



SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

1503rd MEETING: 20 AUGUST 1969

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1503)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND THIRD MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 20 August 1969, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. J. DE PINIES (Spain).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Algeria, China, Colombia, Finland, France, Hungary, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Zambia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1503)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Letter dated 17 August 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Ireland addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9394).

Adoption of the agenda

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The provisional agenda for today's meeting of the Security Council is contained in document S/Agenda/1503. Is there any objection to the adoption of the agenda.

2. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I wish to speak on a matter of principle which is of the greatest consequence to the United Nations, and indeed to every Member State. The principle is set out in the Charter. It is a fundamental principle, the principle—to quote the Charter—that:

“Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State ...”.

3. The principle of domestic jurisdiction is fundamental for us all. If it were breached, if it were eroded, the consequences for the United Nations and for all of us would be most serious. It needs no effort of the imagination to realize that if this necessary safeguard were no longer accepted and respected and effective, the way would be wide open to the encouragement of disunity and division and disorder. No sovereign State would be free from such a threat. We all know this very well. There is no representative in this Council, nor indeed in the United Nations, who would be prepared to accept unwelcome interference in the domestic national affairs of his country.

4. The principle of domestic jurisdiction is essential to all our efforts as Member States of the United Nations. It is surely our duty not to flout it but to support it. That we must do by opposing the inscription of the item now submitted to us. It is not putting it too strongly to say that

to do otherwise would undermine the agreed basis in international law on which the United Nations Organization rests.

5. In dealing with this basic issue of domestic jurisdiction I carefully avoid any substantial reference to the letter which you, Mr. President, have received from the Foreign Minister of the Irish Republic. Moreover, I shall resist any temptation to be drawn into debate on anything but the principle which is of such fundamental consequence to us all. It is that question and nothing else which is before us now.

6. So much for the question of principle. No member of the Council, I am sure, will doubt its overriding importance.

7. With reference to the letter from the Foreign Minister of the Irish Republic, it is only necessary to state certain facts. Northern Ireland is and has long been an integral part of the United Kingdom. The people of Northern Ireland elect representatives to the Parliament at Westminster by adult universal suffrage. Events in Northern Ireland are accordingly an internal matter for the United Kingdom Government. It is within the competence of the Government of the United Kingdom to restore and maintain order. That we are doing. A United Nations force is unnecessary and inappropriate. It is unnecessary because my Government is already taking action. It is inappropriate because United Nations intervention against our wishes would be in violation of Article 2 (7) of the Charter.

8. The situation in Northern Ireland is under control and there is no question of that situation being in any way a threat to international peace and security.

9. The letter from the Foreign Minister seeks to raise the question under Article 35 of the Charter, but we cannot accept that there are grounds or right to do so. In any event, Article 2 (7) is clearly overriding. Neither Article 35 nor any other article can possibly be regarded as prevailing over the specific provisions of Article 2 (7).

10. I would add that my delegation has always been amongst those that consider that this Council should meet to consider all issues properly raised before it. But this issue cannot be properly raised. In this case it is not in the interests of the Council—indeed it would be in direct violation of those interests—to debate a matter outside its competence. At the same time none of us will neglect to take into account the added danger that public debate in this Council would inflame feelings and reopen old wounds, and could well prejudice all the efforts now being so urgently directed to maintenance of order and to the

equally important task of restoration of the confidence and security of all concerned.

11. I trust that we shall at once deal with the important issue of principle before us. I trust that we shall by our votes uphold the principle of domestic jurisdiction.

12. By so doing we shall not only be acting in accordance with the Charter. We shall also, so I am convinced, be making a contribution to the restoration and maintenance of order in Northern Ireland. That is a purpose which I am sure is shared by us all, including most certainly the Foreign Minister, who has already been in close and recent consultation with my Government and will no doubt continue to be so.

13. All of us will hope that nothing done or said here will add to the difficulties and dangers of the situation. All of us will hope that nothing done or said here will complicate or confuse or inflame a situation which calls out for restraint and patience and conciliation. All of us join, I am sure, in hoping to see a rapid and sustained improvement in a situation which has caused us such deep concern.

