

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 542nd

MEETING

Wednesday, 10 December 1952, at 10.30 a.m.

Headquarters, New York

## CONTENTS

Page

The Tunisian question (A/2152, A/C.1/736, A/C.1/737, A/C.1/L.8 and A/C.1/L.9) ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	231
--	-----

Chairman: Mr. João Carlos MUNIZ (Brazil).

### The Tunisian question (A/2152, A/C.1/736, A/C.1/737, A/C.1/L.8 and A/C.1/L.9) (*continued*)

[Item 60]\*

#### DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY PAKISTAN (A/C.1/L.9)

1. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the general debate be interrupted in order to consider the proposal made by the representative of Pakistan at the previous meeting (A/C.1/L.9).

2. Mr. VAN LANGENHOVE (Belgium) said that his delegation, which had previously stated (538th meeting) that it did not consider the United Nations competent to deal with the Tunisian question, could not support the proposed appeal to the French Government. Moreover, it considered such an appeal useless since the French Government had taken its decision after careful consideration of the various consequences of such a decision.

3. As to paragraph 2 of the Pakistan draft resolution, he pointed out that, as Tunisia was under French protectorate, it was through France that its foreign affairs were conducted. In the United Nations, the functions which the protecting Power enjoyed were exercised by the representatives of France, who were recognized as such by the General Assembly. Since the credentials of the representatives of France had been recognized by the General Assembly, they must also be respected by the First Committee. The Committee could not confer competing credentials on other individuals, regardless of their qualifications or status. If the Committee allowed itself to become involved in this procedure, it would follow that the same people could be effectively represented by different organs which might be defending contradictory points of view. Such a practice would imperil the very co-existence of States. For these general considerations, his delegation would vote against both paragraphs.

4. Mr. MOSTAFA (Egypt) noted that the Chairman of the French delegation had, at the 392nd plenary meeting, stated the views of his Government on the Tunisian question. France, of course, was one of the parties most directly concerned and the Egyptian delegation would like to see the French delegation resume its place in the Committee. However, the Bey of Tunis and the Tunisian people were also directly concerned and it was necessary, therefore, to ascertain the Tunisian point of view.

5. Certain delegations had stated at the previous meeting that they had no first hand information on the question. The presence of a representative of the Tunisian Chief of State in the Committee would facilitate the work of the Committee and, moreover, it would be in conformity with the constant practice of the Organization. When the United Nations had dealt with the future of a country, it had always granted a hearing to the representatives of the country concerned. Accordingly, the Egyptian delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution of Pakistan.

6. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) said that adoption of the Pakistan draft resolution would help the Committee to ascertain the truth by hearing the parties. It had been customary in the various Committees of the General Assembly to invite the parties to express their views, so that the Assembly's judgment would always be unbiased. The delegation of Iraq regretted the absence of the French delegation and wished, through the draft resolution of Pakistan, to renew its appeal to France to take part in the present debate.

7. The other party was a sovereign, who had a treaty relationship with France. Aside from that relationship, he should also be heard because he exercised such great influence in the affairs and destiny of his country.

8. If the Bey had asked to come before the Committee, the representative of Belgium could have raised the point that he should conduct his foreign affairs through France. However, it was the Committee which was asking him to take part in the discussion. The Committee was entitled to invite any person from a country which was under discussion.

\* Indicates the item number on the agenda of the General Assembly.

9. Finally, he wished to state that the United Nations was dealing with the destiny of a nation and a people. It must either recognize them as equals who should participate in the discussion of their problems, or consider them as inferiors, backward and not deserving to be heard. In this connexion, he invoked the spirit of the Charter, which required the United Nations to respect the Tunisians and their Sovereign and to receive his views on the problem so that it could make a sound and fair judgment on the whole issue.

