United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
TWENTY-FIRST SESSION
Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE, 1470th MEETING

Thursday, 1 December 1966, at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Chairman: Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

AGENDA ITEM 98

Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America (continued) (A/6399, A/C.1/L.369, A/C.1/L.385-387)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.1/L.369, A/C.1/L.385-387)

1. Mr. DJERMAKOYE (Niger) hoped that the time would soon come when military bases throughout the world would become unnecessary and would be dismantled. However, the risk of conflict still existed in many regions, compelling a number of countries to form alliances and to ask and offer military assistance. Military bases were one of the most effective forms of such assistance available to a government, not for purposes of aggression but to guarantee the security of its territory against any possible danger. It was true that some bases were designed to safeguard material or even ideological interests beyond the interests of the countries in which they were situated. The dubious aims of such bases could not, however, be used as a pretext for demanding the elimination of all bases, including those which served the legitimate needs of national defence. If a base had been established through free negotiations between two countries rather than imposed by force upon the host State, neither any individual Power nor the United Nations itself could validly object to it.

2. It was no secret that some bases, far from having been imposed by force, had been urgently requested by the host States, which considered them necessary to their security. Recent debates in the General Assembly had made it clear that such requests need not limit the sovereignty of States or in any way affect their foreign and domestic policy. For example, even though France was supplying assistance to Niger and the Ivory Coast, it pursued a policy of non-interference in those countries' affairs.

3. The problem was more complicated in the case of bases in dependent territories. The interests of the States to be established in the territories sometimes dictated that the bases should not be hastily dismantled. As the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo had said, what was important was that the territory must be free, at the time of its accession to independence, to decide whether a military base established on its soil by the metropolitan country should be maintained, and that the acceptance of a base must never be made a prerequisite to independence.

4. In view of the highly varied opinions that had been expressed on the subject, he suggested that consideration of the amendments should be deferred until the Committee had more clearly defined the different aspects of the problem of military bases and its relationship with denuclearization and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

5. Mr. AZNAR (Spain) said that the Liberian amendments (A/C.1/L.386), which included the principle of the sovereign right of any State to conclude a treaty for the establishment of military bases on its territory, would improve the Soviet draft resolution (A/C.1/L.369), but still left its scope limited to Asia, Africa and Latin America, forgetting the rest of the planet. The Togolese amendments (A/C.1/L.385) were more equitable, since they also referred to the continent of Europe.

6. The new draft resolution submitted by India, the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia (A/C.1/L.387) proposed that the record of the First Committee's debate on the question should be transmitted to the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, and his delegation wished to have its own views included in that record.

7. The central principle of the problem of military bases was the exclusive territorial sovereignty of the host State; the establishment of a base in a State's territory without its consent not only violated its territorial integrity and sovereign rights but created tensions and situations dangerous to international peace and security. Some treaties establishing military bases had expressed the freely accorded consent of the host States. Others, however, had been imposed upon the host States by force and must therefore be considered void. Article 50 of the International Law Commission's draft articles on the law of treaties[1/] stated that a treaty was void if it conflicted with a peremptory norm of general international law from which no derogation was permitted and which could

1/ See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Supplement No. 9, p. 16.

be modified only by a subsequent norm of general international law having the same character. Since Article 2, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Charter prohibited the threat or use of force, any treaty based on force was void ab initio.

8. What was the status of military bases established by virtue of treaties concluded in earlier times, when the use of force had been an admissible instrument of State policy? No doubt treaties concluded in those times, even under coercion, were valid; but their validity today must be subject to considerations arising from modern developments in international law. Such a treaty could not, for example, be a valid reason for refusing to comply with United Nations resolutions on decolonization.

9. The two classes of foreign military bases must be dealt with differently. In the case of bases established under agreements which reflected the free will of the States concerned and did not violate the essential principles of sovereignty and international law, those States themselves had the right to decide, in accordance with existing agreements, when the bases would be dismantled. On the other hand, where a base had been imposed on the host country by force and maintained as part of a colonial system, justice demanded that it should be made to conform to the principles of legality or, better still, abolished for ever.

10. The elimination of all foreign military bases was not practical at present, even though it was a desirable goal which must be achieved in the future. A beginning must, however, be made by dealing with the elimination of bases whose existence was contrary to justice because it lacked the consent of the local population or contravened United Nations resolutions. For that reason, his delegation intended to vote for the Togolese amendments.

11. Although he saw no reason for strongly opposing the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.387), he could not support it with any great enthusiasm. He hoped that transmitting the record of the First Committee's debate on the question to the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament would not mean simply consigning it to a magnificent tomb.

12. The question should not be considered in isolation but in conjunction with others with which the United Nations had concerned itself, such as that dealt with in resolution 2105 (XX), in which the General Assembly had requested the colonial Powers to dismantle military bases installed in colonial territories and to refrain from establishing new ones.

13. Mr. AJAVON (Togo) expressed appreciation to the sponsors of the three-Power draft resolution for having submitted a proposal which took the complexity of the problem into account. His delegation would support that draft resolution.

14. The purpose of his delegation's amendments (A/C.1/L.385) had been to give the Soviet draft resolution broader scope and to give explicit recognition to the sovereign rights of States. Though the Soviet draft would be improved by the Togolese and the Liberian amendments, it contained certain provisions unacceptable to a number of delegations, which considered that foreign military bases established on the territory of independent States with the free consent of the latter were not necessarily used for the purpose of direct intervention in the domestic affairs of peoples, and even less as a means of repression in the struggle for freedom and independence.

15. While he sympathized with the objectives of the Soviet draft resolution, it was desirable that the question should be referred to the Eighteen-Nation Committee, where it could be dealt with in a less tense atmosphere. He hoped that the Soviet delegation would withdraw its draft resolution.

16. He requested a separate vote on the first preambular paragraph of the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.387). His delegation would vote for the draft resolution as a whole but against the first preambular paragraph, because it strongly disapproved of the title of agenda item 98, believing that foreign military bases should be dismantled everywhere in the world without any discrimination.

17. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) said that in so far as military bases on the territory of foreign countries came within the concept of the use of force in international relations, they were generally to be condemned, particularly in the nuclear age, when preparation for peace was the only logical course. Such bases created tension in the areas in which they were located and were an anachronism, since war had become unthinkable. They were a part of the notion of the balance of power, which had become outdated as an argument for peace.