14. It is with this hope in mind that I appeal to all members of the Council to confine comment to the procedural question before us, and to decide that the principle of domestic jurisdiction must be upheld.

15. Mr. JAKOBSON (Finland): Lord Caradon has just asked the Council to reject the provisional agenda for this meeting on the ground that the questions raised by the Government of Ireland are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United Kingdom. My delegation too has doubts about the right of the United Nations under the Charter to intervene in this matter.

16. We are concerned, however, about the possibility that in the event the agenda is not adopted we shall have disposed of the matter without hearing the representative of the Member State which has brought this matter before the Council. The Foreign Minister of Ireland has come to New York for this purpose, and we believe it would be fair and a matter of courtesy to let him have his say. To do so would in no way prejudice the question raised by Lord Caradon, and I believe it could be done in a manner that would make it clear that this would not constitute a precedent for future procedure.

17. With that in mind I would now propose that the Security Council, before taking a decision on its agenda, invite the Minister for External Affairs of Ireland to make a statement to the Council in explanation of the request contained in document S/9394.

18. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I would like to say that I very much appreciate the spirit in which the representative of Finland has spoken. He knows and I know and we are all aware of the fact that the hearing of representatives from outside the Council before the adoption of the agenda is unusual and I think there are few, if any, precedents for doing so.

19. Nevertheless, for the reasons and on the basis which has been proposed by the Ambassador of Finland, and as a

matter of courtesy to the visiting Foreign Minister who is with us, I would certainly raise no objection to this proposal and I look forward to hearing what the Foreign Minister has to say to us.

20. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The members of the Council have heard the proposal made by the representative of Finland, which the representative of the United Kingdom has kindly decided not to oppose. If I hear no objection to that proposal, I shall take it that the Security Council, before deciding on the adoption of the agenda, invites the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ireland to make a statement to the Council in explanation of the request in document S/9394.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. P. J. Hillery (Ireland) took a place at the Council table.

21. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I should like to welcome His Excellency the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ireland Mr. Patrick J. Hillery and invite him to make a statement.

22. Mr. HILLERY (Ireland): May I thank you, Mr. President, and the members of the Council for affording me this opportunity to be heard at this stage of the proceedings.

23. Members of the Council will have seen the letter of 17 August which was addressed to the President of the Security Council by the Permanent Representative of Ireland [S/9394]. That letter set out very briefly the considerations which led my Government to seek this urgent meeting of the Security Council. I should like now, with your permission, to elaborate, for the information of the Council, the immediate and proximate causes which have given rise to the present tragic situation in our country and which have led my Government to request the urgent dispatch of a United Nations peace-keeping force to the Six Counties of Northern Ireland.

24. Before doing so, I should like to comment on the objections to consideration of the item which have been raised by the representative of the United Kingdom. Lord Caradon has contended that the Council should not discuss the matter on its provisional agenda because, in his view, it falls exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of his Government. With all due respect, I do not think that the Council should accept Lord Caradon's contention.

25. My delegation is, of course, well aware that Article 2 (7) states:

"Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State . . .".

Although we in Ireland have lived for some time with the reality of British control of the North of our country, we do not in any way concede to them the right to exercise jurisdiction there. What happens there can never be a matter of indifference or unconcern to people living in the independent part of our national territory, particularly at a time when our compatriots in the North are driven to seek

refuge with us, as many of them are now doing. What happens there can also vitally affect our relations with Great Britain.

26. The Six Counties, after all, do not constitute a geographically isolated area, but are an integral part of the island of Ireland and an important part of a country which throughout history has been universally regarded as one unit. This historic unity of Ireland is so self-evident as not to require argument. The claim of the Irish nation to control the totality of Ireland has been asserted over centuries by successive generations of Irish men and women, and it is one which no spokesman for the Irish nation could ever renounce. The representative of Great Britain is certainly aware that that claim has been asserted and sustained without interruption up to the present day, and it has never been conceded that a unilateral action on the part of the British Government could sunder an entity which nature and history have made one.