10. Mr. DE SOUZA GOMES (Brazil) said that his delegation was not indifferent to the arguments advanced in support of the Pakistan draft resolution. It agreed that, in so far as possible, both parties should be heard on any issue under discussion before a decision was taken. It even willingly conceded that the presence of a duly accredited representative of the Bey of Tunis might help the Committee to resolve a number of the contentious issues which had arisen during the debates.

11. His delegation had always regretted and continued to regret the absence of the French delegation and, accordingly, was in no position to pronounce itself against representation of the other party. He wondered, however, whether it would be wise to invite a representative of the Bey of Tunis at that late stage of the debate. Moreover, he wondered what the practical implications of such an invitation would be. Would the general debate be adjourned pending the arrival of the representative of the Bey?

12. The Arab-Asian draft resolution (A/C.1/736) and Latin-American proposal (A/C.1/L.8) agreed on one central point: that the issue at stake was fostering the resumption of negotiations between France and the representatives of the Tunisian people. If those negotiations were resumed, it was evident that the Bey would have ample opportunity to state his views and to defend the national aspirations of his people.

13. Moreover, the Committee was at the procedural stage of the Tunisian question. If the Committee had the idea of resuming the consideration of the substance of the question and if a decision were to be taken which involved the future of the Tunisian people, then it would indeed be necessary that such invitation should be extended as expeditiously as possible.

14. Mr. de Souza Gomes pointed out that the Bey of Tunis had made no direct request to be represented. It had always been the practice of the United Nations to limit such invitations to cases where a formal request had been submitted. He wondered on what ground the Committee could, at that late stage of the debate, send an invitation to the Bey of Tunis.

15. Accordingly the Brazilian delegation would abstain from voting on the proposal of Pakistan.

16. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that his delegation supported the proposal of the delegation of Pakistan.

17. The participation of a representative of Tunis in the debate as a party directly concerned would enable the Committee to obtain valuable information as to the state of affairs in Tunisia, and that, in turn, would make it possible for the Committee to understand better

the situation there. That was why his delegation would vote in favour of the Pakistan proposal.

18. Mr. COATON (Union of South Africa) stated that there was one simple principle by which the Committee should be guided in determining whether a representative of the Bey of Tunis should be heard and that was whether such a hearing could legally and properly take place in accordance with the Charter.

19. The Charter gave the right of petition only in one case, namely, in respect of Trust Territories. Certainly there was no such right in respect of territories such as Tunisia and Morocco, which fell in an entirely different category and whose foreign affairs were conducted by the Government of France.

20. He wished to cite two examples of unsuccessful attempts in the past to arrange oral hearings of a political and unconstitutional character, similar to one which was now being suggested.

21. Firstly, there was the proposal in 1948 to invite General Markos to appear before the First Committee in connexion with the Greek question. The sponsors of that proposal had argued that no organ of the United Nations had ever heard the point of view of the Greek Democratic Movement and that it would, therefore, be in the interest of the Committee's consideration of the problem if someone could appear before it to represent that point of view. The representative of Greece had argued that there were certain limits defined both by the Charter of the United Nations and by the unwritten charter of international conduct beyond which the Organization could not go. He had described the proposal as an effort to offend a self-respecting government. The Brazilian representative had described the proposal as improper and incompatible with the principles and purposes of the United Nations, which was an association of sovereign governments. The representative of Paraguay had stated that the policy of his Government was to promote the rule of international law and that it was, therefore, impossible for his delegation to support that proposal. That proposal had been rejected (171st meeting) on a roll-call vote by 50 votes to 6, with no abstentions.

22. In connexion with the same agenda item, it had been proposed that the First Committee should grant a hearing to a certain Mr. Porphyrogenis, on the ground that the Committee should obtain an unbiased picture of the real situation in Greece. The representatives of the United States, Syria, Greece, and the United Kingdom had spoken against that proposal. The United States representative had remarked, *inter alia*, that it was not the custom of the General Assembly to give hearings to individuals; the representative of Syria had pointed out that the rules of procedure of the General Assembly did not provide for hearings of individuals and that it would be useless to discuss the proposal when the Committee was not authorized to take such a step.