18. In the light of those considerations, the item under discussion should be transferred to the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

19. Military bases in foreign countries fell into two main categories. The first consisted of bases established with the free consent of the countries concerned, on terms of sovereign equality, by such means as bilateral or multilateral agreements. However, if that consent was withdrawn at any time, continuance of the base against the will of the country concerned would constitute a violation of territorial integrity and independence. In no case should such bases be used to threaten the sovereignty and independence of any country or to suppress the right of any people to freedom.

20. The second category consisted of military bases established in dependent territories, without the consent of the peoples concerned, whether they were bases established on territory under colonial domination or bases continued after independence as a legacy of colonialism. Such bases could serve as a springboard for intervention and were likely to cause unrest in their area. The United Nations had a particular obligation regarding them, under General Assembly resolution 2105 (XX). The Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Belgrade in September 1961 and at Cairo in October 1964 had taken a firm stand, which his Government endorsed, against the maintenance of foreign military bases.

21. His delegation had given careful consideration to the Soviet draft resolution and the amendments thereto, but it believed that the question could be more effectively examined within the context of disarmament.

It would therefore support the three-Power draft resolution, calling for transfer of the item to the Eighteen-Nation Committee.

22. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, recalled that at the Committee's 1451st meeting his delegation had deplored the existence of foreign military bases as a constant source of unrest, not only for the peoples of the territory where they were installed but for the neighbouring States; certain unpopular Governments, in an effort to remain in power, enlisted the help of imperialist Powers to frustrate the true desires of their people. The Guinean statement, which had been inspired primarily by the decisions of the Organization of African Unity, had been intended as a general statement, but the representative of the Ivory Coast had seen fit to quote from it, adding an admonition against inciting peaceful citizens of friendly countries to revolution by intervention in the domestic affairs and the civil wars of sovereign States.

23. His delegation hoped that the authorities of the Ivory Coast would heed that admonition and that they would, in particular, ensure that irresponsible groups from Guinea, who had sought refuge in the Ivory Coast and who called themselves "the Liberation Front of Guinea", were not allowed to make slanderous accusations against the Government and people of Guinea.

24. In conclusion, his delegation regarded military bases as a danger to the existence of small countries and a violation of the United Nations Charter, as well as of the Charter of the Organization of African Unity.

25. Mr. TOMEH (Syria), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, recalled that the Turkish representative had stated at the 1469th meeting that the Baghdad Pact and CENTO were intended to assist in the maintenance of international peace and security, and he had referred to the collective defence pact between the United Arab Republic and Syria.

26. His own statement had made no specific reference either to Turkey or to Iran, and Syria hoped to have friendly relations with the two countries.

27. However, he could not accept the view that Syria and the United Arab Republic needed the protection of the Baghdad Pact and CENTO, which had been rejected by the peoples of those countries because they believed that they endangered the security of the area. Those agreements were not directed against their countries' real enemy. Both the United Arab Republic and Syria had been attacked by a so-called State in the area, and that was the reason for the collective security pact between the two countries.

28. Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his delegation adhered to the statement it had made at the Committee's 1467th meeting and that it also adhered to the policy of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States. Accordingly, his Government, on whose territory there were several hundred thousand Guineans who, for various reasons, had fled from their homeland, had prohibited the use of its territory by Guineans for any movement against Guinea. In any case, he hoped that the Guinean representative would agree with him that there was no need to open a dialogue on a painful problem separating two fraternal States and he assured him that he had in no way intended to attack the Guinean Government or delegation.

29. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) said that, while he had no intention of engaging in sterile polemics, he had noted with interest the statement of the Ivory Coast representative that Guineans living in the Ivory Coast would no longer be authorized to make use of the territory or the radio of the Ivory Coast against the Republic of Guinea. Guinea, since its independence, had never maintained on its soil any group which planned action against an African State.

30. Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast) said that, in view of the Guinean representative's use of the expression "would no longer be authorized", he wished to state for the record that the Ivory Coast had never authorized any movements by Guineans directed against their country.

31. Mr. TINOCO (Costa Rica) said that his delegation supported the three-Power draft resolution because it felt that the method proposed could lead to a solution of the problem, which involved juridical and constitutional questions. While the existence of military bases might be the result of an abuse of force, it might also result from treaties concluded with the free consent of the parties, and such bases might have an important role to play in the defence of the country that had made its territory available for the purpose.

32. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the three-Power draft resolution, appealed to the Togolese representative not to press his request for a separate vote on the first preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. A separate vote on that paragraph would complicate the procedure for dealing with a draft resolution which was already itself procedural.

33. As a number of delegations had said that they would prefer to vote on the draft resolution on the following day, he asked for the voting to be postponed until then.

34. Mr. AJAVON (Togo) said that he would not press his request for a separate vote on the first preambular paragraph of the three-Power draft resolution. But at the General Assembly's twenty-second session the title of the item should be changed to read "Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa, America and Europe".

35. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections to the request for postponement, the voting would take place the following day.

It was so decided.

Organization of work

QUESTION RAISED BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF GUINEA CONCERNING A DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED UNDER AGENDA ITEM 93

36. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) said that his delegation was aware that, in accordance with the order of priorities established at the beginning of the session (A/C.1/933), the Committee should now proceed to consider agenda item 96 (Status of the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissability of Intervention in the

Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty). But he wished to draw the Committee's attention to draft resolution A/C.1/L.383 and Add.1-3, which his delegation and others had submitted under agenda item 93 (Withdrawal of all United States and other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations and dissolution of the United Nations Committee for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea) and which, in fact, they would be glad to submit under that item and item 31 (The Korean question: report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea).[2/] The draft resolution was purely procedural. It did not in any sense refer to the substance of item 93, and it was devoid of any controversial elements. It merely contained an unconditional invitation to the two parties concerned in the Korean question to participate in the Committee's discussions on the matter.

37. At the Committee's 1429th meeting, the Saudi Arabian representative had argued that it was wrong to wait until the end of the session before taking up the items on Korea, since there would not then be time for the two parties primarily concerned to send representatives to New York to state their views. The current session was due to end in less than three weeks. If the Committee were to adopt the procedure envisaged in the draft resolution, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea should be given sufficient time to select their representatives and arrange for them to attend the meetings at which the Committee discussed the substance of the Korean question. The Republic of Korea had an observer at United Nations Headquarters, but North Korea did not.

38. Accordingly, he proposed that draft resolution A/C.1/L.383 and Add.1-3 should be put to the vote at the current meeting.

39. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) supported the Guinean representative's proposal. It would be helpful if the two items on Korea could be merged. He hoped that, when the delegations of North and South Korea made their appeance in the Committee, the discussions would be conducted in an amicable and constructive manner and that ideological considerations, accusations and recriminations would be avoided. Koreans of North and South belonged to a single people and should not be divided. His country had always been opposed to the partitioning of States for reasons of political expediency. Some progress towards the unification of Korea could be made if the two great Powers were to create a propitious atmosphere for the discussions.

40. The United Nations should avoid the mistakes made by the League of Nations. It should not let its actions be guided by the selfish interests of individual Powers. If it did, it would come to grief as the League of Nations had done. The world would for ever be divided into spheres of influence, and small nations would become mere adjuncts of the major Powers.

41. Mr. FOSTER (United States of America) pointed out that the Committee still had to decide the order in which it would discuss the five remaining items on its agenda—the two items relating to Korea and the three items on outer space. The order in which those items were to be taken up should be settled before the Committee considered the Guinean representative's proposal.

42. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had decided at its 1430th meeting that, after completing consideration of the six items relating to disarmament, including item 98, it would proceed to the consideration of item 96. The Chair would abide by that decision unless, of course, the Committee now wished to amend it.

43. Mr. AJAVON (Togo) thought that delegations should not be asked to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.383 and Add.1-3 without giving it due consideration. He moved the suspension of the meeting.

44. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection to the Togolese motion, the meeting would be suspended.

The meeting was suspended at 12.35 p.m. and resumed at 3.30 p.m.

45. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that his delegation unreservedly supported the proposal of the representatives of Guinea and Saudi Arabia that the Committee decide about inviting the parties involved, that is, the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and those of South Korea, to take part in the discussion of the Korean question without waiting for debate on the substance of the matter. That procedure was dictated not only by considerations of equity and respect for the rights of the Korean people, but also by practical considerations. A decision must be made as soon as possible so as to enable the representatives to prepare to come to New York. A matter as elementary as inviting the parties concerned should present no obstacles, and there was no doubt that it would be difficult to undertake an objective debate without their participation. Nevertheless, artificial obstacles had hitherto unfortunately been raised to prevent the extension of an invitation to the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. There had been various conditions and reservations, and for obvious reasons: some members of the Committee were afraid to hear the voice of free, socialist Korea in the First Committee. They were even trying to keep Korea divided and to maintain their occupation forces in South Korea. That approach was intolerable because it was blatantly at variance with the Charter and with the most elementary procedure governing discussion of questions in the United Nations.

46. The ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.383 and Add.1-3) was as simple as it was clear: the Committee would decide "to invite unreservedly and simultaneously representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea—the parties directly concerned—to participate in the discussion of the Korean question". The Soviet delegation supported the draft resolution and believed it should be put to a vote at once. It could not accept the United States representative's proposal to defer debate on the question of inviting the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of South Korea.

2/ On 2 December 1966, the sponsors resubmitted the draft resolution under agenda items 93 and 31 (A/C.1/L.383/Rev.1).

It asked all members of the Committee to support the ten-Power draft resolution and to redress the injustice committed in the past with respect to the problem.

47. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania) noted that the ten-Power draft resolution did not touch on the substance of the issue. It was merely a procedural draft resolution intended to enable the Committee seriously to examine the two agenda items regarding Korea. At the beginning of the Committee's work the Saudi Arabian representative had rightly pointed out that, if the Committee wished to have representatives of the two Koreas take part in the discussion of the two items, then they must be invited in time to do so.

48. The United States representative had been correct in saying that no decision had been made as to the priority of items other than those dealing with disarmament and the inadmissibility of intervention. It was certainly not the Tanzanian delegation's intention to press for priority for the two Korean items. It only wished to ensure that the representatives of the two Koreas were invited early enough to enable them to attend the Committee's debate on questions involving them. It was that realistic attitude that led him to urge the Committee to vote on the ten-Power draft resolution immediately.

49. Mr. TINOCO (Costa Rica) wondered whether the draft resolution could be discussed before the Committee reconsidered its decision of 13 October as to the order of discussion of the various items.

50. The CHAIRMAN referred to the verbatim record of the 1430th meeting and pointed out that the Committee had established an order of priority, which had been followed up to the present. What the Committee was now discussing, as he understood it, was a proposal by the representative of Guinea that it consider beforehand an item not included in the established order of priority. Once it had decided to do so, it could discuss the question of inviting the Korean representatives. The Committee had not yet gone into the substance of the Korean question. It was discussing a procedural question, that is, whether it should agree to consider sending the invitations before continuing in accordance with the order of priority already established.

51. Mr. CORNER (New Zealand) believed it was wrong to state that the ten-Power draft resolution in no way touched upon the substance of the item concerning Korea. The seemingly very simple text departed significantly from procedural resolutions adopted by the Committee at previous sessions. In view of that fact alone, the draft resolution could not be regarded as purely and simply procedural.

52. The Committee was aware that the suggested invitations would have implications beyond the mechanical element of procedure in issuing them. For instance, could it be contended that an invitation to Mr. Smith's Rhodesian régime to take part in a United Nations discussion would be only procedural in its implications, and that no account had to be taken of previous Assembly decisions on Rhodesia? Would the same argument be sustained if the question of Germany were being discussed? With Korea, as with Southern Rhodesia and Germany, it was simply not possible to separate procedure from substance. Many members of the Committee, among them many Asian and Pacific members, knew the history of the problem intimately and had strong views on the nature of the so-called Government of North Korea, on its representative character and on the degree of its independence. They knew that it was a mockery to speak, as the Soviet representative had done, of the "voice of free, socialist Korea", just as many European nations had strong views on the régime in East Germany, and as nations throughout the world knew the nature of the Rhodesian régime.

53. For all those reasons, his delegation could not but oppose the draft resolution. Further, it was no secret that in due time there would be another draft resolution to examine on the question of invitations. As at previous sessions, the Committee could not come to a decision without considering the substance of the question, for what was involved was much more serious than the simple question of equity and respect for the rights of the Korean people. The Committee therefore could not make a "snap" decision, as had been proposed.

54. Several delegations, including those of Guinea and Saudi Arabia, had raised the question of time. That was a question which must be taken into account when the Committee considered the order of the five remaining items on its agenda. To avoid a long debate, he suggested that in the first instance the Chairman and other officers of the Committee should undertake consultations on the order of those items. There was no objection to the Korean items being considered immediately after the discussion of item 96, the last of the items on the order of which the Committee had agreed at the beginning of the session. But to interrupt the agreed order would be inadmissible, inasmuch as that would involve reversal of a decision the Committee had taken at its 1430th meeting.

55. Mr. CHURCH (United States of America) objected to the proposal that the Committee take up the ten-Power draft resolution, for, if it were to deviate from the decision it had taken at its 1430th meeting, its proceedings would become chaotic and delegations would have difficulty preparing for their work.

56. Moreover, the draft resolution under discussion was not related to any item on the agenda that day. It was even questionable whether its formal introduction was in order. It was therefore entirely contrary to the concepts of orderly procedure and fair play to insist that a vote be taken on a proposal which had been introduced without any advance notice and which was unrelated to the items on the agreed agenda.

57. Every member of the Committee knew that the proposal was controversial. They also knew that many delegations had different views on inviting representatives of North Korea to take part in the substantive discussion of the Korean item. The United States delegation had no desire whatever to prevent the Guinean proposal or any other proposal related to the same subject, from being considered and voted on early enough for the representatives of North Korea to have ample time to make the necessary preparations for their participation in the debate, should the Committee consider this desirable. But, in view of the rapidity of present-day communications and the immediacy with which proceedings at

the United Nations were followed, it seemed rather exaggerated to suggest that three weeks would be required to make the necessary arrangements.

58. There was no need for the Committee to go against logic or common sense. There was in fact a very simple way to meet the legitimate desires of all representatives, and at the same time to comply with the requirements of orderly procedure. The Committee could decide to devote one meeting in the near future to the organization of work. In the meantime, as the New Zealand representative had suggested, the Chairman could hold consultations to see if agreement could be reached on the order of the remaining items.

59. His delegation would have no objection to the Committee's discussing the two items relating to Korea immediately after it had concluded its consideration of the item still before it and, of course, of agenda item 96. The Committee would, however, be creating a very unfortunate precedent if it were to permit immediate action on a proposal which had been introduced in haste, without giving delegations an opportunity to consider it carefully, and in full knowledge that a different proposal would be submitted on the same subject.

60. Mrs. SAM SIDARETH (Cambodia), speaking as a sponsor of the ten-Power draft resolution, strongly supported the statements of the representatives of Guinea and the Soviet Union. As the General Assembly had approved the inclusion of two items relating to Korea in its agenda, the two parties concerned should be invited simultaneously to take part in the debate on the items, and the invitation should be sent in time for them to be present when the Committee took up item 93. Contrary to what had been said by the representatives of Costa Rica, the United States and New Zealand, the issue was merely procedural and should not take much time. Accordingly, her delegation earnestly hoped that the Committee would vote on the draft resolution as soon as possible.

61. Mr. CHIMIDDORJ (Mongolia) said that, since the question of Korea was on the Committee's agenda, it would be logical and just for all the interested parties to be represented and to have an opportunity of expressing their Governments' views. There was no need to look for precedents or motives. Justice should be the paramount consideration in organizing the Committee's work. The discussions and debates at earlier sessions of the General Assembly had shown that, without the participation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the debates on the so-called Korean question had not been very valuable or useful. That point had been stressed in statements by many representatives, and in the draft resolution the Saudi Arabian representative had submitted at the twentieth session (A/C.1/L.366).[3/] Many General Assembly resolutions contained references to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea. In its official documents, therefore, the General Assembly had recognized that there were two States in Korea. That situation was reflected in the ten-Power draft resolution. As there were two States in Korea, it was justifiable and logical to invite representatives from both their Governments. The participation of those representatives would not only be just and in keeping with the principles of the United Nations Charter. It would also contribute to the success of the Committee's work. Accordingly, his delegation asked the Committee to support the proposal that representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of South Korea should be invited forthwith to take part in the discussion, so that they could arrive in time to place before the Committee their respective Government's views on the substance of the question. He could not understand why the representatives of States which wanted the Committee to discuss the question of Korea were opposed to inviting representatives from one of the parties concerned. If those States believed that there was no Democratic People's Republic of Korea and that there was therefore no need to invite its representatives, why should the question be discussed in the General Assembly at all?

62. The New Zealand representative had violently attacked an Asian State—one of Mongolia's neighbours—in comparing its Government to the fascist government of the white minority in Rhodesia. That was an unprecedented statement, which should be rejected by all those who respected the right of peoples to self-determination. If representatives from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea were not invited to take part in the discussion of the Korean question, it was doubtful whether the discussions in the General Assembly would be of any value at all.

63. The United Nations could not go on discussing the Korean question and adopting the same resolutions year after year, without making any changes and without taking into account new situations and new events in the world.

64. The ten-Power draft resolution did not touch upon the substance of the matter. On the contrary, it was designed to ensure that the substance of the discussion would be as fruitful as possible. The question raised was purely procedural and could not be linked to the date when the question of Korea would be discussed. Allegations that the question had been raised at too short notice were groundless. In the first place, the Committee's agenda had been known since October. Secondly, the draft resolution had been submitted ten days previously.

65. As one of the sponsors, his delegation asked that the draft resolution should be put to the vote at once.

66. Mr. MATSUI (Japan) observed, first, that neither of the items relating to Korea appeared on the agenda for the meeting. It was, therefore, quite irrelevant to discuss draft resolution A/C.1/L.383 and Add.1-3, which had been submitted under item 93.

67. Secondly, the Guinean representative's suggestion amounted to a proposal to change the order of items already decided upon by the Committee. The reasons given for the proposed change were unconvincing, particularly as there had been no new important developments regarding the Korean question since the Committee's earlier decision on the organization of its work. Lastly, though the question appeared superficially to be merely procedural, it was

3/ See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Annexes, agenda item 32, document A/6221, para. 7.

closely connected with a substantive question. Moreover, many delegations who had understood that the items relating to Korea would be dealt with after the question of the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States had not yet had time to make a detailed study of the matter and were not therefore fully prepared to discuss it. The question was a complex and important one, and should not be dealt with in such a hasty and inopportune way.

68. On 6 October, when the Committee had originally discussed the order of discussion of agenda items, the Japanese delegation had suggested that items 31 and 93 relating to Korea should be placed at the end of the agenda and should be considered in their present numerical order, possibly on the understanding that the general debate could be conducted on both items simultaneously. It was therefore opposed to the Guinean representative's suggestion, but it agreed with the New Zealand and United States representatives that the Committee should meet in the immediate future to discuss the organization of its work.

69. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) said that he intended to deal solely with the order of the Committee's work. Since 1950, the Committee had been discussing the question of the unification and rehabilitation of Korea in the presence of representatives of one only of the two parties concerned. It had thereby complicated the question. If Korea were to be unified peacefully, steps should now be taken to simplify the matter again. In other words, a representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea should be present when the matter was discussed. He should be given time to make all the necessary arrangements before leaving for the first time after so many years to take part in the discussion.

70. The New Zealand representative had compared the Democratic People's Republic of Korea with the Ian Smith régime. But the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was not a colony. It was an independent State pursuing an entirely independent policy, unlike South Korea, which had often changed régimes under pressure from certain Powers. There was sufficient evidence of that in the international Press.

71. The procedural question regarding the invitation to be sent to the two parties should be settled as soon as possible, so that the Korean question could be discussed seriously and with all the necessary realism. Mention had been made of consultations. But discussions on procedural matters were consultations. Why was it not possible to take a decision at once? If the United States and other countries did not wish to invite the two parties, but only South Korea, that was their business. But realism, integrity and honesty dictated that both delegations should be present when the Committee was discussing the unification of Korea, which was of great importance to Korea as a whole.

72. Mr. TINOCO (Costa Rica) said that the Committee had, unwittingly and imperceptibly, changed the order of priority decided on at the beginning of October. After concluding its consideration of item 98, it should have taken up item 96. But it was now discussing a document relating to item 93. The foregoing discussion had demonstrated that the document before the Committee was not quite so simple as might have been thought at the beginning of the meeting. The Committee should now be asked whether it wished to alter the order of priority decided on in October, and to begin discussing item 93. If not, consideration should be given to the New Zealand representative's proposal.

73. Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba) said that while he did not wish to discuss the substance of the question of Korea, he categorically rejected the attacks made against the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

74. What he wished to emphasize was that the Guinean representative had not proposed a change in the order of work. Each year, the discussion of the Korean question had two aspects: one relating to substance and the other to form. The first aspect concerned the actual consideration of the various elements in the Korean situation, while the second concerned the consideration of the question of invitations.

75. The time had come for the Committee to break with a tradition which did it little credit. At the last session, the question of Korea and that of extending invitations to the two parties directly concerned had been taken up only two days before the close of the Committee's work. If the Committee had decided to invite representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, it would have been physically impossible for them to respond to the invitation within forty-eight hours. Even before deciding on the question of invitations, the Committee had observed that some thirty persons apparently representing the South Korean régime had entered the chamber. Such occurrences must be stopped once and for all.

76. The Guinean representative's proposal was logical. Its adoption would not call for immediate consideration of item 93. It would simply make it possible to decide the question of invitations. If the Committee decided to make the Korean question the next item on its agenda, following item 96, would it not be rather late to discuss the invitation to be sent to the parties directly concerned? The Committee would unquestionably consider the Korean question at the current session, and it should stop following a procedure which would make it possible for the party already in New York to participate in the debate while preventing the other from arriving in time.

77. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary), invoking rule 118 of the rules of procedure, moved that the debate should be closed and that the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.383 and Add.1-3) should be put to the vote immediately.

78. Mr. TINOCO (Costa Rica) said he thought that before voting on the draft resolution the Committee should decide whether it agreed to change the decision it had taken at its 1430th meeting concerning the order of discussion of agenda items.

79. The CHAIRMAN said he regretted to have to point out that under rule 118 of the rules of procedure, permission to speak on the closure of the debate on the item under discussion could be accorded only to two speakers opposing the closure.

80. Mr. HSUEH (China), speaking on a point of order, asked the Chairman to state what item was under discussion.

81. The CHAIRMAN found it strange that after several hours of discussion there should be any doubt as to the subject of the debate. As he had explained more than once, the Committee was discussing a motion by the Guinean representative to change the previously adopted order of discussion so as to permit consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/L.383 and Add.1-3.

82. Mr. IDZUMBUIR (Democratic Republic of the Congo) asked what would be the effect of the vote about to be taken. The draft resolution in question had been submitted under item 93. Since the closure of the debate had been moved, must the consideration of item 93 be regarded as completed?

83. The CHAIRMAN said that since item 93 was not yet under discussion, the Committee first had to decide whether it wished to change its order of work. If so, it would take up the aspect of item 93 to which the ten-Power draft resolution related; if not, it would continue its work in the order it had already established at the 1430th meeting.

84. Mr. MUDENGE (Rwanda) said it was his understanding that the point of order raised by the Hungarian representative concerned two completely different questions: closure of the debate, and consideration of the item relating to Korea.

85. The CHAIRMAN replied that the Committee would decide first on the closure of the debate, in accordance with rule 118, and then on whether it wished to change the order in which it had decided, at its 1430th meeting, to examine the items on its agenda.

86. Mr. KANE (Senegal) said that his delegation would oppose the Hungarian motion for closure of the debate, since it felt that the Committee should clarify the question further.

87. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea), speaking on a point of order, recalled that during the first part of the meeting he had made a proposal which amounted to a procedural motion for the Committee to decide on a point of procedure concerning a question whose substance it was soon to consider. He had not requested a change in the order established by the Committee at its 1430th meeting for consideration of the items on its agenda; in any case, consideration of the items affected by that decision had been almost completed. He had simply wished to save time by settling a procedural question which would facilitate the Committee's subsequent work. He regretted that the Committee had lost sight of the procedural nature of the Guinean motion and had dwelt on the content of the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.383 and Add.1-3). If some delegations wished to prevent the two parts of Korea from being heard by the Committee, then, to be sure, they had reason to oppose his proposal. However, if all delegations sincerely believed that both parts of Korea must be heard, now was the time to decide the matter. The Hungarian motion for closure related to the debate on the proposal he had made during the first part of the meeting, which would be put to the vote if the Hungarian motion was adopted; if his proposal was adopted by a simple majority, the Committee would then take up the draft resolution.

88. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the ten-Power draft resolution came under agenda item 93 and that the Committee must first decide whether it wished to consider that item; after that, it would take a decision on the draft resolution.

89. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) confirmed that that was his view and that three votes should therefore be taken: one on the Hungarian representative's motion for closure, one on the Guinean proposal that the Committee should take up the ten-Power draft resolution, and one on the draft resolution. He had hoped, however, that there would be no need to take any vote, since all delegations seemed to agree that both parts of Korea should be heard. The Committee could therefore tacitly take a decision to that effect.