27. Moreover, I wonder whether in fact Article 2 (7) has always been applied in the clear-cut, rigid manner which the representative of Britain implies. I would recall, for instance, that the United Nations—in actual fact the General Assembly, but Article 2 (7) speaks of “the United Nations”—is accustomed, and rightly so in the view of my delegation, to discuss year after year the question of *apartheid* in South Africa, even though the Government of South Africa maintains that that is not a proper subject for discussion, by virtue of Article 2 (7).

28. I might also point out that in a letter [S/5543]¹ of 15 February 1964 the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom suggested that the Security Council should deal with the tension existing between the Greek and Turkish communities of Cyprus, although Cyprus had been for several years a sovereign State and a full Member of the United Nations. I recognize that, in formulating that request on Cyprus, Sir Patrick Dean invoked the fact that Britain was a guarantor under the Treaty of 1960. Nevertheless, I do not see how the British delegation could reconcile the stand taken then by it, to the effect that the internal tensions in Cyprus were a proper matter for discussion by the Security Council, with its rejection now of any competence of the Security Council in the matter before the Council today.

29. My Government has no doubt whatsoever that the present situation in Northern Ireland is grave and could become aggravated to a degree which would create a major problem both in Northern Ireland and in relations between Great Britain and Ireland, both independent Members of the United Nations. I know that the representative of Great Britain maintains that this situation can be handled satisfactorily by his Government. With all respect, I beg leave to doubt that. After all, the immediate cause of the present disturbances in the North was a parade that took place in the city of Derry on 12 August—eight days ago. That parade, described as that of the Derry Apprentice Boys—not boys but a Protestant sectarian organization—took place against the express wishes and warnings not only of my Government but of responsible opinion both in the

Six Counties of Northern Ireland and in Great Britain itself. Far from being a harmless procession to commemorate events almost three hundred years old, that parade, which took place in a predominantly Catholic and nationalist city, was, in the words of a British weekly, *The New Statesman*: “a deliberate provocation by Protestant extremists, reminding the Catholic inhabitants of the province, in the most blatant and humiliating manner, of the ascendancy under which they have suffered for nearly 300 years.”

30. On 1 August—prior to that parade of 12 August—on behalf of my Government, I had travelled to London to express privately our grave fears of the consequences of allowing the parade to take place. I received assurances from the British Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Mr. Michael Stewart, that the situation was under control and that no civil disorder was anticipated—the same combination of assurances as we heard here today. I heard also what we have just heard here: I was told frankly that the matter was none of mine or my Government’s business. In the event, the Council and the whole world have witnessed the effects of the tragic folly of the Six-County Government in allowing that parade to go on and the profound misjudgement exhibited by the British authorities who claim ultimate responsibility for the Six-County area.

31. The disturbances in Derry spread quickly to other towns and cities in the Six-County area, notably to Belfast. They have led to the deaths of eight people, widespread destruction of property, the virtual collapse of the civil machinery of law and order and, finally, the employment of British troops. On 13 August the Head of my Government addressed the nation. He voiced the concern of the Government and the people of Ireland at the tragic events that had taken place in Derry and elsewhere in the North and expressed our apprehension for the future. It was evident, he said, that the Belfast Government was no longer in control of the situation and that the Royal Ulster Constabulary was no longer accepted as an impartial police force, but that the employment of British troops was not acceptable, nor would such troops be likely to restore peaceful conditions. He then revealed that the Irish Government had requested the British Government to apply immediately to the United Nations for the urgent dispatch of a peace-keeping force to the Six Counties. The British Government rejected that request. Consequently, on 15 August, on the decision of my Government, I travelled to London once again to urge the British authorities to reconsider the request for a United Nations peace-keeping force or, if they found themselves unable to accede to that, to agree to the dispatch of a joint Irish and British peace-keeping force to the area concerned. That suggestion also was rejected by the British Government.

32. In those circumstances and in conformity with Ireland’s stated policy of seeking every legitimate means to end the present crisis, I have come before the Council to request the inscription on the Council’s agenda of an item relating to the present situation in the Six Counties; specifically to request the dispatch to Northern Ireland of a United Nations peace-keeping force. To explain the need for a peace-keeping force, and specifically an impartial force, I must explain that the breakdown of law and order

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Nineteenth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1964*.

and the plight of the minority in the area of the Six Counties have their origins in the partition of Ireland, an act of fundamental injustice.