23. The South African delegation fully agreed with the views to which he had referred. They constituted a complete case against the proposal before the Committee. His delegation would ask those who still had any doubts on the matter to reflect carefully before lending their support to such dangerous action, which would have the most serious repercussions upon the whole future of the Organization.

24. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) pointed out that the proposal was that the Committee should extend an invitation to a sovereign, not to any ordinary individual.

25. Mr. COATON (Union of South Africa) stated that he had been referring to an individual appointed by the Bey of Tunis.

26. Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom) stated that, as the Committee knew, his delegation did not believe that the Committee was competent to discuss the Tunisian question at all. It followed that it would also be out of order for the Committee to decide to hear a representative of the Bey of Tunis. Furthermore, the debate might result in a great deal of harm.

27. No one seemed to dispute the fact that the conduct of the foreign affairs of Tunisia was, rightly or wrongly, the responsibility of the Government of France. Consequently, if a duly accredited representative of the Bey were to appear before the Committee, it would have to be someone whose credentials were countersigned by the French Resident-General in Tunisia, or his representative. Under the circumstances, nobody was likely to feel that that was very probable. It followed that if some person claiming to be the representative of the Bey came before the Committee, he would almost certainly, from the legal point of view, prove to be only a private individual. In this connexion, Sir Gladwyn Jebb quoted the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, who had stated at the 13th meeting of 14 November 1952 that it was contrary to the practice of the political Committees of the General Assembly to hear private individuals. He could not think that the members of the Committee were unaware of the dangers of establishing the practice of allowing private individuals to appear before the Committee. There were very few members of the Committee who would not be gravely embarrassed if private citizens from their own countries were asked to air in the Committees of the United Nations criticisms of their own Government's domestic policies.

28. Mr. JESSUP (United States of America) pointed out that article 6 of the Treaty of Bardo contained an undertaking of the Bey of Tunis that he would conclude no act having an international character. If the Bey accredited a delegate to come to the United Nations to argue the question whether France had complied with its obligations under the Treaty, he would be acting contrary to that provision.

29. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan, in his address to the Committee (537th meeting), had referred to certain principles concerning the interpretation of treaties in connexion with the treaties between France and Morocco. He had quoted from opinions of the Permanent Court of International Justice to the effect that treaties should be interpreted according to certain legal maxims; and the result of the application of those maxims was to obtain an interpretation favourable to the position of Tunis. Mr. Jessup believed that it was well agreed and supported by international jurisprudence and by doctrine that the whole basis of interpreting a treaty was to find out what the parties had intended. It might be said that the parties did not have in mind the question of the procedures of the United Nations. But who could doubt that if they had contemplated an international organization, they would

have thought that that provision would apply to international organizations as well as to bilateral international relations? The spirit of the treaty was obviously along these lines.

30. Mr. Jessup said that he did not wish to leave the matter only as a legal one. The representative of the USSR had said that the invitation would give the Committee valuable information. But, as he had tried to explain before, the Committee was not concerned with collecting information about Tunisia, because it was not a court collecting evidence and trying to pass judgment on that basis. The best thing the Assembly could do was to try to create an atmosphere in which negotiations between France and Tunisia could proceed in a calm and forward-looking manner. That would not be accomplished by extending the proposed invitation to the representative of the Bey of Tunis.

31. Accordingly, the United States delegation would vote against the draft resolution of Pakistan.

32. Shaikh ALIREZA (Saudi Arabia) stated that it was with a sense of gratitude that his delegation supported the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Pakistan. His delegation concurred wholeheartedly in the appeal to France to reconsider its position. He pointed out that the proposed invitation to the Bey of Tunis was in accordance with the precedents established in the cases of Libya, Palestine, Eritrea and Somaliland.

