

resolutions and to replace them by a joint amendment to the Bolivian proposal providing for the appointment by the Assembly of a committee to study the situation and report to the fourth regular session.

The majority of the members of the Committee, however, were not in favour of the establishment of a special committee at this stage. The delegates of the *United Kingdom* and the *United States*, for instance, considered that the proper and most practical and effective course for the Assembly was to encourage action under the procedures for inquiry and determination laid down in the peace treaties. They were opposed to parallel procedure by the Assembly unless it became clear that the treaty procedure would not work. The *Australian* representative, while agreeing that the peace treaty procedure should be used, denied that his proposal for a special committee of inquiry cut across the peace treaties, and stated that human rights in the two countries were not a matter exclusively for the treaty signatories but for all members of the United Nations. The *New Zealand* delegate agreed with this latter view, believing that since the Assembly had included the item on the agenda and was convinced of its competence to discuss the question it should take steps to initiate a full inquiry in order to elucidate all the facts. After this fact-finding stage, in which the co-operation of the accused countries should be invited, the Assembly could then proceed to make appropriate recommendations. Nevertheless the view prevailed that the machinery of the peace treaty should be fully utilized before any other action was taken, and the *Cuban-Australian* amendment, aimed at establishing a United Nations committee of inquiry, received support from only 4 countries (Australia, Cuba, the Lebanon, and New Zealand), 30 voting against and 18 abstaining.

The *Bolivian* resolution was then adopted by 34 (N.Z.) to 6 with 11 abstentions. Even this somewhat modified resolution was bitterly denounced by the *Eastern European* countries on the ground that it was a flagrant violation by the United Nations of the principles of the Charter, in that it represented a totally unwarranted intervention in the internal affairs of the two countries.

Eventually the Assembly adopted the resolution submitted by the *ad hoc* Political Committee by a vote of 34 (N.Z.) to 6 with 9 abstentions. The resolution reads as follows :—

“ The General Assembly,

“ Considering that one of the purposes of the United Nations is to achieve international co-operation in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion,

“ Considering that the Governments of Bulgaria and Hungary have been accused, before the General Assembly, of acts contrary to the purposes of the United Nations and to their obligations under the peace treaties to ensure to all persons within their respective jurisdictions the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms,