

The representative of the Philippine Republic (Mr Cuenco) thought that Mr Vyshinsky's speech and his "sonorous but empty motion" were "disillusioning." They constituted a final proof of the need of a conference to revise the Charter. The representatives of the United States and France repeated their former expressions of opinion, the former stating that he could support the Australian proposal except for the paragraph which appeared to reflect on past transactions of the Council.

The Danish representative then proposed the appointment of a sub-committee to try to reconcile the various proposals and arrive at a unanimously acceptable solution. The Australian representative saw little need or possibility of reconciling the Australian and Soviet Union resolutions. These two resolutions, he said, dealt with two different problems. He could have added that other resolutions which had been moved also dealt with different problems, notably the Cuban resolution for a General Conference on revision of the Charter and a Philippine proposal for a specific amendment to the Charter. Believing that the appointment of a sub-committee would be useful only after the committee had expressed its preference by voting on these various proposals, the New Zealand representative voted against the appointment of a sub-committee. The proposal was carried by 33 votes to 8, and the following countries invited to be represented on the sub-committee: Argentina, Australia, China, Cuba, Denmark, France, India, Peru, Philippine Republic, Poland, Soviet Union, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela.

When, after several days of fruitless argument in sub-committee, the question was again referred to the First Committee, several resolutions had been withdrawn, others slightly modified.

Finally, votes were taken on the following resolutions:—

- (a) Chinese resolution in favour of which the resolution of the Soviet Union was withdrawn¹;
- (b) Australian resolution²;
- (c) Argentine resolution³;
- (d) Cuban resolution (see p. 11 above).

The voting was as follows:—

The Chinese resolution was rejected by 24 votes (including New Zealand) to 13, with 5 abstentions.

The Australian resolution was then voted upon, paragraph by paragraph. All the paragraphs were adopted except the second (criticizing the previous action of the Security Council), which was rejected by 19 votes to 10 (including New Zealand), with 13 abstentions. The remaining paragraphs of the Australian resolution were adopted by majorities varying from 26 to 27 votes in favour (including New Zealand), 5 to 7 votes against, with 9 to 10 abstentions.

¹ Document A/C1/122.

² Document A/C1/121.

³ Document A/C1/57.