U. N. BID TO EGYPT VETOED BY SOVIET
By THOMAS J. HAMILTONSpecial to THE NEW YORK TIMES.
*New York Times (1857-Current file);* Mar 30, 1954; ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2002
pg. 7

# U. N. BID TO EGYPT VETOED BY SOVIET

## Vishinsky Kills Council Move Urging Suez Canal Passage for Israel-Bound Ships

By THOMAS J. HAMILTON
Special to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., March 29—A resolution calling on Egypt to remove restrictions on passage of Israeli-bound ships through the Suez Canal was vetoed today by the Soviet Union in the United Nations Security Council.

Eight members, including the United States, voted in favor, the Soviet Union and Lebanon voted against, and Nationalist China abstained.

It was the fifty-eighth Soviet veto, and was the second time in three months that the Soviet Union had vetoed a resolution on the Palestine question that was supported by the Western powers and opposed by the Arab states.

On Jan. 22 Andrei Y. Vishinsky vetoed a Western resolution taking the Israeli side in a dispute with Syria over the development of electric power from the Jordan River. However, Mr. Vishinsky abstained last Nov. 24 when the Security Council adopted a Western resolution expressing "the strongest censure" of an Israeli raid on the Jordan village of Kibya.

Both Leslie Knox Munro of New Zealand, the author of the Suez resolution, and Sir Pierson Dixon, the British representative, upbraided Mr. Vishinsky today for vetoing the resolution. They expressed concern over the effect this would have on the prestige of the Security Council.

### Veto Called Distressing

Mr. Munro declared that the "inherent reasonableness" of the resolution had been shown by the vote in favor. He expressed "the greatest regret" of his Government over an action that, he declared, would harm the future of the Security Council.

Sir Pierson recalled that Sir Gladwyn Jebb, his predecessor, had said that Mr. Vishinsky's veto of the Jordan River resolution was "a melancholy and sinister event," and declared that the veto today was even more distressing.

He recalled that the Soviet Union had merely abstained on the original Suez resolution in September, 1951, and declared that the new resolution would merely have recalled the 1951 resolution, noted "with grave concern" Egypt's non-compliance, and called upon Egypt to comply with it.

Mr. Vishinsky, in his speech before the veto, merely termed the resolution "unacceptable," without going into details except to say that its basic error was that it attempted to impose a decision that was unacceptable to Egypt. He called for direct Israeli-Egyptian negotiations.

Later Mr. Vishinsky struck back at his New Zealand and British critics, declaring that the Soviet Union had abstained in 1951, despite misgivings over the resolution, in the hope that it might accomplish something. He insisted, however, that it had proved "absolutely useless," and again urged direct negotiations.

### Egypt Promises Tolerance

Dr. Mahmoud Azmi, the Egyptian representative, who had earlier told the Security Council that Egypt would not comply with the resolution if it was adopted, said after the vote that Egypt "of its own free will" would now be willing to follow "a policy of tolerance," and that "threats" would only stiffen Egypt's attitude.

Egypt had contended that the restrictions on Israel-bound shipping were justified by international law, since the Palestine war was halted only by an armistice and there was still no peace treaty.

Abba S. Eban, the Israeli representative, said his Government would re-examine its position as a result of the fact that while Security Council resolutions favorable to the Arab states were allowed to pass, none recognizing Israel's rights under the Armistice Agreement "appears capable of adoption."

Mr. Eban said that a majority of United Nations members were against Egypt's stand on the Suez question, and it is believed that Israel, having obtained nothing in the Security Council, may appeal the issue to the General Assembly, which will meet in September.

Israel had previously been thinking about appealing to the Security Council the refusal of Jordan to agree to direct talks about compliance with the Armistice Agreement, but may give up the idea now, in view of the Soviet Union's open and continued support of the Arab states.

The United States and British delegations, at the request of the latter, conferred today on the latest in the growing list of Israeli-Jordanian incidents, in which, according to Jordan, nine Jordanian citizens were killed. No immediate appeal to the Security Council is planned and the talk centered on the possibility of getting Israel to end its boycott of the Israeli-Jordanian Mixed Armistice Commission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.