any threat to China came from sources other than those referred to in the item. Furthermore, it was obvious that the Interim Committee had refused to consider such an allegation.

12. He therefore requested the Committee to recommend the deletion of the item.

The Committee decided, by 9 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions, to recommend the inclusion of item 23.

ITEM 24

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion of item 24.

ITEM 25

13. The CHAIRMAN said that he had received a request from the delegation of the Union of South Africa to speak. He accordingly invited the representative of that country to take a seat at the Committee table.

14. Mr. JOOSTE (Union of South Africa) said that he fully realized that the item on the treatment of

people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa had been introduced as a result of resolution 395 (V) adopted the previous year by the General Assembly. However, the Committee was aware that, in the past, South African representatives had consistently protested to the General Committee against the inclusion of that item in the agenda on the ground that its discussion in the United Nations constituted interference in the domestic affairs of the Union of South Africa.

15. When the matter had first arisen, the United Nations had decided that it was competent to deal with it, in spite of the fact that the South African Government had clearly demonstrated that Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter explicitly precluded it from doing so. On subsequent occasions, the General Committee had maintained that, since the General Assembly had dealt with the matter once, its competence to do so again could not be disputed. Nevertheless, the South African Government had sought on every occasion to stress the fact that the original decision on competence should not oblige the United Nations to continue on a course so obviously unjust to the Union of South Africa.

16. It was often argued that the mere discussion of a matter, whether it fell within the domestic jurisdiction of a Member State or not, did not necessarily constitute intervention and did not therefore constitute a violation of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. Mr. Jooste pointed out that his Government challenged such a contention, and he believed that there was a growing consciousness in the Organization of the dangerous implications of continued discussion in the United Nations of the domestic affairs of Member States. Such discussions were exploited by some to further their own ends.

17. Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter was intended to have overriding effect. Indeed, it had been on that understanding that many of the smaller States had agreed to sign the Charter. The original Charter remained intact and could not be amended by arbitrary interpretation.

18. In the circumstances, the South African delegation wished to lodge a formal objection to the inclusion of item 25 in the agenda. If the Committee were to recommend its inclusion, his delegation would be obliged to oppose the recommendation when it was considered in the General Assembly.

19. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Indian delegation had also requested to speak on the inclusion of item 25 in the agenda and he invited the Indian representative to take a seat at the Committee table.

20. Sir Benegal RAU (India) said that he would confine his remarks to the procedural issue.

21. The inclusion of item 25 in the agenda was the logical consequence of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 395 (V). The first recommendation contained in that resolution for the holding of a round-table conference between the Governments of India, Pakistan and the Union of South Africa had not been implemented since the South African Government had been unable to accept the resolution as a basis for such a conference. Consequently, the General Assembly had no alternative but to consider how the recommendation for a commission of three members could be implemented.

22. Mr. JOOSTE (Union of South Africa) stated that the reasons for the failure of the first recommendation

contained in General Assembly resolution 395 (V) had been communicated to the United Nations by his Government. He fully recognized the fact that the present issue arose out of the resolution adopted at the Assembly's fifth session. However, the General Assembly was free to take whatever decision it wished with regard to the agenda of the present session, and the mere fact that the inclusion of the item was being examined clearly showed that the General Committee was competent to recommend its removal from the agenda if it so desired. To retain the item would amount to a perpetuation of intervention in the domestic jurisdiction of the Union of South Africa.

The Committee decided, by 10 votes to none, with 4 abstentions, to recommend the inclusion of item 25.

ITEMS 26 TO 48

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion of items 26 to 48.

ITEM 49

23. Mr. BEBLER (Yugoslavia) proposed that sub-paragraph (c), "Draft code of offences against the peace and security of mankind" should be deleted since the draft code had only recently been communicated to governments and, in accordance with article 16 of the Statute of the International Law Commission, a one year period of study should be allowed. If the sub-paragraph was deleted, the Secretary-General could be authorized to include the item in the provisional agenda of the seventh session.

24. Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom) supported the proposal.

The Committee decided by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions, to recommend the exclusion of sub-paragraph (c) of item 49 from the agenda of the sixth session and its inclusion in the provisional agenda of the seventh session.

ITEMS 50 TO 61

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion of items 50 to 61.

ITEM 62

25. Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom) proposed that the words "Complaint of" should be added at the beginning of the title of item 62. The item would then read: "Complaint of violation by France in Morocco of the principles of the Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights."

It was so agreed.

26. The CHAIRMAN said that he had received a request from the Egyptian delegation to participate in the debate under rule 43 of the rules of procedure. He accordingly invited the Egyptian representative to take a seat at the Committee table.