90. Mr. SOURDIS (Colombia) expressed the view that the Guinean representative's proposal concerned two points: first, a change in the order of priority of the agenda items and, secondly, the question whether or not the Committee wished to invite the representatives of the two parts of Korea to participate in the debate. It had been his understanding that the Hungarian representative's motion for closure had concerned the first of those points and that the Committee would then consider whether the Guinean representative's proposal should be taken up. Whether one liked it or not, the proposal was one of substance, since not all the delegations agreed that the Committee should extend invitations to the representatives of both parts of Korea. There seemed to be an attempt to induce the Committee, by roundabout methods, to discuss a question other than non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States. If the Committee approved the proposal to change the order of priority of agenda items and discuss the invitation to be sent to the representatives of the two Koreas, it would automatically become involved in a debate that would prevent it for a long time from taking up agenda item 96, even though the latter item had priority according to the agenda already established. The agenda was not worked out merely as a matter of courtesy but was a commitment entered into between those who guided the debate and those who participated in it. His delegation had been prepared for discussion of the question of non-intervention and was not prepared to take a decision on short notice on the question of Korea. It therefore felt that the Committee could vote only on the question whether it wished to change its agenda.

91. Mr. TINOCO (Costa Rica) said that he fully appreciated the Colombian delegation's reservations, for he also felt that the Committee was conducting two debates at once—one on a procedural question and one on a question of substance. His delegation opposed closure of the debate on the substance, i.e. on the ten-Power draft resolution.

92. Mr. CHIMIDDORJ (Mongolia) asked the Chairman to apply rule 118 of the rules of procedure without further delay.

93. The CHAIRMAN noting that, in accordance with rule 118, two speakers had opposed closure, invited the Committee to decide on the motion for closure of the debate.

The motion was adopted by 70 votes to 3, with 21 abstentions.

94. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Guinean representative's proposal on the question whether the Committee should decide to take up draft resolution A/C.1/L.383 and Add.1-3. A roll-call vote had been requested. He wished to point out that once the voting had begun, he could not give the floor to any representative except on a motion relating to the actual conduct of the voting.

95. Mr. CHURCH (United States of America) said he wished to make it clear that if, contrary to his Government's wishes, the Committee approved the proposal to consider the draft resolution, his delegation would immediately introduce a draft resolution on the same subject. He would like to receive assurance that he would be able to submit a proposal on the substance of the matter.

96. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee was not at the moment called upon to take a decision on the substance of the draft resolution but only on the question whether it wished to consider it.

97. Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast) asked what majority would be required for the Committee's decision on the Guinean representative's motion. It seemed to him that the motion involved reversing a previous decision, since a change would be made in the order established for the consideration of agenda items.

98. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) said that his motion was merely a procedural prooposal on which a simple majority vote was sufficient.

99. Mr. SHAW (Australia) said that since the Committee would really be deciding to begin consideration of item 93, the question being put to the vote should be presented in those terms. It was inappropriate to consider a draft resolution under item 93 without first deciding that the Committee should take up that item.

100. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that since the Chairman had announced the beginning of voting, the Committee should proceed at once to take a vote.

101. The CHAIRMAN announced that the roll-call vote would begin with Brazil.

102. Mr. CORREA DA COSTA (Brazil), speaking on a point of order, said it was rule 124 that applied to the decision which the Committee was about to take, since it involved reversing a previous decision; hence, a third-thirds majority was required.

103. The CHAIRMAN, pointing out that the voting had begun, said that the Brazilian representative had not referred to the actual conduct of the voting, as provided in rule 129, but to its result. The Committee could perfectly well take a vote and then, after the voting was completed and the votes counted, decide whether rule 124 applied.

104. Mr. CORREA DA COSTA (Brazil) and Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast) said that it was of basic importance to make clear before the vote what majority was required, since otherwise it would not be possible to know what decision had been taken. The matter could be decided on the basis of rule 124.

105. The CHAIRMAN said that, although he was not competent to interpret the rules of procedure, he wished to point out that both rule 124 and rule 121, which was closely linked to rule 124, referred to "proposals", i.e. to draft resolutions, and not to decisions by the Committee. Since the question of the necessary majority had to do with the conduct of the voting and therefore came under rule 129, he would like to have the Committee's views on whether rule 124 was applicable.

106. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) said he agreed that the term "proposals" in the rules referred to draft resolutions, amendments and other documents, but not to questions relating to the organization of the Committee's work. The decision should therefore be taken by a simple majority.

107. Mr. OWONO (Cameroon) asked the Chairman if he would make it clear that the decision which the Committee was about to take involved reconsidering its agenda.

108. The CHAIRMAN said that there was a difference between the daily agenda indicated in the Journal, which related to the discussions to take place at each meeting, and the over-all agenda, which included all the items allocated to the Committee. The item to which the present discussion related was not on the agenda for the meeting but was part of the Committee's programme of work.

109. Mr. OWONO (Cameroon) said that what he had meant by the Committee's agenda was the decision it had taken at its 1430th meeting, following consultations among the delegations, with regard to the order of discussion of seven agenda items.

110. Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba) said that a two-thirds majority would have been required for the Guinean proposal only if the Committee had previously decided by a vote not to consider the question at the present meeting. However, that was not the case.

111. Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast) expressed the view that at its 1430th meeting the Committee had taken a genuine decision on a proposal by the Chairman, for document A/C.1/933 was entitled "Order of consideration of items on the agenda of the First Committee as approved at its 1430th meeting, on 13 October 1966". Hence, any decision by which the Committee reversed that previous decision would have to be taken by a two-thirds majority.

112. Mr. MUDENGE (Rwanda) said he agreed with the Chairman and other representatives that the rules of procedure made a distinction between "proposals" and "decisions", as could be seen not only from rule 121 but also from rules 130, 131 and 132. Rule 126 stated that "Decisions in the committees of the General Assembly shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting", i.e. by a simple majority.

113. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in order to extricate itself from the present impasse, the Committee should take a vote in conformity with rule 129 and then, before the result was announced from the Chair, decide whether rule 124 applied.

114. Mr. CORREA DA COSTA (Brazil) said he was still convinced that the proper procedure was to decide first whether rule 124 was applicable. He felt that the Committee had taken a decision at its 1430th meeting when it had adopted the Chairman's proposal concerning the order of consideration of items and the Chairman had stated that the items for which the order of priority had not yet been established were not of lesser importance and would be considered in due course in whatever order the Committee decided. If the vote which the Committee was about to take would change that decision, rule 124 should be applied. Since some delegations did not believe that to be the case, however, it was important to clarify the matter before taking a vote.

115. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary) said that since, in his view, rule 124 did not relate to the actual conduct of the voting, the discussion of whether or not it was applicable was at variance with rule 129. Rule 124 could not be invoked during the process of voting; he urged that, as the Chairman had suggested, the question of the applicability of rule 124 should be raised after the voting had taken place and before the result was announced.

116. Mr. OKOBOI (Uganda) and Mr. RAFAEL (Israel) asked whether it was possible to apply rule 119, which related to the adjournment of the meeting, so as to allow delegations time for reflection and avoid creating dangerous precedents.

117. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) said that he also wished to avoid creating precedents. If he had not been convinced of the good intentions of the Brazilian representative, he might have thought that the discussion just held had represented deliberate obstruction. If a request was now made for the suspension or adjournment of the meeting, he would be forced to conclude that the objective had in fact been to prevent the Committee from reaching a decision. Rule 129 left no room for misunderstanding. The voting had begun, and it would be advisable to complete it lest the rules of procedure should be endlessly invoked. The approach suggested by the Chairman was the most reasonable one, for the voting would make the general trend sufficiently clear to the Committee.

118. The CHAIRMAN said that he was sorry to have to declare the request of the representatives of Uganda and Israel for adjournment inadmissible, since it was his duty as Chairman to apply the rules of procedure as strictly as possible, though with the necessary degree of flexibility. If he allowed the Committee to depart somewhat from the rules of procedure the Committee would be entitled to accuse him of lack of authority. He therefore suggested that, as the voting had already started, the Committee should, in accordance with rule 129, proceed with the vote, since the vote was an expression of the will of each delegation and the fact that the Committee had not decided in advance what majority was required did not in any way affect the right of each voter. Once the votes had been counted, the Committee would decide whether rule 124 was applicable. If no one challenged his decision, which was not irrevocable, the Committee would vote at once on the Guinean representative's proposal that the Committee should consider the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.383 and Add.1-3.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Brazil, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Sudan, Syria, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria.

Against: Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, South Africa, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia.

Abstaining: Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Dahomey, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Iran, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Malawi, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, Tunisia, Upper Volta, Austria.

The result of the vote was 38 votes in favour, 37 against and 26 abstentions.

119. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the question whether rule 124 of the rules of procedure was applicable, i.e., whether a two-thirds majority was required for the adoption of the Guinea motion.

120. Mr. YANKOV (Bulgaria), speaking on a point of order, said that his delegation was not quite clear whether a formal proposal on the interpretation of rule 124 of the rules of procedure had been submitted. It had been his understanding that the Chairman had ruled that rule 124 was not applicable—which was his delegation's view—and that the Chairman's ruling had been accepted in accordance with rule 114 in the absence of a formal challenge.

121. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, when the application of rule 124 had been suggested, he had said that the term "proposal" should perhaps be interpreted in the sense of rule 121, but that he would consult the Committee on that point. There had thus been no ruling from the Chair. He had suggested that the Committee should be asked to decide, by a vote, whether or not rule 124 was applicable. Consequently, any objection to that procedure at the present stage would constitute an alteration of a decision taken by the Committee at the request of the Chairman.

122. Mr. DA COSTA (Brazil) said that he was in agreement with the Bulgarian representative, and he therefore moved formally that the Committee should decide immediately on the applicability of rule 124. The Chairman had indicated that he would come to a decision after the vote; there was there-

fore no reason to challenge a decision that had not yet been taken.

123. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that that was exactly what he had suggested: namely, that the Committee should vote on the applicability of rule 124.

124. Mr. IDZUMBUIR (Democratic Republic of the Congo) drew attention to the difficulty, at that late hour, of taking up a question of interpretation of the rules of procedure, namely, whether or not rule 124 was applicable. He therefore proposed that the Chairman should adjourn the meeting and ask the opinion of the Legal Counsel on the interpretation of rule 124.

125. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) said that it lay with the Committee to interpret the rules of procedure and that was exactly what the Chairman was suggesting in asking the Committee to vote on the applicability of rule 124. He accordingly asked the Chairman to call for a vote, and he hoped that the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo would not press his proposal.

126. Mr. IDZUMBUIR (Democratic Republic of the Congo) pointed out that, although the Committee had the right to interpret the rules of procedure for itself, it would nevertheless be useful for it to have the opinion of the Legal Counsel, which would not be a decision. The Committee could then take a vote on that opinion. He therefore maintained his proposal.

127. Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast) joined the representative of Guinea in asking the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo not to press his proposal and to leave it to the Committee to decide the question.

128. Mr. IDZUMBUIR (Democratic Republic of the Congo) withdrew his motion for adjournment.

129. Mr. OWONO (Cameroon) said that it was still not clearly established whether the vote that had been taken entailed an amendment of the order of priority of agenda items that had been decided upon. The representative of Rwanda had referred to rule 126 of the rules of procedure. The provisions of that rule, however, applied to votes on motions as well as to votes on proposals. He himself was still convinced that the vote that had been taken entailed an amendment of the order of priority that had already been adopted, and he asked the Chairman to clarify that point for the Committee.

130. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that a number of representatives had tried to lead the Committee into an impasse and it was now easy to see the reason for the stubbornness and obstructive spirit that some delegations had shown during the discussion. The Chairman had acted in accordance with the rules of procedure in putting the question to the vote. The vote was now over and the result was positive: the proposal that had been put to the vote had gained a majority. Consequently, the question had been disposed of and the Committee should now move on to the consideration of what it had already adopted; it should not go back and allow itself to be dragged into unprofitable debate.

131. Mr. MUDENGE (Rwanda), replying to the representative of Cameroon, said it was true that it was not altogether clear whether the word "proposal" used in the rules of procedure was to be understood to mean draft resolutions and amendments or any kind of proposal submitted formally. His delegation thought that any proposal, whether oral or written, came within the meaning of a "proposal" and that once it had been adopted it became a decision. His delegation was therefore inclined to think that rule 124 could be applied to the decision that had been taken.

132. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that the question of Korea had always, at successive sessions of the Assembly, been placed at the end of the agenda, with the paradox that everybody had agreed to invite both parties to the table. It so happened that the invitation had always been discussed either on the last day of the session or a few days before the end, so that it could never be acted upon. If the Committee prevaricated on that question under the cloak of the rules of procedure, it would mean postponing the question for another year without the United Nations having the benefit of listening to both sides.

133. With regard to the procedural point as such, questions of that kind had never required a two-thirds majority. Examination of the verbatim records of the Committees would show that there had always been a gentlemen's agreement on procedure and that a two-thirds majority was required only in the case of reconsideration of resolutions or proposals of a substantive nature.

134. To put off the question to a later date was to defeat the purpose of the United Nations. Small nations would thus be denied the right to hear both parties. He hoped there would be no procedural debate and no lobbying or voting by solidarity on a question that was vital to small nations. If they were not now given an opportunity to find out what the Korean question was all about, when would they be? Momentous events were taking place in the Far East, and perhaps those whom it was proposed to invite would have something interesting to tell. The United Nations must not become a laughing-stock by inviting both parties to the Committee table at the last minute. The question should be expedited so that the United Nations would have an opportunity to listen carefully to what both parties had to say, with a view to bringing about an agreement in the years to come.

135. Mr. TOMOROWICZ (Poland) said that the first vote had shown clearly the willingness of the majority in the Committee to continue discussing the problem with which draft resolution A/C.1/L.383 and Add.1-3 was concerned. That did not imply making any changes in the agenda or the sequence of the separate items. The Committee should therefore go ahead and decide on the invitations to be sent out, so that it could proceed, in accordance with its previous decision, to the discussion of the other items.

136. Mr. CHURCH (United States of America) said that, in taking the vote, the Committee had been fully aware that if the result was as it had actually turned out to be, the question whether rule 124 applied would have to be faced. The Chairman had suggested that the decision lay with the Committee, and it seemed to his delegation that the matter was quite clear. The Committee had decided upon the sequence in which certain items of the agenda would be considered, and

if a simple majority was to apply, that sequence would be changed. Some members had suggested that the word "proposal" was inapplicable in the present instance. He reminded the Committee that when, at the 1430th meeting, it had taken the decision on the order of discussion of agenda items, the Chairman himself had referred to the matter as a proposal—the very term used in rule 124. It seemed to him that the Committee must now face the question whether or not rule 124 was applicable, even if the question had to be settled without benefit of the precedents or of the scholarly opinion of the Legal Counsel. As far as his delegation was concerned, its position was in accord with what it understood to be the position of the Chairman concerning rule 124 and with the position taken by the representative of Brazil. The time had come to decide whether or not rule 124 governed the present situation.

137. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew the Committee's attention to the legal aspect of the question. The United States representative had stated that those who spoke of the utter illegality of any attempt to apply rule 124 to the present question based their argument on the fact that the rule was applicable to certain proposals but not to others. That was not the case. If rule 124 were read in conjunction with rule 121, and if the two rules were looked at from a common sense point of view, it was impossible not to be convinced that "proposal" meant any proposal concerning the substance of items on the agenda of the Committees or of the Assembly. Over the twenty years since the United Nations was established, there had been no precedent such as the United States representative was now trying to establish. There had been no instance where the vote on the question of the order of discussion of the various items of the agenda had been made subject to the application of rule 124, once a Committee or the Assembly had decided that the sequence should be changed. In no instance over twenty years had the United Nations regarded questions concerning the order in which the various agenda items should be discussed as questions of substance to which rule 124 was applicable. Whenever an Assembly Committee took a decision on the substance of a question on the agenda, the decision could be changed only by a two-thirds majority, and that was true of all proposals. However, in the case in point, there was no question of a proposal in the sense referred to in the rules of procedure. It was not even a question of going back on a decision taken by the Committee in regard to the sequence in which the items of its agenda should be examined. The Committee was only concerned at the moment with one part of a question which, while admittedly very important, was nevertheless a procedural one.

138. Now that a majority had voted in a democratic fashion and with due regard to the rules of procedure, anyone in the position of the United States delegation should, as a matter of dignity and prestige, admit defeat and bow to the decision taken. He urged the United States delegation and all who felt inclined to support its proposal to reflect on the dangerous precedent it would set for the first time since the United Nations had come into being. If such a precedent were admitted, whenever the Committee decided to change the order of discussion of agenda items, a single vote less than a two-thirds majority would be sufficient to produce an absurd situation. Representatives should decide the matter in a dignified manner with due regard to their prestige. Moderation was desirable in all things; and it was especially desirable in regard to attempts to introduce unlawful and undesirable methods of upsetting a decision after a vote had been taken in conformity with democratic principles. That was a matter of principle, and the problem could have repercussions going far beyond the limits of the question at present before the Committee.

139. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said there were several different ways of solving the procedural question. It could be solved by a ruling from the Chair, bolstered with legal arguments. The alternative was a precedent from the records, and it should be pointed out that a two-thirds majority had never been required for a procedural matter, let alone in regard to the order of the items on the agenda.

140. The Committee should not be used to serve individual interests. Whatever the motives of the United States and the Soviet Union, decisions should be taken on the basis of texts and rules, and the rules were clear. People should learn to be good losers, and precedent showed that in the case in point the Soviet representative had been right and the United States representative wrong. The United Nations must above all be jealous of its rules; if it merely played politics, the Organization would not be able to transcend egocentric national interests. Every representative must be honest with himself and observe the rules of procedure and precedent. He wondered why objections should be raised when the majority of members of the Committee considered that the Korean question should be dealt with first, particularly when the question was procedural and therefore did not require a two-thirds majority.

141. He asked the Chairman to consider the three possibilities before the Committee. The first would be for the Chairman to give a ruling, and that would hardly be wise. The second would be for the Chairman to consult with the two Powers now taking a strong position on the issue and let the Committee know the result, although the Committee would be at liberty to oppose them both if they came to an agreement which contravened the rules of procedure. The third possibility would be to adjourn the meeting until the next day.

142. Mr. DENORME (Belgium) said there was a fourth possibility, namely, to apply rule 118. He therefore moved the closure of the debate on the question.

143. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) moved the adjournment of the meeting under rule 119 of the rules of procedure.

144. The CHAIRMAN, applying the order of priority laid down in rule 120, put to the vote the motion for adjournment of the meeting.

The motion was adopted by 73 votes to 4, with 13 abstentions.

145. The CHAIRMAN informed the representative of Cameroon that he would furnish the explanation requested at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

Litho in U.N. 77101—August 1967—2,150