33. Partition was accomplished by the British Government as a concession to an intransigent minority within the Irish nation. Ireland was divided as a result of an Act of the British Parliament in 1920, an Act in favour of which not one Irish vote, either North or South, was cast and, I might say incidentally, an Act which explicitly contemplated the reunion of Ireland. In pursuit of our declared policy of seeking to bring about reunification by peaceful means, my Government has sought national reconciliation through economic and other forms of co-operation so as to eliminate the barriers of mistrust and prejudice.

34. The Six-County régime, however, has been reluctant or unable to bring about the basic reforms of the social and political structure of Northern Ireland which would give meaning to this approach, which would bring some improvement in the plight of the minority in the Six-County area.

35. In recent months a movement has grown up within the Six Counties aimed at securing basic civil rights for the minority. The civil rights movement focused attention on the disparity between the declared constitutional equality of all the citizens of the United Kingdom and the actual, real predicament of the minority in the Six Counties. By concentrating attention on the plight of the minority which is denied basic civil rights in voting and is discriminated against in employment and housing—in fact, is denied its rights of equal access to the fundamentals of a dignified life and citizenship—the civil rights movement aroused the conscience and evoked the sympathy and solidarity of people in the Six Counties and the remainder of Ireland, and indeed secured the attention and sympathy of men of goodwill everywhere. Movements for civil rights inevitably bring about what has been called a revolution of rising expectations on the part of repressed and disfranchised minorities. Likewise such movements may exacerbate the opposition of those elements within the entrenched majority who would see the granting of such rights as a threat to their economic or political hegemony. When, in addition, the Government is lukewarm in its commitment to reforms, or is so weak as to be open to coercion by intransigent and reactionary forces among its own supporters, then the expectations of the minority, however just or modest they may be, are likely to be thwarted and their frustration is likely to express itself in violence. All those factors are present in the situation in the Six Counties. And the Government of Six Counties, by allowing the provocative parade on 12 August, further aggravated the situation and sparked the recent conflagration.

36. The calling of British troops was and remains a confession of the Six-County Government's manifest inability to maintain control impartially. The troops were requested by the Six-County Government, but they are responsible directly to Westminster. Thus, the Six-County Government can no longer claim to be able to enforce the law and maintain the civil order through its police forces which are distrusted and even detested as partisan by the minority.

37. Obviously an impartial peace-keeping force was required. British troops have been employed to maintain order. They have been received by the citizens of Derry and Belfast—but, I think, as the lesser of two evils. The use of British troops alone is unacceptable because British troops constitute a basic factor in the perpetuation of partition.

38. The partition of Ireland, as I said earlier, was accomplished by the British Government as a concession to an intransigent minority within the Irish nation as a whole. Once partition was accomplished, what had been a national minority was transformed into a local majority in that north-eastern part of our country which was partitioned off. That position could be sustained only through military support from outside. The presence of a foreign—British—force in Ireland and the intransigence of the Northern Unionists remain the two elements in the division of Ireland. The Irish Government believes and has never failed to reiterate that the only lasting settlement to the recurring cycle of discrimination, bitterness, violence and reprisal is the reunification of our country.

39. Our history has meant that British troops are a hindrance, not a help, to a lasting settlement of our differences. We have maintained that differences between Irishmen can be settled only by Irishmen without interference from our nearest neighbour. We are not alone in that belief. It is evident that a growing body of responsible opinion in Britain itself agrees with us. I should like to quote from *The Sunday Telegraph* of London of 17 August, which stated:

“The British Government, in this sudden emergency, had no option but to send in troops. But let there be no pretence that this is a token of continued responsibility, or that they are there to stay until peace is restored. There is no will for such a task in this country”—that is, referring to Britain. “We no longer care enough. Ulster is a very near country which we know nothing about. Its problems do not speak to our hearts”—the reference again is to British hearts. “It is close at hand but light years away in matters of emotion. If one British soldier is killed, the cry for withdrawal here will make America's revulsion against the Viet-Nam fighting seem like the twittering of sparrows. This is the truth that must be faced. It is an Irish problem not a British one. Temporarily, we are undertaking a peace-keeping role, as we have done in many parts of the world. But not for long; certainly not for ever. The Protestants and the Catholics must make their own peace.”