27. SALAH-EL-DIN Pasha (Egypt) stated that on 4 October 1951 the Government of Egypt had asked (A/1894) for the question of Morocco to be included in the agenda of the General Assembly's sixth session under the heading of "Violation by France in Morocco of the principles of the Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights". An identical request had been made by the Governments of Iraq (A/1898), Lebanon (A/1904), Saudi Arabia (A/1918), Syria (A/1908) and Yemen (A/1909).

28. His Government had been prompted to make that request particularly in view of recent incidents in Morocco which had, like previous similar incidents there,

provoked great resentment not only in that country but in the other Arab and Islamic countries and in the world at large, including even many important circles in France. The cleavage between France and Morocco had become increasingly grave and had taken the form of armed clashes between the French and Moroccan people; for no other reason than that the latter had given expression to the will of their country to assert its rights.

29. The Arab countries which had submitted the request had done so on the grounds of blood, religion, language and proximity, and also because they regarded the submission of such a request as an exercise of their right and a fulfilment of their duty as Members of the United Nations, loyal to its principles and its purposes, as laid down particularly in the Preamble of the Charter.

30. The position in Morocco was rapidly deteriorating and might endanger international peace and security. The Egyptian representative pointed to the inescapable duty of the United Nations to take appropriate action under the Charter on situations which might lead to international friction, particularly under Article 1, paragraphs 1 and 3, Article 10, Article 14, Article 34 and Article 35, paragraph 1.

31. It was abundantly clear that the question of Morocco was pre-eminently international in character. He recalled action taken by the United Nations with regard to Indonesia, Spain, Czechoslovakia, the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, human rights and fundamental freedoms in Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria, and the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa. He would not, however, refer in detail to the considerations which had led the United Nations to concern itself with those and other similar cases which it had deemed to be international in scope. The Egyptian representative recalled a statement made by Mr. Evatt, President of the General Assembly's third session, to the effect that if any question came within the scope of the Charter, it could no longer be considered a matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a State.

32. After thirteen centuries of independence, Morocco had been affected by the partition of Africa by the European Powers. Among the phases of that process had been the notorious Entente Cordiale between France and Great Britain, relating to Egypt and Morocco. Nevertheless, the Act of Algeiras of 7 April 1906 had specifically stated that the introduction of reforms in Morocco was based upon the threefold principle of the sovereignty and independence of the Sultan, the integrity of his dominions, and economic liberty without any inequality.

33. It was noteworthy that the Act of Algeiras had been to a great extent an expression of the public opinion of the free world, and particularly of the United States of America. The French Government had, at the time of imposing a protectorate status upon Morocco under the Treaty of Fez of 30 March 1912, stated that its main objectives were to endow Morocco with a series of administrative, judicial, educational, financial and military reforms without prejudice to the traditional sovereignty of the Moroccan people under the authority of the Sultan.

34. The position which France claimed for herself in Morocco and recent events there were contrary to the Purposes and Principles of the Charter and the rightful claims of the Moroccan people. Those claims had already been brought to the attention of the United

Nations on several occasions, especially since 1947 when the Moroccan independence movement had submitted a memorandum to the Secretary-General, on 8 October of that year, outlining claims and grievances.

35. In view of the fact, therefore, that recent developments in Morocco endangered international peace and security and constituted violations by France in Morocco of the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, he urged the Committee to adopt inclusion of the item in the agenda.

36. Mr. STONE (Canada) thought that the question was complex and that many delegations, including his own, would like to have time to consider it more fully. He therefore moved the postponement of the debate on the question until a subsequent meeting of the General Committee.

37. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) considered that, as no political decision of any kind was involved, the inclusion of item 62 could be recommended forthwith. Time could be allowed for representatives to obtain their governments' instructions, if necessary, prior to the discussion of the item in the Committee to which it was allocated.

38. Mr. Maurice SCHUMANN (France) said that it had not been without some surprise that his Government had learned that the governments of some Member States had requested the inclusion of the item under consideration. Members of the General Assembly would have no difficulty in understanding that astonishment in the light of the following considerations.

39. First, the request for inclusion of the item would be tantamount to asking France to account to the General Assembly for the manner in which it was carrying out a mandate under a treaty concluded some forty years ago between France and the Sultan of Morocco. By virtue of what principle, undertaking or promise could such a request be made? Was there any provision in the Charter under which it could be claimed that, in Morocco, France had violated principles by which France was bound as a result of responsibilities which it had assumed under the Treaty of Fez of 30 March 1912? His Government knew of no such provision nor of any intention in that sense on the part of the authors of the Charter. Nor, again, had there been, to his Government's knowledge, any interpretation of the Charter that would support such a view.