33. Mr. CHARLONE (Uruguay) said that the draft resolution which had been co-sponsored by his delegation (A/C.1/L.8) did not assign responsibility with regard to the substance of the matter, since his delegation felt that the United Nations was not able to come to a judgment on the substance merely on the basis of the statements of the parties. The Committee was an assembly of the representatives of States and Governments, and its functions were political rather than judicial. It was, therefore, improper for it to act as a tribunal which would consider evidence and decide what was the burden of the evidence.

34. His delegation had always regretted the absence of France. It felt, however, that another appeal to that country would be in vain, because France had based its absence on the ground that the United Nations was not competent to deal with the Tunisian question. As for inviting a representative of the Bey of Tunis, his delegation believed that it would be inexpedient, despite the respect it had for the Bey.

35. Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) said that the absence of the parties did not serve the Committee's aim of bringing the opposing points of view closer together. There had been general expressions of regret at the absence of the French delegation and of hope for a reconsideration of that position. Several delegations had remarked upon the lack of first-hand information on Tunis and of official Tunisian views. It would therefore be useful to invite a representative of the Tunisian sovereign who could clarify the exact situation and the reasons for the dispute.

36. The representative of the United States had pointed out that a treaty prevented the Bey from engaging in any international commitments; but the Committee would merely ask a representative of the Bey

to give them an understanding of the situation. The treaty which bound the Bey had been imposed and the Bey desired to free himself from it. That treaty therefore could not be invoked to prevent the progress of Tunisia towards self-government. It should be recalled also that the United States had recognized the authority of the Bey during World War II, when President Roosevelt had addressed a request directly to the Bey concerning the passage of United States troops through Tunisia.

37. It was reasonable to appeal to France to reconsider and help the Committee find a solution. It would be proper too to ask the Bey to present his views through a representative. That procedure would aid the Committee in bringing the parties together.

38. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) said he appreciated the motives behind the Pakistan draft resolution. At first sight it might appear that that procedure would clarify the debate and lead towards a solution. However, the basic objective of the draft resolution presented by the Arab-Asian group as well as of the Latin-American draft resolution was to put an end to the crisis through the immediate resumption of negotiations, with a view to bringing about self-government for the Tunisians. The Committee was not concerned with an exhaustive inquiry into all aspects of the Tunisian problem. Mr. Belaunde therefore believed that the Pakistan proposal would have effects which would run counter to the basic objectives. The aim was to bring France and Tunisia closer by creating a new atmosphere and exerting the moral pressure of the United Nations. A friendly understanding was desired and the proposed procedure might close the door to a solution.

39. The Latin-American draft resolution recognized that the Charter established the principle of self-determination and stated explicitly that negotiations would be directed towards self-government for Tunisians. If the negotiations were to fail, the General Assembly could decide to discover the reasons for that failure. Then they might hear the parties but not at the present stage. As the Peruvian delegation hoped that the General Assembly would be informed of fresh negotiations in a new atmosphere, it would vote against the Pakistan draft resolution.

40. Mr. POLITIS (Greece) said that according to his understanding the Pakistan draft resolution was indivisible. The question was whether there was a desire to have a debate of a controversial nature when one party was absent. The French Government had taken the position that the General Assembly was not competent to discuss the question and was not likely to reverse that attitude. Perhaps it would be better if the Pakistan delegation withdrew the proposal since it would not gain the desired objective. Accordingly, the Greek delegation would not participate in the vote.

41. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq), responding to the intervention of the representative of Peru concerning the aim of inviting a representative of the Bey, said that the Committee had two draft resolutions before it, both of which suggested resumption of direct negotiations, while one provided for the good offices of the United Nations. After hearing both parties the Committee could better judge whether negotiations

would be workable without those good offices. A representative of the Bey could give them an insight into the situation to assist them in reaching a decision. That would be the practical result of hearing both sides.

