



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED
A/C.1/PV.846
13 February 1957
ENGLISH

Eleventh Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHT HUNDRED AND FORTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 13 February 1957, at 3 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. BELAUNDE

(Peru)

The Algerian question [62]

Note:

The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.846. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

QUESTION OF ALGERIA (A/3197; A/C.1/L.165, 166, 167) [Agenda item 62] (continued)

Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand): I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me the floor. In asking to speak again, I would like to make it clear that I have no desire to start a legal controversy on this question. We have spoken; we have presented our draft resolution. The purpose of my speaking again today is to try to clear up some misunderstandings which may have been created as a result of the statements made by certain representatives.

In the first place, I would like to thank all the representatives who have expressed their objections and their criticism to our joint draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.166, presented by Japan, Philippines and Thailand. If I may be allowed, I would like especially to take up the statement made by the representative of Australia, Sir Percy Spender, because I believe that the objections which he raised can be said to epitomize the criticism and objections which have been raised against our joint draft resolution. I hope the Australian representative will forgive me for this kind of discrimination. I believe that, with his usual juristic and legal talents, he has raised very important and very interesting objections to our proposal.

The first objection is that the three-Power draft resolution has assumed the competency of this Committee and of the Assembly to discuss the Algerian question. To this I can reply that the joint draft in no way assumes the competence of the United Nations -- of this Committee or of the Assembly. Nor does it have to do so because, by the absence of opposition on the part of the delegation of France and by the adoption of the agenda of the Assembly containing the question of Algeria, this question has been and still is before the United Nations. As a consequence, the joint draft resolution does not have at all to assume the competence of the United Nations.

(Mr. Khoman, Thailand)

Anyway I can affirm in the most categorical manner that it is not the intention of the joint draft resolution to assume the competence of this Organization.

The second point is this. I think that the Australian representative said that the three-Power draft resolution implies that the negotiations will take place between France and the Algerian people. To this objection I should like to say that, as we all know, negotiations imply that there must be two parties. There cannot be negotiations with only one party. Besides that, I myself do not think that negotiation is in principle taboo. I believe that the representatives of France have made clear in their statements that they do not object in principle to negotiations. In this connexion, I should like to quote from a declaration made by the Prime Minister of France, Mr. Guy Mollet, who said on 9 January 1957 the following. I should like to say that, incidentally, the Foreign Minister of France said at one time that he thought this declaration should be mentioned more often. In any case, this is what Mr. Guy Mollet, the Prime Minister of France, said on 9 January 1957:

"The solution of the Algerian problem can result only from negotiations and free discussions between the representatives of the populations of Algeria and those of all France, of France which is the first to be interested in the peace and prosperity of Algeria, of France which is in the best position to act as an arbiter."

I should like to go still further, if I may, to say that even the Foreign Minister of France has also said almost the same thing. On 12 February 1957 he said before this Committee the following:

"The French Government has always affirmed that it seeks a negotiated solution and not an imposed solution of the problem." (A/C.1/PV.843, p. 56)
As may be seen, negotiation is in accordance with the contemplated or proposed action by France.

In consequence, the mention of negotiations in the joint draft resolution proposed by Japan, Philippines and Thailand in no way acts contrary to the interests or to the proposed action of France. On this question I should like to insist a little. I would also draw the attention of the members of this Committee to the fact that negotiation is the normal method of solving the differences wherever they exist, whether differences of opinion, differences of interest or any kind of

NR/ns

A/C.1/PV.846

4-5

(Mr. Khoman, Thailand)

differences. I am sure the members of this Committee know that it is mentioned in the Charter, and we can find it especially in Article 33. We all know that the other alternative to negotiation would be the use of force, and, of course, that would be contrary to the purposes and provisions of the Charter.

(Mr. Khoman, Thailand)

I therefore believe that, as to the first of these two objections -- that the three-Power draft resolution assumes the competence of this Committee or of the Assembly -- I have made clear that the draft does not make such an assumption and does not have to do so inasmuch as the question of Algeria is already, and has been for some time, before the Organization. As regards the question of negotiations, I do hope I have made it clear that this is not against the policy of the French Government. I therefore think that we have removed the two objections raised by some representatives to our joint draft resolution.

We now come to the last question, having to do with the assertion of the principles of the Charter. It is true that the joint three-Power draft resolution specifically mentions the principles of the Charter, but I cannot conceive that there can be any objection to such mention, since we are all signatories of the Charter and believe in and respect its provisions.