40. The representatives of the French Government at the San Francisco Conference, when the provisions of the Charter dealing with Non Self-Governing Territories were drafted, had been too conscious of the obligations that their country had assumed to allow to pass unnoticed any formulation involving either explicitly or implicitly any such interpretation. Articles 73 and 74 of the Charter contained the undertakings assumed by Member States in respect of Non Self-Governing Territories. They had assumed no other obligations in that field. He would not say that France had accepted such responsibilities with any greater sense of their importance than other countries, but he could say that his country had considered such obligations and weighed their implications all the more carefully inasmuch as it was one of the few on which such obligations actually fell. Such obligations, apart from the furnishing of statistical and technical information to the Secretary-General, were not new for France. It had been successfully fulfilling them for some thirty years and that fact had been duly recognized. Only

recently the Sultan of Morocco had publicly declared that there could be no discord between France and Morocco, that nothing could divide the two countries and that everything constrained them to act in unison.

41. The progress made in the letter and spirit of the Treaty of Fez, with due regard for the traditions and aspirations of the people of Morocco, and the reforms accomplished and under way, would continue to be inspired by the principle of furthering international peace and security. The responsibility for implementing that principle lay with no other government than the Government of France, which had signed the Treaty of Fez of 1912 and had been assigned the sacred mission defined in Article 73 of the Charter, the obligations contained in which it was determined to pursue faithfully.

42. As to the allegation that France was violating the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in Morocco, not all Members of the United Nations were familiar with the social and legal structure in that country, nor with the very special conditions in which the principles of the Declaration had to be applied. The Treaty of Fez defined the lines agreed upon between the Sultan of Morocco and the French Government for the application of such principles. None understood such matters better than the Arab States, to which France was linked with age-long ties of friendship. His country was confident that a few passing storms could not for long disturb the serenity of the atmosphere in which its long standing relations with the Arab world were developing.

43. In the circumstances, the Canadian representative's proposal that discussion on the item should be deferred was the wisest course. Detailed discussion of the matter would not be in the interests of the Moroccan people, nor of world peace.

44. The CHAIRMAN said that in view of the Canadian representative's proposal that consideration of the question by the General Committee should be postponed, he would apply rule 115 of the rules of procedure.

45. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, assumed that the members of the General Committee would not be precluded from stating their views if they wished to do so.

46. Mr. AUSTIN (United States of America) said that his delegation felt that the General Committee should make a recommendation to the General Assembly with regard to the inclusion of item 62. As amended by the United Kingdom proposal, its terms were exceedingly broad. It dealt with a complicated situation, which warranted very careful study. The request for its inclusion had been made only a month before the Assembly convened and in the meantime delegations had been exceedingly busy with many other items that had been brought up previously.

47. Morocco was a Non-Self-Governing Territory within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter. The United States delegation was mindful of the obligations assumed by Member States under that Chapter and was gratified to hear the French representative stress his Government's recognition of the principles of Articles 73 and 74 and its eagerness to carry out the sacred trust on behalf of the people of Morocco. He was also sure that France would carry out in the spirit of the Charter the reforms to which its representative had referred.

48. The United States delegation was also mindful of the views of the six Member States that had put forward the request, and it seemed to him that they

might agree that the interests of the Moroccan people were paramount. A detailed discussion on that complex question would not be in the interests of the Moroccan people. Efforts should be made, in the spirit of the Charter, outside the United Nations to settle such matters before submitting them to the Organization, and his delegation was confident that such efforts would be made.

49. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) was surprised to see so much reluctance to accept the inclusion of the item. Without entering into the substance of the matter, he would merely emphasize that the hope of freedom-loving peoples now under subjugation reposed in the United Nations; the latter should not close the door to any of them.

50. Morocco was a country with a special status. It had its own individuality, its own sovereign and a specific treaty with France, and it should not be dealt with under Chapter XI of the Charter. In the circumstances, his delegation believed that the item should be included in the agenda forthwith. A very similar situation had arisen in the case of Indonesia, when, despite attempts made by the Netherlands Government to keep the matter from the United Nations, the latter had decided to deal with the problem; Indonesia had finally obtained its independence and had become a Member of the United Nations. It was to be hoped that Morocco would one day follow suit. There should be no discrimination between one country and another, the aim of all being the establishment of friendly relations between all countries of the world and the abolition of the status of subjugation.

51. Another case of a similar nature had been the consideration of the question of the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa, which further justified the view that the United Nations was competent to deal with the Moroccan question. The matter was one that also harmed the friendly relations between France and the Arab States.