42. With regard to the argument of the representative of the United States, Mr. Al-Jamali stated that the significant word in article 6 of the Treaty of Bardo was "*conclure*". The purpose of the draft resolution was not that the Bey should conclude a treaty, but only that he should be heard. Article 6 therefore seemed to have no bearing upon an invitation to the Bey. With regard to the assertions that it would be unwise to set a precedent of inviting individuals, Mr. Al-Jamali submitted that the Bey was not an individual but a sovereign. His representative therefore would speak with responsibility and not present the views of an individual.

43. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) said that he supported the Pakistan draft resolution because direct information from the parties would help the Committee to make the right decision, not as a judge, but as a Committee making recommendations. It was to be hoped that the French delegation would resume its place and that the Committee would invite the Bey to be represented. When a majority accepted the competence of the General Assembly to discuss and make recommendations on the matter, it followed that Tunisia should have an opportunity to present its case.

44. Mr. GONZALEZ ORELLANA (Guatemala) said that, as the Committee was seeking a just solution, it would be important to be informed from original sources concerning the views of both sides. The regrettable absence of the French delegation ought not to prevent them from hearing the views of the Bey, which would help their understanding. He would therefore vote in favour of the invitation.

45. Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador) said that if the General Assembly had been trying to solve the problem of Franco-Tunisian relations, he would have supported a motion to hear both parties. However, their aim was only to draw attention to the question and create an atmosphere in which there could be meetings directed toward a solution. They did not require evidence in order to reach any judgment, nor were they required to intervene. If peace had been imperilled the Security Council would no doubt call upon both parties. However, in Mr. Trujillo's opinion, the request to consider the matter had been dealt with and Ecuador had joined in submitting a draft resolution directed toward their basic task. The Ecuadorean delegation would therefore vote against the Pakistan draft resolution.

46. Mr. SARPER (Turkey) said he doubted the propriety of the Committee seeking to interfere with the decision of the French Government to absent itself from the debate. With regard to an invitation to the Bey, the situation might be different if the General Assembly had in mind an intervention. However, the objective was to assist in reaching an early understanding. An invitation to the Bey would deviate from that goal and might lead to an acrimonious debate which would make an understanding difficult. As the Pakistan proposal might in that manner delay a settlement, the Turkish delegation would abstain on both paragraphs.

47. Mr. FOUCHÉ (Haiti) stated that the Haitian delegation would never do anything designed to put the parties against each other in an irreconcilable position. The Committee was not a tribunal either to acquit or to condemn. The debates should not assume an antagonistic character, since neither France nor the Bey desired that. Furthermore, the Bey had not asked to be represented. The Haitian delegation would therefore vote against the Pakistan draft resolution.

48. Mr. FRANCO Y FRANCO (Dominican Republic) expressed regret that despite the good motives behind the Pakistan proposal he would be obliged to vote against it. He agreed with the various views which had been advanced by other delegations against that proposal. The aim of the Committee was to create an atmosphere of good understanding for direct negotiations and the Pakistan proposal would tend to frustrate rather than serve that purpose. Moreover, they should abstain from any act that might modify the treaty establishing the protectorate. Finally, they should do nothing which might appear to be an act of intervention which would raise again the question of competence.

49. Mr. CHAVES (Paraguay) said his delegation had joined in submitting a draft resolution appealing for the resumption of direct negotiations. That proposal differed from the Arab-Asian draft resolution in that the latter provided for a commission of good offices. It would not be in accordance with the guiding principles of the Latin-American draft resolution to extend an invitation to the Bey at the present stage. Accordingly, while expressing regret at the absence of the French delegation, Paraguay would vote against the Pakistan draft resolution.

50. Mr. LEA PLAZA (Chile) said that his delegation supported the Pakistan proposal because it believed it desirable and necessary to hear the views of the French delegation on the question before the Committee. That position should not be interpreted as intending any criticism of the stand taken by the French delegation. He also favoured extending an invitation to the Bey. Though the United Nations was not a tribunal, proper political decisions required first-hand rather than second-hand information. He emphasized that the proposed invitation would not involve any anticipated judgment on the problem.

51. Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria) supported the Pakistan draft resolution. He associated himself with the various representatives who had expressed regret concerning the absence of the French delegation from the deliberations of the Committee. The presence of the French delegation, he pointed out, would not of itself imply any change of that delegation's attitude on the substance of the problem. Dealing with the second part of the Pakistan proposal, he said that delegations who believed the Organization to be incompetent to deal with the Tunisian question could logically take the stand that neither side should be invited. Delegations which believed that the General Assembly was competent, as his delegation believed, saw the matter differently. Recalling that in the course of the previous sessions the General Assembly had invited not only representatives of non-Member Governments but also private individuals and representatives of non-govern-

mental organizations to assist in regard to various matters, he declared that the issue before the Committee was that of obtaining more information. The status of the Bey and the interpretation of the Treaty of Bardo were not relevant to that issue. In connexion with the United States representative's statement, he noted that the limitations placed by that Treaty on the authority of the Bey could by no means extend to the point where the Bey could not be heard by an international body. On many occasions, the Bey had undertaken steps in the international field. As had been pointed out, President Roosevelt had addressed directly to the Bey a request that United States troops be allowed to pass through Tunisia. The Bey was not only the ruler of his country; the stand he had taken had assured him of the unbounded support of the Tunisian people. The Bey would certainly select a representative who would not bring to the Committee's debates an attitude which would change the objective and impartial tone that had obtained in those debates. It was true that the Bey had not asked to be heard, but that was not a sufficient reason to deter the Committee from seeking information on the situation in Tunisia. While the Committee was not a court, such information would certainly increase the value of its work.

52. Mr. VON BALLUSECK (Netherlands) was unable to support the Pakistan draft resolution. For the Committee to make the appeal contained in the first paragraph would be to under-estimate the seriousness of the decision explained by the French Government in the letter (A/C.1/737) to the Chairman of the Committee. It was doubtful, moreover, whether the Committee, in its own name, was entitled to make such an appeal. Apart from the question of competence, he pointed out that the Committee, if it should address an invitation to the Bey, might be compelled to do so through the French Government, because of the Treaties between France and Tunisia. The proposed invitation would not be helpful since what the Committee wanted was a situation in which the parties might come together again. In that case there would be ample opportunity for the Bey and the French Government to resume discussions. Furthermore, even in the absence of the Bey, certain delegations had been able to give a very full account of what, in their opinion, had happened in Tunisia.

53. Mr. LEGER (Canada) said that the Committee should seek to create an atmosphere favourable to negotiations between France and Tunisia. The presence of a representative of the Bey would in no way serve to create such an atmosphere and might indeed have the opposite effect. He therefore opposed the Pakistan draft resolution.

54. Mr. ARZE QUIROGA (Bolivia) said that his delegation would abstain since it felt that, by abstaining, it would contribute to the best political solution of the Tunisian problem. He would explain his delegation's position more fully in the general debate.

55. Mr. MOKAISH (Lebanon) said that his delegation, which was among those who had requested the inclusion of the question in the agenda, would naturally vote for the Pakistan draft resolution, particularly since adoption of that proposal would facilitate con-

sideration by the Committee of the situation in Tunisia. In connexion with the legal aspects of the matter, he noted that it had been said that to ask the Bey to depute a representative would be tantamount to inviting a private citizen to address the Committee. When a sovereign appointed a representative, that representative ceased to be a private person. The provisions of the Treaty of Bardo had also been invoked in that connexion. That Treaty, however, was what lay at the root of the problem, and it would be inequitable to invoke it in order to prevent the appearance of a representative of Tunisia. Even under private law, in cases where the interests of a trustee and a ward conflicted, an *ad hoc* trustee was often appointed to represent the interests of the ward. That could not be applied to the question under discussion, but a similar principle should obtain. Tunisia had its own sovereign, although part of its sovereignty had been relinquished. The appointment of a representative by the Bey for the purpose of giving information to the Committee would not be an international action under the terms of the Treaty. There had been no question at the time the Treaties were concluded of relationships with an international body such as the United Nations. The question was not of the same order as that of appointing a Tunisian Ambassador to a foreign Power.

