**DEBATE ON TODAY**
By THOMAS J. HAMILTON Special to The New York Times.The New York Times by Er...
*New York Times 1857-Current;* Nov 1, 1956; ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2002)
pg. 1

# DEBATE ON TODAY

## Council Votes, 7 to 2, for Study of 'Actions Against Egypt'

*Excerpts from U. N. speeches are printed on Page 16.*

By THOMAS J. HAMILTON
Special to The New York Times.

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., Oct. 31—The Security Council tonight called an emergency session of the General Assembly to make recommendations on the "actions undertaken against Egypt."

The Council did not say whether it was referring to the Israeli attack Saturday or the British-French attack today, or both.

The vote was 7 to 2, with two abstentions. The United States joined with the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Nationalist China, Cuba, Iran and Peru in overriding British and French protests against the decision. The decision was not subject to the veto.

The two Western powers contended that the procedure for calling emergency sessions of the Assembly did not apply in this case. Australia and Belgium abstained.



The New York Times (by Ernest Sisto)

**DISCUSS CALL TO GENERAL ASSEMBLY: At the U. N. yesterday Sir Pierson Dixon, left, of Britain, Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, center, and Henry Cabot Lodge Jr., United States representative, discussed proposal to summon General Assembly on Mideast.**

### Boycott Question Raised

Sir Pierson Dixon, British representative, and Louis de Guiringaud, acting French representative, told the Council after the vote that their Governments reserved "complete freedom of action" concerning the decision.

[In a bitterly divided House of Commons, Hugh Gaitskell, Labor party leader, charged Prime Minister Eden with an act of "tragic folly."]

Later they declined to say whether this meant that Britain and France would boycott the emergency session, which will begin tomorrow at 5 P. M. The General Assembly's regular 1956 session will begin Nov. 12, but the foes of the British-French action felt the Egyptian situation would not permit a delay.

The proposal for a special session was made by Yugoslavia last night when the Council took up an Egyptian charge that Britain and France were planning an act of aggression. No resolution on the merits of the case was introduced, although the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and Iran were bitter in their denunciations.

### Hammarskjold Attacks Vetoes

Dag Hammarskjold, United Nations Secretary General, who was the first speaker, also condemned the Israeli and British-French attacks. Without naming them, he made what United Nations officials said was an attack on the two vetoes last night by Britain and France, which killed Soviet and United States resolutions calling for a cease-fire between Israel and Egypt.

Mr. Hammarskjold said he had planned to bring each of these issues before the Security Council. He emphasized that his office required him to be "a servant of the principles of the [United Nations] Charter," and added:

"Were the members to consider that another view of the duties of the Secretary General than the one here stated would better serve the interests of this organization, it is their obvious right to act accordingly."

### Not an Offer to Resign

United Nations officials said later that Mr. Hammarskjold was not offering to resign, but was saying that if any member disliked the role he had played in the Palestine and Suez questions, they should make known their objections.

Henry Cabot Lodge Jr. of the United States immediately took the floor to praise Mr. Hammarskjold's activities and ask him to continue. Similar expressions came from other delegates opposing the British-French action, including Arkady A. Sobolev of the Soviet Union. The British and French delegates joined in the praise with less enthusiasm.

Five votes in favor of a special session were assured at the start of the Council meeting,

**Continued on Page 16, Column 8**

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

# General Assembly Is Meeting For Special Session on Mideast

Continued From Page 1

but the backers were uncertain whether they would get the two additional votes required. In fact, India and other countries not members of the Council were exploring the use of a different method—to poll the seventy-six members and determine if there was a majority in favor.

This, however, would have required two days. The matter was settled when Mr. Lodge and Dr. T. F. Tsiang of Nationalist China announced that they would vote for the Yugoslav proposal. The seven were thus assured. Mr. Lodge exchanged congratulations with Dr. Joza Brilej of Yugoslavia after the vote tonight.

Earlier in the meeting the British and French representatives renewed their defense of the attack on Egypt following Egypt's rejection of their ultimatum yesterday. They insisted that their aims were to safeguard shipping using the canal and to restore peaceful conditions in the area.

Sir Pierson told the Council his Government had information that the danger of "a major clash between Israel and its Arab neighbors had become more imminent" than at any time since the Palestine war ended in 1949.

He denied a charge by the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia that the Israeli and British-French attacks were part of a common plan.

"I think," Sir Pierson said, "we can all understand why the representative of the Soviet Union would wish to invent such stories in view of his own country's troubles in East Europe."

The British delegate emphasized also the recent cool relations between Israel and Britain as proof that there was no coordination. He said the Israeli attack was a violation of the Israel-Egyptian armistice.

M. de Guiringaud also emphasized the importance of the canal to the shipping of all countries. He said France felt that the Israeli attack was "only an episode in the permanent state of hostilities" between Israel and Egypt. "The time had come to take measures likely to prevent any repetition of these incidents," he added.

Mr. Sobolev, who led the attack on Britain and France, said the Council should condemn them as aggressors and should call for the immediate withdrawal of their forces. He said he was ready to offer a resolution to that effect, but did not do so for unexplained reasons. He may have thought it would be vetoed by Britain and France.

### Iranian's Attack Bitter

The most biting attack came from Nasrollah Entezam of Iran—a country that, after Egypt's nationalization of the canal's operation last July, joined the Western powers in the proposal to set up international operation of the canal.

Mr. Entezam said the only "excuse" for the action was the contention that threats to peace existed in the Suez Canal area. If Egypt had created a threatening situation, he said, Britain and France should have gone to the Security Council and Egypt would have had to explain sending troops.

"An excuse of that kind," he added, "coming from those who had themselves sent troops, is completely unjustified."

It is expected that foes of the British and French action will propose a resolution in the Assembly along the lines suggested by Mr. Sobolev. However, the legal debate in the Council tonight may be resumed in the Assembly.

The procedure for calling emergency sessions of the Assembly was set up in 1950 under the "united for peace" resolution, proposed by Dean Acheson, then Secretary of State. In the aftermath of the Korean war this was adopted as a means of using the General Assembly, instead of the Security Council, to deal with acts of aggression if a veto prevented the Council from acting.

However, the two British-French vetoes were cast last night while the Council was considering the item submitted by the United States, "The Palestine Question: steps for the immediate cessation of the military action of Israel in Egypt."

Today, however, the Council was considering a different item, the Egyptian protest against the British-French attack. Accordingly, the only item on the agenda was a letter from Egypt submitting the protest.

The British and French representatives insisted, therefore, that the emergency procedure did not apply because no resolution on this issue had even been submitted, and still less had there been a veto.

Mr. Lodge, who had not spoken in the debate since his tribute to Mr. Hammarskjold, contended the Yugoslav resolution was neverthless in order. Dr. Tsiang agreed with the British and French contention, but said it was a technical argument and was really an invitation to have some one submit a resolution that would be vetoed.

The Council then rejected the British-French contention that the Yugoslav motion was out of order and adopted it. However, Mr. Lodge and other members agreed after the vote that the Assembly would take up the vetoed United States resolution, which called on "all" members of the United Nations to refrain from the use of threat or force in the area.

Thus it was not clear, as far as the Security Council is concerned, which attacks the Assembly could take up. In the United States view both are covered.

In any event the special session can take up any issue whatever if a two-thirds majority votes in favor, and it is expected that it will in fact debate the entire Egyptian problem.

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