52. The Iraqi representative sincerely hoped, therefore, that the General Committee would recommend the inclusion of item 62 and that France would be guided by the general desire for countries such as Morocco to be led forward towards self-government.

53. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that those who opposed the inclusion of the item in the agenda had advanced no sound reasons for their attitude. They merely sought to postpone the question indefinitely. It was not customary for the General Committee to decide on the substance of any item on the agenda, and a decision that the item in question should be postponed would be a decision on substance. Such arguments as had been advanced could hardly be taken seriously since the General Assembly was to remain in session for some three months and that would allow sufficient time for all to study the matter fully.

54. Morocco was a Non-Self-Governing Territory and France was under an obligation to submit information on it to the Secretary-General. The neighbouring Arab States saw most clearly the situation in Morocco and it was they who had submitted the matter to the General Assembly. The latter was competent to discuss it by virtue of the provisions of the Charter and of General Assembly resolution 66 (I). There was therefore no reason why the General Committee should not recommend the inclusion of item 62. If the Main Committee, to which the question was assigned, found it appropriate

to defer consideration, that Committee could do so but it was not for the General Committee to recommend postponement. The United States' contention that the problem was complex could not be regarded as a serious argument for deferring its consideration as that would be equivalent to saying that the General Assembly could not deal with complex questions.

55. In the circumstances, the Soviet Union representative supported the request for the inclusion of item 62.

56. Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom), speaking on a point of order, said that he appreciated the interpretation given to the Canadian proposal. Two speakers had now spoken in favour of it and two against it. He would, therefore, merely inquire as to the actual position. If the Canadian proposal implied a simple decision to postpone the discussion in the General Committee, he assumed that the Committee would conclude its consideration of all the items of the provisional agenda and report to the General Assembly without including the item in question in the list of items recommended for inclusion. The General Committee would then, at a later stage, revert to item 62 thus allowing delegations more time to consider the matter. If that were the correct interpretation of the Canadian motion, he would reserve his right, when the moment came, to propose that the General Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it postpone discussion of the question, since his delegation took the view that such discussion would do more harm than good.

57. SALAH-EL-DIN Pasha (Egypt) felt that much of what he had already said would adequately answer the French representative's objection to the inclusion of the item in the agenda. He would, however, call attention to a statement made by the Philippine representative, General Carlos Rómulo, on 15 November 1950, at the 43rd meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, with regard to the question of the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa.

58. As General Rómulo had said :

" It could not have been the purpose of the members of the Committee in San Francisco to draft Chapters IX and X of the Charter, particularly Articles 55 and 56, which obligate all member States to take joint and separate action in co-operation with the Organization for the achievement of universal respect for observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and, then, having laid down this obligation, to turn around and say that this obligation does not exist after all because Article 2, paragraph 7, forbids the Organization from intervening in matters, including the observance of human rights, which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of Member States. Such an interpretation would be a manifest absurdity.

" A matter ceases to be essentially one of domestic concern if it is capable by its nature of assuming an international complexion or of giving rise to international repercussions, and especially if such repercussions are such as to impair the friendly relations between States or constitute a direct or potential threat to international peace and security".

59. The United States delegation had expressed the view that Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter was not intended to preclude discussion in the Assembly on the defence of human rights and fundamental freedoms, should the need arise. Moreover, it had stated, there was nothing to prevent the Assembly from express-

ing an opinion or making a recommendation when a particular country constantly and deliberately refused to recognize those human rights.

60. On 10 February 1946, at the 14th meeting, of the Security Council, the USSR representative, Mr. Vyshinsky, had stated that he could not agree with the view that the Indonesian question was not the business of the United Nations, and that the Charter in no way contemplated the possibility of intervention in a matter of that kind. Mr. Vyshinsky had added:

“We are being referred to Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, in an attempt to prove that the events in Indonesia are an internal matter and that the Organization has no right to interfere in such matters, as otherwise, as Mr. Bevin put it, the sovereign rights of Holland would be impaired... If we adopt the position of Mr. Bevin and Mr. van Kleffens, how is it that the sending of a Commission to Greece to control the carrying out of the elections does not amount to interference in the internal affairs of Greece?”

61. On 17 March 1948, regarding the Czechoslovak question, Sir Alexander Cadogan, the United Kingdom representative, said at the 268th meeting of the Security Council:

“Nobody has yet asked the United Nations to intervene in matters of domestic jurisdiction in Czechoslovakia. That is not the question before the Security Council. What is before us is an allegation made by a Member of the United Nations—the Government of Chile—... it is a charge of violation of the Charter... and I cannot think that the Security Council should turn a blind eye to it. It seems to me that the Security Council should certainly investigate the charge.”

