

New Zealand was supported strongly by Brazil and the Netherlands, who had tabled similar amendments, and by Australia. None of the Big Four was in favour of removing the two-thirds rule. After long debate (between 31 July and 6 August) the amendment was defeated by 11 votes to 9, with 1 abstention. (*For*: Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, Netherlands, Brazil, Greece, Belgium, *Abstained*: Ethiopia. *Against*: U.S.A., France, U.K., U.S.S.R., Byelo-Russia, Ukraine, Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, China, Norway.)

Discussions then centred round the United Kingdom compromise proposal, which was finally adopted by a vote of over two-thirds, 15 to 6. (*Against*: U.S.S.R., Byelo-Russia, Ukraine, Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia.)

In the earlier stage of the debate Mr Molotov and Mr Manuilsky had pressed strongly for the adoption of the two-thirds rule, arguing that the same procedure should be followed at the Paris Conference as had been adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations. Dr Evatt and other delegates correctly pointed out there was no true comparison between the General Assembly and the Peace Conference, first, because the former makes decisions, not merely recommendations, and, secondly, because the Four Powers are not committed to support proposals placed before the General Assembly.

Almost simultaneously Mr Molotov was maintaining that a majority of two-thirds should be necessary to change the rules of procedure, despite the fact that a simple majority only is necessary in the General Assembly. As the Conference became more deeply involved in procedural questions hours were absorbed in discussing whether a two-thirds majority was necessary to decide as to whether or not a two-thirds majority was necessary to settle whether a question was one of procedure or of substance.

The United Kingdom proposal was accepted by a majority of more than two-thirds, in a vote which indicated the future voting alignment of the Conference. Mr Molotov then maintained that unanimity was necessary. He would not accept a two-thirds majority, which he said was dictation over the minority by the majority. Nor would he submit his opinion to the vote. He had stated his opinion, and this could not be changed.

Mr Molotov maintained this position before the Plenary Conference, when the rules of procedure (providing, *inter alia*, for the two types of recommendations) were adopted on 9 August by 15 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions. (*Against*: U.S.S.R., Byelo-Russia, Ukraine, Yugoslavia. *Abstained*: Poland, Czechoslovakia.) The Conference was left uncertain therefore, as to whether the U.S.S.R. would accept proposals recommended to the consideration of the Council of Foreign Ministers by a simple