Before I conclude, I should like to say that in many ways the three-Power draft resolution is closely akin to the six-Power draft resolution. The only difference is that the latter is a little bit less comprehensive and a little more laconic than the three-Power draft.

I shall refrain, of course, from appealing to the members of this Committee to vote for the three-Power draft. In doing so, I think I am following the principles of Buddhism -- that is to say, we should like to leave the whole question to the good conscience and judgement of each and every Member of this Organization. If any Members feel that the three-Power draft resolution in any way constitutes an interference or intervention in the internal affairs of France, it is, of course, their duty to oppose it. But, for my part, I can say this: If we had felt in our conscience that it was in any way an intervention or interference in the domestic affairs of France, my delegation would have refrained, in the first place, from joining in the sponsorship of the draft -- and, of course, if it did constitute such interference, we would have to vote against it. But I am convinced that the joint draft resolution presented by the delegations of Japan, the Philippines and Thailand in no way intervenes in or interferes with the internal affairs of France. It is simply an expression of the opinion of this Committee after an exhaustive and detailed discussion of the question of Algeria. I therefore leave the matter before the members of the Committee.

Mr. de THIER (Belgium)(interpretation from French): The position of the Belgian delegation, which I have had the honour to set forth in the course of the debate, obliges us to vote against the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Japan, the Philippines and Thailand, as well as against the draft resolution submitted by the eighteen delegations. There is no doubt that the first of these is drafted in more moderate terms than the eighteen-Power draft, and I should like to pay tribute to the spirit of moderation which prompted the three Asian delegations in moving that draft. But we do believe that it is open to serious objections from the point of view of the competence which it seems to impute to the United Nations, in a manner which we feel to be contrary to the provisions of the Charter. Objection can also be taken to certain expressions which may be confusing. As for the French Government's intention to engage in talks with freely elected representatives, it would appear that according to this draft what is proposed is to supplant such talks with talks between a State, on the one hand -- that is, France -- and the Algerian people, on the other hand. We have been shown, however, that the Algerian people is a particularly complex entity. Who are to be its spokesmen? How shall they be designated? What guarantees are there that they will be truly the authorized spokesmen and representatives of the Algerian people? We know nothing about that. A conception of this kind seems to us to be less in accord with democratic principles than the solution offered by France. Moreover, it is scarcely of such a nature as to lead to the results which are hoped for. Quite on the contrary, this might run the risk of complicating the situation in Algeria. All those who have followed the debate have surely been struck by the remarkable complexity of the situation. It is manifest that great prudence is required at the moment when this Committee seeks to bring out the conclusions of the debate.

The only draft resolution which the Belgian delegation can support is the one presented by the delegations of Argentina and five other countries. That draft resolution does not prejudge the question of competence. By that token, it can be accepted by the members of this Committee, regardless of the position which they may have espoused on the matter.

Mr. LEQUERICA (Spain)(interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Spain is ready to vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Argentina and five other States. We wish to express our thanks to the representative of Argentina for the very kind words that he uttered when submitting this joint draft resolution, and we also wish to thank other Latin American delegations, particularly those of Venezuela and Bolivia, for their allusions to Spain's example in those countries, which helped them to achieve their independence.

We will have to vote against the proposal submitted by the eighteen Powers, not because we do not understand their point of view or do not feel friendship for them, and not because we lack understanding of the problem that they are trying to solve, but for the reasons which I have expressed to this Committee at great length, and which I shall not repeat here, regarding our conviction that the United Nations should base its very existence on respect for Article 2, paragraph 7, in all its meanings. Otherwise, we would become a conglomeration of peoples accusing one another mutually and creating unnecessary problems. I know that the sponsors of the draft resolution have submitted it with all goodwill, but they use terms, such as those involving invitations to non-existent nations and to countries that are not recognized, which we feel complicate unnecessarily the problem of Algeria, which we have met here to solve.

(Mr. de Lequerica, Spain)

I have stated that although the words "self-determination" are very close to our hearts and are contained in all the philosophies which we respect, they nevertheless must be very carefully applied if they are not to become an element of total anarchy. The principle of self-determination was applied in a violent way by the thirteen States of the United States and by the Kingdom of the Spanish Indies when they achieved their independence. Brazil achieved its independence by the peaceful application of the principle of self-determination, because it was led by the Crown Prince of the Empire.

