

on the broader issues raised by the Cuban item. The resolution also proposed that, pending a decision by the General Assembly on the special committee's report, the Nationalist Government Delegates should continue to sit in the Assembly with the same rights as other representatives. This resolution proved acceptable to a large majority and was adopted by a vote of 42 in favour and 9 against, with 6 abstentions.

Since this resolution provided that the special committee should not report back until after the General Assembly had discussed the question of recognition of the representation of a member state, it amounted in effect to the postponement of a decision on Chinese representation until consideration could be given to the item proposed by Cuba. Later the Korean crisis was to overshadow other questions with the result that although the special committee consisting of representatives of Canada, Ecuador, India, Iraq, Mexico, the Philippines and Poland held its first meeting on December 16, it decided to leave to the chairman the calling of further meetings "in the light of discussions relating to the cease-fire in Korea".

The debate on the question of the recognition of the representation of a member state centred mainly on two draft resolutions, one submitted by Cuba, the other by the United Kingdom. Both proposals recommended that when the question of the right of a government to represent a member state arises, the matter should be referred to the General Assembly of the United Nations for decision and the other organs of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies should, in the interest of uniformity, be requested to take appropriate action on the General Assembly's decision. Both draft resolutions also stipulated that a decision of the General Assembly on such a question should not affect the direct relations of member states with the state, the representation of which has been challenged.

The two proposals also recommended that certain criteria be adopted as the basis upon which the General Assembly might arrive at its decision. The United Kingdom proposal recommended that, in arriving at a decision, the General Assembly should consider which government has "effective control and authority over all or nearly all the national territory, and has the obedience of the bulk of the population of this territory, in such a way that this control, authority and obedience appear to be of a permanent character". This is the test generally applied in the recognition of one government by another. The Cuban proposal on the other hand emphasized subjective tests. It stressed "consent" of the population as opposed to "obedience" and insisted also on the ability and willingness of a government to fulfil the obligations of the Charter and its international obligations generally, and on the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

While the question of China was undoubtedly in the minds of all delegates throughout the debate, there was a marked disposition to approach the problem on the basis of more general considerations. The Soviet bloc, however, insisted that a purely political decision on the specific case of China was required and that the attempt to establish criteria of general application was intended to deny China her rights as a member state. A large number of delegations doubted