56. The inclusion of the question, to which the General Assembly had agreed, had been requested in order to avoid the violence which plagued both Tunisia and France and to safeguard the interests of those countries. The Pakistan proposal would provide means to assist the Committee towards that objective.

57. Mr. HUSAIN (Pakistan), referring to the question of competence, noted that it was on that question that the French delegation had founded its decision not to participate in the debate. He asked whether that attitude was justified with regard to a question which the General Assembly had already decided to consider. It was not the first time that the issue of competence had been raised. He pointed out that in the debate on the questions of the treatment of Indians in South Africa and of *apartheid*, the South African delegation had rightly continued to participate after raising the question of competence. His delegation therefore renewed its appeal to the French delegation to assist in the discussions in the Committee. The position was that the question was being considered without either France or the Bey being represented in the Committee. It would not be the first time that the representative of a non-Member country was asked to participate in the deliberations of a General Assembly Committee. As other representatives had pointed out, non-governmental organizations and individual persons had been asked to address Committees during previous sessions of the General Assembly. The question of the relevance of the Treaties between France and Tunisia had already been covered and he would add only that the French Government had never questioned the sovereign status of the Bey. It was true that the Committee was not a court, but it nevertheless was responsible for making its conclusions as correct as possible and, if the parties had information to provide, the Committee should be acquainted with it.

58. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested that the Pakistan draft resolution be voted upon paragraph by paragraph.

59. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote paragraph 1 of the draft resolution of Pakistan for which a roll-call vote had been requested.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Indonesia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, voted first.*

*In favour:* Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Burma, Chile, China, Egypt, Guatemala, India.

*Against:* Israel, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Australia, Belgium, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Haiti, Honduras.

*Abstaining:* Liberia, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Iceland.

*Paragraph 1 was approved by 19 votes to 16, with 22 abstentions.*

60. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 2 of the draft resolution submitted by Pakistan, for which a roll-call vote had been requested.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*The Netherlands, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, voted first.*

*In favour:* Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon.

*Against:* The Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Sweden, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Luxembourg.

*Abstaining:* Turkey, Argentina, Brazil, Ethiopia, Israel, Liberia, Mexico.

*Paragraph 2 was rejected by 26 votes to 24, with 1 abstention.*

61. Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran), on a point of order said that he had not opposed the request for a separate vote on the two paragraphs for reasons of courtesy. However, the Pakistan draft resolution constituted a whole, and those who had voted in favour of the first part had done so in the hope that the second part would be adopted. He felt another vote should be taken since the second paragraph had been rejected. He would abstain in that vote, since the part that he regarded as constructive had been rejected.

62. The CHAIRMAN proposed that a vote be taken on the draft resolution as a whole.

63. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru), speaking on a point of order, said that the position of the Iranian representative was justified, although, as that representative recognized, the point should have been made prior to the voting. However, since the division had taken place, it was no longer appropriate to vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

64. Mr. VAN LANGENHOVE (Belgium) had no objection to a new vote on the part of the draft resolution that remained but considered that the Committee could not vote again on the part that had been rejected.

65. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution of Pakistan without paragraph 2, for which a roll-call vote had been requested.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Ecuador, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, voted first.*

*In favour: Guatemala, Chile.*

*Against: Ecuador, Egypt, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic.*

*Abstaining: Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia.*

*The draft resolution, without paragraph 2, was rejected by 21 votes to 2, with 34 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.