Propaganda campaigns which have both preceded and followed wars have often led people to believe that self-determination was the only way in which they could solve their problems. Let us not forget the interpretation of the incident which I referred to a few days ago, that of the efforts of one part of the United States to secede and the will which was imposed on all the States of the country by the President at that time.

We therefore cannot vote in favour of this draft resolution, despite the fact that we are very friendly towards all its co-sponsors. Perhaps it is because we are friendly with those States that we are unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution. An agreement was signed two days ago between Morocco and Spain, which testifies to the friendship that we have for the Moslem people. We shall exchange diplomatic relations with them and our relations with them will take place in various types of organizations, including the United Nations.

The five-Power draft resolution, in our view, is more satisfactory than the other draft resolutions. It contains the essence of the second proposal.

We shall abstain from the vote on the three-Power draft resolution because we feel that we should not vote against it. We shall abstain also because we find included in it certain words which might be dangerous for the juridical status of the United Nations. As regards its basic content, we feel that we are supporting that by voting in favour of the five-Power draft resolution.

Why is it necessary for us to examine the different wording of these two draft resolutions? What difference is there between the expression of the hope that a peaceful and democratic solution of this question will be found, and, as expressed in the other draft resolution, the hope to bring about the end of bloodshed and the peaceful settlement of the present difficulties? We feel that the five-Power draft resolution is much more succinct.

(Mr. de Lequerica, Spain)

It merely states: "Expresses the hope that a peaceful and democratic solution of this question will be found". The representative of Cuba, with his usual clarity, stated yesterday that this was a very simple draft resolution, but a very significant one. It contains the essence of the entire debate. It retains the essential importance of the position which the United Nations must take, bearing in mind Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter. We must listen to and ~~examine~~ the complaints of peoples, and then we must try to improve their conditions. We are a world forum in which we can hear the complaints of all nations.

No one should feel that the five-Power draft resolution is of no consequence. It offers more than just one step forward. If I had the opportunity at this time I would ask the Committee to give priority to this joint draft resolution and I would also ask the co-sponsors of the other draft resolutions to withdraw them and to support this draft resolution. That would give this draft resolution much more importance. I believe that this should serve as a model for France as well as for the Moslem countries that submitted the eighteen-Power draft resolution. I feel sure that they are ready to view this draft resolution as a model.

In conclusion, I should like to say that Spain had decided originally not to vote in favour of the draft resolution when it contained the ending that the Committee decided not to include the matter on the agenda, which we felt would curb the powers of the United Nations in its efforts to seek solutions to problems under the Charter. We were not ready to vote in favour of the draft resolution because of that part at the end. Now that the deletion has been made and the five-Power draft resolution is in its present form, I feel that we should give it priority over the other draft resolutions. I do not make this in the form of a definite motion, but I feel that we should try to convince the co-sponsors of the other draft resolutions of our view so that they might vote in favour of this draft resolution and thereby give to the five-Power draft resolution overwhelming support.

Mr. GEORGE-PICCT (France): (interpretation from French): Now that the voting on the draft resolutions is about to begin, the French delegation wishes to recall that it will not take part in the vote, just as it did not take part in the debate on the draft resolutions, for the reasons which were given yesterday by the head of the French delegation in his final statement at the close of the general debate.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The list of speakers on the draft resolutions is now exhausted. We shall now proceed to the vote on the draft resolutions. I wish to draw the attention of the Committee to the draft resolutions which are before it, and the order in which they were submitted:

the eighteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.165), dated 5 February 1957; the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.166), dated 11 February 1957; and the five-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.167), dated 12 February 1957.

I shall ask the Secretary of the Committee to read out rule 132 of the rules of procedure, which bears upon the voting which is about to take place.

The SECRETARY: Rule 132 of the rules of procedure reads as follows:

"If two or more proposals relate to the same question, a committee shall, unless it decides otherwise, vote on the proposals in the order in which they have been submitted. A committee may, after each vote on a proposal, decide whether to vote on the next proposal."

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In fulfilment of the terms of that rule of procedure, I shall put to the Committee the first proposal submitted, namely, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.165. The representative of Ecuador has requested a vote paragraph by paragraph. Accordingly, I now put the first paragraph to the vote.

