

by the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee at the tenth session by a vote of 39 in favour (including Canada) 0 against, with 3 abstentions; a similar majority supported this resolution when it was considered in plenary session.

### Hostilities in the Area of Formosa

Sporadic hostilities between Chinese Communist and Chinese Nationalist forces in the area of the Formosa Straits were renewed in the last few months of 1954. Accordingly, on January 28, 1955, the Representative of New Zealand took the initiative in asking the Security Council to consider these armed hostilities as a potential threat to the maintenance of international peace and security. On January 30 the Representative of the Soviet Union addressed a similar request to the Council, transmitting a draft resolution which referred to "the question of the acts of aggression by the United States of America against the People's Republic of China in the area of the islands of Taiwan, the Pescadores and other islands off the coast of China which it has seized . . ." and asked the Security Council to condemn these "acts of aggression". The following day the Soviet Representative introduced another draft resolution asking that a representative of the Chinese Communist Government be invited to attend the meetings of the Security Council and participate in the discussion of the Soviet substantive resolution.

The Soviet intervention introduced confusion into what had been a clear-cut initiative taken by New Zealand, and lengthy procedural debates followed. In the event, the Security Council decided not to invite a Communist Chinese representative on the basis of the resolution proposed by the Soviet Union, but to consider both the New Zealand and Soviet substantive items in that order.

When the Council had adopted its agenda, the Representative of New Zealand proposed that a Chinese Communist representative be invited to participate in the discussion of the item submitted by his Government and that the Secretary-General be asked to convey the invitation to Peking. This proposal was adopted by 9 votes to 1 (China), with 1 abstention (U.S.S.R.), and telegrams were then exchanged between the Secretary-General and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China. The Foreign Minister's reply was to the effect that while his Government could agree to send a representative to discuss the matter on the basis of the resolution submitted by the U.S.S.R., it could not agree to discuss the New Zealand item. Subsequently, at a meeting on February 14, 1955, several representatives expressed their disappointment at the response of the Peking Government, which had led them to the conclusion that the Council should not try to push matters forward immediately but should adjourn its discussion for the time being. With the consent of all members of the Council except the Soviet Union, the matter was left on that basis.

While the Security Council devoted three meetings to this question, it achieved very little more than the adoption of its agenda. Nevertheless, opportunities were taken by the representatives on the Council to place their views on the record during the procedural debates. The majority obviously considered that the New Zealand initiative had originally been a useful one, and that the important thing was for the Council to bring about a cease-fire, thereby eliminating the immediate threat to international peace and security. To this end they were willing, indeed considered it essential, that a representative of the Government of the People's Republic of China participate in the discussion. Unfortunately, the will of the majority was effectively frustrated