

the Arab States, to invite the Israeli representative to answer such questions and make such statements as the Committee might deem desirable. The representative of *Argentina* proposed that the Committee should also ask the Holy See to present an oral or written statement regarding the question of safeguarding the Holy Places in Palestine. It was thereupon suggested that representatives of the Greek Orthodox Church and of the Moslem faith should also present their views. Various arguments were adduced in opposition to these proposals. In the first place it was pointed out that it was not the task of the Committee to attempt to solve the problem of the protection of the Holy Places, but that, in fact, the Conciliation Commission established by the Assembly resolution of 11 December, 1948, was charged with this responsibility. It was to this Commission that the religious authorities concerned should submit their views. Further, the list of religious authorities mentioned in the proposals was by no means complete and it would in any case be quite impossible to hear the views of representatives of all sects of the Christian, Jewish, and Moslem faiths. Finally, such a procedure could only lead to a lengthy delay. In the face of this opposition, the *Argentinian* representative agreed to defer his proposal for the time being, and eventually it was withdrawn. The Committee, however, agreed to include in its final report a passage expressing the desire that the United Nations Conciliation Commission should, when studying the question of the internationalization of Jerusalem and the problem of the protection of the Holy Places, and free access thereto, take into account the views of the Holy See and other religious authorities (including the Commission of Churches on International Affairs, which was created recently by the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council).

When the general debate on the question of the admission of Israel began, *Iraq*, supported by the other *Arab* States and *Pakistan*, attempted to prevent action on the application by proposing that an inquiry should be sent to the Security Council "seeking further explanation of the validity of the vote taken with regard to the application of Israel for membership in the United Nations," in view of the abstention of one of the permanent members (the United Kingdom), and, "without prejudice to the discussion of the merits of the case," that an advisory opinion be sought from the International Court of Justice upon the nature of this vote. The representative of *Pakistan* (Sir Zafrullah Khan) in particular argued at length in favour of the view that the Security Council decision had not been taken in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, since it was not in conformity with the specific conditions prescribed in Article 27—namely, that decisions on other than procedural matters (and the admission of Israel was not a procedural matter) should be made "by an affirmative vote of seven members