The paragraph was adopted by 39 votes to 26, with 7 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee will now vote on the second paragraph, beginning with the word "Recognizing". A vote by roll call has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, India, Indonesia, Iran.

Against: Ireland, Israel, Italy, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland.

Abstaining: Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, Philippines, Thailand, Uruguay, Venezuela, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala.

The paragraph was adopted by 36 votes to 27, with 14 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We shall vote now on paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution. A vote by roll call has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

The United States of America, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Abstaining: Bolivia, Cambodia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Liberia, Mexico, Paraguay, Philippines, Spain, Thailand.

The paragraph was rejected by 34 votes to 33, with 10 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I now put to the vote paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution, the paragraph which begins with the word "Invites".

Paragraph 2 was rejected by 34 votes to 33, with 9 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee will now vote on paragraph 3 of the operative part of the draft resolution, which begins with the words "Requests the Secretary-General".

Mr. NUÑEZ-PORTUONDO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I do not see how the Committee can vote on this last paragraph of the operative part of the eighteen-Power draft resolution. The first two operative paragraphs have been rejected. How, then, can we request the Secretary-General to assist the parties in conducting negotiations which are referred to in paragraphs which have been rejected?

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): What the representative of Cuba has just said is quite logical. The fact, however, is that it is up to the Committee, not the Chairman, to draw logical conclusions. If the Committee agrees that the logical consequence of its votes on the preceding paragraphs of this draft resolution is that the last paragraph should not be put to the vote, I shall be very happy to proceed in accordance with that interpretation.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I would now consult the Committee as to whether it wishes to vote on the eighteen-Power draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. LOUTFI (Egypt) (interpretation from French): I think that no useful purpose would be served by taking a vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I must say that I share the opinion of the representative of Egypt. Since only the preamble to the draft resolution has been adopted, there would seem to be no draft resolution as a whole to vote upon; there can be no draft resolution without an operative part.

If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees not to vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

It was so decided.

Mr. NUÑEZ-PORTUONDO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Cuba, together with the other sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.167, has accepted the suggestion made by the representative of Mexico and some other representatives that the following words should be added to the paragraph of the draft resolution beginning with the words "Expresses the hope": "in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations". Hence, when this draft resolution is put to the vote, it should be read as including those words.

Since this text, with the addition of the above-mentioned words, seems to be acceptable to a great number of delegations, I would take the liberty of requesting, if the Committee agrees, that priority in the voting should be given to our draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I take note of that request. A number of representatives have asked to speak. I shall call on them in the order in which their names have been inscribed on the list.

Mr. VIETTI (Italy): I wish to support the statement just made by the representative of Cuba, both as regards the addition of the words he read out to the draft resolution and as regards the request that priority in the voting should be given to the draft resolution. It seems to me that it would be quite logical to put this draft resolution to the vote now, before the other one is voted upon.

Mr. PEARSON (Canada): I just want to say a few words in support of the statement of the representative of Cuba, both in regard to the additional words that have been suggested, which, I think, should improve the draft resolution, and in regard to the suggestion that the draft resolution should be given priority in the voting.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Before calling on the representative of Sudan and the other representatives that have asked to speak, I should like to ask the co-sponsors of this joint draft resolution, A/C.1/L.167, whether they agree to the amendment suggested by the representative of Cuba, following the suggestion originally made by the representative of Mexico.

Mr. MAURTUA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Peru accepts the suggestion of the representative of Cuba.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In that case, the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.167 has been amended so that the last paragraph reads:

"Expresses the hope that a peaceful and democratic solution of this question will be found in conformity with the principles of the Charter."

Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan): I wish to raise a point of procedure. I am not concerned with the amendment, and I am not going to discuss it. The question before the Committee is the voting on the draft resolutions which have been submitted to and discussed by the Committee. At the time when you, Mr. Chairman, declared that the voting would take place, priority was not asked for any of the draft resolutions. The Committee proceeded to vote, and voted on the first draft resolution. Rule 132 of our rules of procedure states:

"If two or more proposals relate to the same question, a committee shall, unless it decides otherwise, vote on the proposals in the order in which they have been submitted."