40. I have taken advantage, Mr. President, of the kind invitation extended by you and the members of the Council, as a result of the helpful and friendly proposal of the representative of Finland, to set forth certain considerations which in the view of my delegation should lead the Council to deal with the request conveyed in our letter. I recognize that the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom may lead certain members of the Council to pause before they agree to inscribe the item, inasmuch as by doing so they might feel that they would seem to be taking sides on a territorial issue. But that would not, I submit, justify the Council in refusing to inscribe the item.

41. I have explained how the persistent denial of their civil rights to a large part of the population of the Six Counties has been the immediate cause of the demonstrations and protests which have taken place in that area over recent months. My delegation maintains that that aspect of the matter alone would be sufficient to justify the Council's considering our request. And I think that the representative of Britain could not maintain that such a course would be in conflict with the Charter.

42. In the address he delivered on 14 October 1968, in the general debate at the twenty-third session of the General Assembly, the British Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs gave considerable place to the importance of the strict observance of human rights and in that section of his speech he made the following statement, which I quote from the provisional verbatim record of the 1693rd meeting of the Assembly:

"Article 56 of the Charter makes it clear that no country can say that the human rights of its citizens are an exclusively domestic matter. A country that denies its citizens the basic human rights is by virtue of Article 56 in breach of an international obligation."²

43. It is the urgent hope of my delegation that the members of the Council, in taking a decision on inscription of this item, will give due weight to the desirability of meeting the preoccupations of a Member State which is sincerely anxious to find through the United Nations a means of defusing the tensions which prevail in the North of Ireland and obviating the risk of those tensions mounting, spreading beyond the area itself and leading to friction between two neighbouring Member States. It was in that spirit that my Government decided to bring the matter before the Council. We sincerely trust that our hopes will not be disappointed, that the Council will not close the door to our appeal, and that, in particular, it will not appear to have pronounced negatively—and perhaps inadvertently so—on the merits of a national issue which has been a source of constant concern and preoccupation to the Irish nation during the last fifty years.

44. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, the Government of Ireland has submitted a request that the Security Council be urgently convened to consider the situation in Northern Ireland. An explanation of this step by the Irish Government is given in the letter dated 17 August 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Ireland to the United Nations, Ambassador Cremin, addressed to the President of the Security Council. A detailed statement in explanation of that request by the Government of Ireland has just been made to the Council by Mr. Hillery, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ireland, who is in New York especially for this purpose.

45. The Soviet delegation supports Ireland's request for the convening of the Security Council in response to its request. Mr. President, the facts show that the policy of the United Kingdom authorities towards Northern Ireland is designed to maintain that country in an unequal position.

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1693rd meeting, para. 109.

The United Kingdom authorities are encouraging the division of the population of Northern Ireland on religious lines. This can be seen, in particular, from the fact that the right to form a government and establish other organs of authority has been granted to only one religious community—the Protestants. Discrimination on other grounds is also flourishing. The civil rights of the overwhelming mass of the population have been curtailed.

46. The United Kingdom Government must take steps to put an end to the persecution of those who are fighting to remove the causes of inequality and discrimination in Northern Ireland, so that the necessary conditions can be created for the solution of problems in conformity with the wishes of the people of Northern Ireland.

47. I waive consecutive interpretation.

48. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): First of all, I wish to refer to the careful and restrained speech which has been made to us this morning by the Foreign Minister of the Irish Republic. He and others will not be surprised to learn that there are a number of statements which he made with which I could not possibly agree. But I said when I spoke before that I did not propose to be drawn into a debate on the substance of the issue which was reported to us in the Foreign Minister's letter, for the very good reason that I have maintained and still strongly maintain that this is a matter within the jurisdiction and responsibility of my Government.

49. I would however say a few words to the Council on the main points which have been raised by the Foreign Minister today.

50. First I shall comment on the constitutional question. Then I should make, as he did, a special reference to human rights because that is an essential matter in this respect. And then I would like to refer to the role of the British troops and to the decisions taken by my Government as they deal with this difficult and indeed dangerous situation.

