

which the United States called for the imposition of embargo measures against the People's Republic of China, made it evident, in his opinion, that the text was designed to bring about the continuation and the extension of the war in Korea. The ruling circles of the United States continued, in fact, to drag the United Nations with them on a course which involved violation of the Charter and the adoption of illegal measures, the USSR representative said.

The representatives of the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Poland and the Ukrainian SSR agreed with the representative of the USSR that the question of applying an embargo was exclusively within the competence of the Security Council. They stated that, consequently, they would not participate in the discussion.

The representatives of Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Ecuador, France, Greece, Haiti, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Thailand, the Union of South Africa, the United Kingdom, the United States and Venezuela, among others, supported the draft resolution submitted by the Additional Measures Committee. They considered that, because the Chinese Communists and the North Korean authorities were pressing their attacks against the Republic of Korea, it had now become necessary to consider how best to support the United Nations forces fighting in Korea, to help end aggression and to bring about a peaceful settlement. The draft resolution took into account the actual situation in Korea as well as the objectives laid down in General Assembly resolution 498(V) of 1 February. They felt that, had the Chinese Communist Government had any inclination to negotiate, ample opportunity had been given it to make its wishes known. Moreover, opportunities for a peaceful settlement were still clearly available under the present draft resolution. That draft represented, in their view, an implementation and elucidation of the Assembly resolution 498(V), and to support it would be a logical reaffirmation of the stand taken by most Members in support of the Security Council's decision on Korea. The Additional Measures Committee, they felt, should continue to examine the situation in Korea so as to take other appropriate measures if necessary.

Those representatives maintained that the draft resolution submitted by the Additional Measures Committee was not inspired by a spirit of vengeance; it was intended merely to protect the United Nations forces which were resisting aggression in Korea. The measures suggested re-

lated only to supplies of raw materials or of materials of a strategic value which might contribute to an extension of the area of hostilities.

They stressed the fact that adoption of the draft resolution and of the amendment would not only be valuable in itself but also an effective demonstration of United Nations determination to make use of the means available under the Charter to bring the aggression in Korea to an end. There could not be two views as to the principle involved: no Member could object to a resolution requesting it not to give aid to the enemies of the Organization.

Adoption of the draft resolution, those representatives felt, would also give formal recognition to a policy already applied individually by Member Governments, and would provide for the United Nations machinery through which all Governments could work together to make the restrictions more effective.

The representative of India stated that the draft resolution was based on General Assembly resolution 498(V) which the Indian delegation had opposed, and, therefore, it could not vote in favour of this draft resolution. The recommended embargo, he said, had already been applied by the States, so that the adoption of the draft resolution could not mean any reduction in the supplies entering China. On the other hand, he felt, it might create additional obstacles in the way of a peaceful solution of the problem. The proposed embargoes, however, did not concern India which did not send any war materials to foreign countries and did not propose to do so. The Indian delegation, he said, would therefore abstain in the vote.

The representative of Iraq indicated that, though voting for the resolution, his country could not assure co-operation in implementing it with one State in the Middle East because no relations existed between Iraq and that State.

The representative of Syria stated that, consistent with the attitude his country had taken on Assembly resolution 498(V), he would abstain from voting on the draft resolution although his abstention should not be construed to mean that his Government would not comply with the provisions of the resolution. A similar statement was made by the representative of Sweden.

The Committee adopted, by 43 votes to none, with 11 abstentions, the preamble of the draft resolution submitted by the Additional Measures Committee. The joint amendment (A/C.1/662/-