62. At the same meeting of the Security Council, Mr. Parodi, the representative of France, had added:

“If it is contended... that a complaint submitted to the Council has no facts to support it, we must still be able to examine it to find out whether or not that is really the case; to do that we must first of all include it in the agenda.”

63. The Egyptian representative then recalled that the Canadian representative had proposed that the General Committee should recommend to the General Assembly postponement of a decision on the question whether or not the item under discussion should be included in the agenda. Such a proposal, if accepted, would unjustifiably discriminate against one of the seventy or more items on the agenda. It was in the interest of all concerned, and of the United Nations as a whole, that the item should be included.

64. Mr. STONE (Canada) said, in reply to the Chairman's previous statement, that he had understood, when making his proposal, that the debate on the question under consideration should be adjourned and that decision would be reported to the General Assembly. If that were so, there appeared to be little difference between his proposal and the position taken by the United Kingdom representative when declaring his intention of proposing, if necessary, that a recommendation should be made to the General Assembly that it postpone consideration of the matter.

65. The CHAIRMAN said that if the motion was for adjournment of the debate he would have to apply rule 115 of the rules of procedure. If, however, the

proposal was for the General Committee to recommend that the General Assembly should postpone consideration of the item, that was a different matter and rule 115 would not apply.

66. Mr. STONE (Canada) said that he accepted the interpretation placed upon his motion by all speakers, with perhaps the exception of the United Kingdom representative.

67. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq), addressing himself to the remarks made by the United States and United Kingdom representatives, said that the complexity of the problem was no reason for not taking up the item. It could be included in the agenda and dealt with in such a manner as to allow sufficient time for a detailed and careful study. What was the General Assembly for but to look into problems of human rights and fundamental freedom? To postpone consideration of the matter would do the United Nations an injustice and seriously prejudice the cause of freedom.

68. Mr. Maurice SCHUMANN (France) said that he had not thought it necessary to deal with the question from the standpoint of the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. Morocco, as the USSR representative had so rightly said, was a Non-Self-Governing Territory; he had therefore confined himself to the provisions of Chapter XI of the Charter. There was no call for anyone to intervene between France and Morocco, for that would be contrary to the provisions of the Treaty of Fez. As to the alleged discrimination by the French authorities against the Arabs in Morocco, if those who brought the charge would visit countries of the French Union and associated countries, they would see that it was unfounded. Finally, no one would question the friendship existing between France and the Arab States and their peoples.

69. Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom) referring to the Iraqi representative's remarks, considered that the question required mature reflection, more especially as it concerned a nation which was said to be struggling to be free. If the revised Canadian proposal was that the General Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it postpone consideration of a difficult problem, the General Assembly was master of its own procedure and might or might not accept the recommendation. He hoped that the Committee could now proceed to a vote on the Canadian proposal.

70. The CHAIRMAN declared the debate closed and proposed to put the matter to the Committee in accordance with rule 40 of the rules of procedure.

71. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand) wished to explain his vote in advance. If it had been a question of adjourning the debate in the General Committee he would have voted in favour of such a motion. The matter was complex in that it involved the question of the competence of the General Assembly and that it was of such a serious nature that delegations should be allowed sufficient time to ascertain all the facts. A decision to adjourn the debate would have meant that the question of the inclusion of the item would still be before the General Committee.

72. The Canadian proposal now seemed to be for the General Committee to recommend to the General Assembly that it should postpone consideration of the matter, namely, that it should postpone the inclusion of the item in the agenda. Although that would mean that the General Assembly itself would take the final deci-

sion, he would, nevertheless, vote against such a proposal.

73. The CHAIRMAN observed that the General Committee, in accordance with rule 40, could recommend either the inclusion of an item in the agenda, the rejection of the request for its inclusion or its inclusion in the provisional agenda of a future session. In the circumstances, it seemed that the Committee should vote on whether to recommend that the General Assembly should reject the request for the inclusion of the item under consideration.

74. Mr. HENRIQUEZ UREÑA (Dominican Republic) felt that the Canadian representative had recommended

postponement of the discussion and not rejection of the request for the inclusion of the item. It would be preferable to have the proposal in writing before taking a vote on it.

75. Mr. TSIANG (China) also thought that the proposal should be submitted in writing so that members could fully appreciate the implication of their vote; he moved the adjournment of the meeting.

76. THE CHAIRMAN put the motion for adjournment of the meeting to the vote.

The motion was adopted by 8 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 8.30 p.m.