51. I am anxious, as I said before, and I believe that we are all anxious that nothing should be said here which adds to the intense feelings, adds to the suspicion, adds to the fear and hatred which are at the core of the human problem with which we are concerned.

52. On the question of the constitution, this is not an international matter. It is true that the Irish Republic in its Constitution states that the national territory consists of the whole island of Ireland. But the Irish Republic has over the years recognized the fact of partition and has accepted its consequences. I could give many specific examples, but it is sufficient to say that the Prime Minister of the Republic of Ireland has had several meetings with the Head of the Government of Northern Ireland to discuss such matters, for instance, as the establishment of a joint tourist board and co-operation over a joint electricity supply.

53. There is no justification for a contention that this is an international question. We are dealing with a fact—the fact of the existence of the United Kingdom which includes Northern Ireland.

54. I know the Foreign Minister seeks the same purposes as we seek, the purposes of reconciliation and the reduction of intense feeling and the restoration of order.

55. I wonder if he takes into adequate account the dangers of an attempt at intervention. I had better not use my own words but in speaking about the old fears which we have to take into account I quote from what was said in *The New York Times* of this morning:

"Moves by Dublin to reopen the partition question, to resist the use of British troops in Northern Ireland—something Ulster's Catholics favour—and now to press for a United Nations peace-keeping force undoubtedly are aggravating these fears."

56. We have watched in the last few days the arrival of British troops in Northern Ireland. We have seen how they have been welcomed by the people. We have seen how they have discharged their duties with an absolute impartiality. No peace-keeping force could have approached this problem and carried it out with greater fairness to all concerned, as is well recognized throughout the whole population of Northern Ireland. We talk about a peace-keeping force. A peace-keeping force is there. No better peace-keeping force could be there. Talk about a peace-keeping force being introduced against the wishes of the country concerned is a contradiction in terms. I speak about the arrival of British troops and their reception, and I also speak about the urgent action which my Government has taken, is taking and will continue to take to restore and maintain the situation.

57. I do not wish unduly to delay the Council but I think it will be of interest to those who watch from outside to hear the actual words of the declaration which was made by my Government in London yesterday. These are the words of the declaration made at No. 10 Downing Street yesterday:

"The United Kingdom Government reaffirm that nothing which has happened in recent weeks in Northern Ireland derogates from the clear pledges made by successive United Kingdom Governments that Northern Ireland should not cease to be a part of the United Kingdom without the consent of the people of Northern Ireland or from the provision in section one of the Ireland Act, 1949 that in no event will Northern Ireland or any part thereof cease to be part of the United Kingdom without the consent of the parliament of Northern Ireland. The border is not an issue.

"The United Kingdom Government again affirm that responsibility for affairs in Northern Ireland is entirely a matter of domestic jurisdiction. The United Kingdom Government will take full responsibility for asserting this principle in all international relationships.

"The United Kingdom Government have ultimate responsibility for the protection of those who live in Northern Ireland when, as in the past week, a breakdown of law and order has occurred. In this spirit, the United Kingdom Government responded to the requests of the Northern Ireland Government for military assistance in

Londonderry and Belfast in order to restore law and order. They emphasize again that troops will be withdrawn when law and order has been restored.

"The Northern Ireland Government have been informed that troops have been provided on a temporary basis in accordance with the United Kingdom's ultimate responsibility. In the context of the commitment of these troops, the Northern Ireland Government have reaffirmed their intention to take into the fullest account at all times the views of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, especially in relation to matters affecting the status of citizens of that part of the United Kingdom and their equal rights and protection under the law.

"The United Kingdom Government has welcomed the decisions of the Northern Ireland Government relating to local government franchise, the revision of local government areas, the allocation of houses, the creation of a Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration in Northern Ireland and machinery to consider citizens' grievances against other public authorities which the Prime Minister reported to the House of Commons at Westminster following his meeting with Northern Ireland Ministers on 21 May as demonstrating the determination of the Northern Ireland Government that there shall be full equality of treatment for all citizens. Both Governments have agreed that it is vital that the momentum of internal reform should be maintained.

"The two Governments at their meeting at 10 Downing Street today have reaffirmed that in all legislation and executive decisions of government every citizen of Northern Ireland is entitled to the same equality of treatment and freedom from discrimination as obtains in the rest of the United Kingdom, irrespective of political views or religion. In their further meetings the two Governments will be guided by these mutually accepted principles.

"Finally, both Governments are determined to take all possible steps to restore normality to the Northern Ireland community so that economic development can proceed at the faster rate which is vital for social stability."

58. That declaration made yesterday represents the determination of my Government and the Government of Northern Ireland to face the difficulties which now exist, and the dangers, and to deal with them fearlessly until they are properly resolved.

59. It is quite right that special attention should be paid to human rights. I accept what the Foreign Minister has said in that matter. It is not a question of denial of human rights—it is a determination that human rights shall be respected, shall be established and protected.

60. The particular section which I read of the formal declaration issued yesterday with regard to human rights cannot fail to convince members of this Council that our determination in this matter—the determination to achieve equality—will be pursued relentlessly. This is the best answer to those who seek that human rights in Northern Ireland should be respected and protected.

61. I might add that the Civil Rights Movement in the North is directed not to the transfer of Northern Ireland from the United Kingdom but to internal reforms. The greater number of the demands of the Civil Rights Movement have been accepted. The programme of reform is under way. The principle of equality of treatment and freedom from discrimination was publicly and solemnly confirmed as recently as yesterday.

62. I do not wish to speak in regard to the intervention which we heard from the representative of the Soviet Union just now except perhaps to note that he spoke with a restraint which is unusual in his case. I hope that we can all approach this problem with the determination to avoid any word which might make the situation more difficult.

63. Sir, I go back to the contention which I made originally. We have gone out of our way and departed from established practices in order to pay respect and courtesy to the visiting Foreign Minister and enable him to speak to us today. I would most earnestly again represent to the members of this Council that to breach the principle of domestic jurisdiction would have most serious consequences not only for the individual members of this Council but for the United Nations itself.

64. On the suggestion of the representative of Finland we were prepared to vary our practices in order to pay respect to a Foreign Minister whose purposes I am sure are basically not different from ours.

65. I have heard in the consultations which have taken place today a suggestion that it might be the wish of this Council that, having heard what the Foreign Minister has to say we should adjourn our meeting. I would have thought, Mr. President, and we had expected that we would now proceed in a normal and straightforward manner to vote on the adoption of the provisional agenda. I would say to you, Sir, that we would not complain if the Council decided to adjourn. But I should make it very plain that we should accept such a decision on the clear understanding that the wish of the Council is not to accept and proceed with the item proposed.

66. I have already put forward the arguments which we consider are overwhelming against doing so.

67. Mr. MUUKA (Zambia): My delegation has listened with great attention to the statements made this morning by the Minister for External Affairs of the Republic of Ireland and the Ambassador of the United Kingdom. Those of us who have had the advantage of watching at close quarters what has been happening in the Six Counties of Northern Ireland will agree that the situation existing there at the moment is a tragic one indeed. The very fact that we have the Minister for External Affairs of Ireland among us is an indication that that is the case. Indeed, the representative of the United Kingdom has underlined that; and, if I may say so, the very fact that the United Kingdom Government, which is so much opposed to the idea of using force in the solution of political questions, has seen fit to send troops to that part of the United Kingdom more than demonstrates the gravity of the situation.

68. The question before us is whether or not to adopt the agenda. It is our feeling, a feeling which is shared by other members of the Security Council, that in the light of the statements made this morning it might be wise of the Council to adjourn a decision on that question. Accordingly, I would formally propose that in accordance with the rules of procedure, and in particular rule 33, paragraph 2 the meeting be adjourned.

69. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The members of the Council will have noted that the representative of Zambia has submitted a motion to adjourn the meeting under rule 33, paragraph 2, of the rules of procedure. Since that type of motion must be decided without debate, I propose to put it to a vote immediately.

70. If there is no objection to the motion submitted by the representative of Zambia, I shall declare that it has been unanimously adopted and that it is therefore the desire of the Council that this meeting be adjourned.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre librairie ou adressez-vous à: Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Напишите справки об изданиях в нашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