The Committee had actually proceeded to vote. A paragraph-by-paragraph vote was requested on the eighteen-Power draft resolution, and that was done. The representative of Cuba raised the point that there was no logic in voting on the last operative paragraph of that draft resolution, since the first and second operative paragraphs had been defeated. This, again, is wrong, because if a draft resolution is voted upon paragraph by paragraph, even if all the paragraphs are defeated, the draft resolution then has to be put to the vote as a whole. Therefore, the voting on the last operative paragraph should have been proceeded with, and then the voting on the draft resolutions should have followed in the order of their submission, namely, first the eighteen-Power draft resolution, secondly, the three-Power draft resolution, and, finally, the five-Power draft resolution which has now been amended.

When the voting has already started, representatives should not be permitted to ask for priority. It is my submission that our rules of procedure do not allow this. It is not a matter of voting, it is a matter of following the rules of procedure which have been laid down.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): May I briefly tell the representative of the Sudan that the voting on the second draft resolution had not started and, therefore, it was appropriate for observations and remarks to be made at that time. I also wish to tell the representative of the Sudan that, quite calmly, I told the Committee that if it accepted, then we would go along with the suggestion of the representative of Cuba. No objection was raised.

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): I wish to bring two points to the attention of the Chair and of the members of the Committee. The first point is that the amendment which was submitted at the last moment is not in order, and the reason is simple. The draft resolution is not yet under discussion, and no amendments can be submitted to a draft resolution which is not before the Committee. Therefore, the amendment which has been submitted is out of order, and cannot be held, although it does not add or subtract anything of real substance. However, from the point of view of order and of procedure, this is an abnormal procedure which is contrary to the principles according to which amendments can be submitted.

No amendment can be submitted while a vote is going on, and a vote is going on at the present time on the proposal under consideration.

Coming to the question of priority, I am sorry that the representative of Cuba and the other representatives who supported him did not explain to us why they wanted this priority. To begin with, such a priority would not be in order, according to rule 132 of the rules of procedure, and a reading of that rule might elucidate matters. The rule reads:

"If two or more proposals relate to the same question, a committee shall, unless it decides otherwise, vote on the proposals in the order in which they have been submitted."

There are more than two proposals before the Committee, and the voting had begun, as the representative of the Sudan has mentioned. The Committee did not decide to change the order of voting, although it can so decide at the proper moment.

Besides the question of order, this question of priority has some importance. Here we have three draft resolutions. One was presented to the Committee on 5 February, the other presented on 11 February, and then the last one presented on 12 February. This indicates a special interest that some delegations have in this matter, and it stands to reason that the voting on the three proposals should normally follow the order of submission, as laid down in rule 132 of the rules of procedure, unless, of course, there is some substantive reason which can be brought forward to support a change in the order of voting, but we have not yet heard any such reason.

This being the situation, I should like most courteously to call the attention of the Chairman and of the Committee to this situation, so that we can proceed to vote on the draft resolutions in the order in which they were submitted. When we come to the third and last draft resolution, an amendment can be submitted, if it is so desired and if the Chair finds it acceptable, although it is not acceptable from our point of view.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall reply very courteously to the representative of Syria and tell him that his lengthy statement contained three inaccurate premises. First of all, the discussion has centred

RSH/gd

A/C.1/PV.846

29-30

(The Chairman)

upon the three draft resolutions. Secondly, we had not begun the voting on the second draft resolution, and the process of voting is indivisible for each draft resolution, but it is not indivisible so far as all the draft resolutions are concerned, not only by virtue of the rules of procedure but also by virtue of pure logic. Draft resolutions are not a mechanical process. After all, we have a certain freedom here which is a gift and which must be exercised within the prudence of the Assembly itself. Lastly, the moment for raising the question of priority or for submitting amendments can occur at any time before the draft resolution is voted upon, and it must be so because the Committee must be given a chance to improve, perfect, and polish the draft resolution as much as possible. Otherwise, we would be undermining and restricting the freedom and liberty of the delegations who are trying to present as good a resolution as possible if we prohibited them from amending such draft resolutions when they wanted to.

Mr. LOUTFI (Egypt) (interpretation from French): I wish to endorse what has been said by the representatives of Syria and the Sudan, but at the beginning of the discussion on the vote the Chairman made a ruling to the effect that we should proceed to the vote on the draft resolutions in the order in which they had been presented. At that time no delegation objected; consequently, the ruling of the Chair was endorsed by the Committee. If we were to alter that ruling now, it seems to me that we would require a two-thirds majority to decide, the Chairman having said at the beginning that we should vote according to the date of submission of the draft resolutions. Nobody objected at that time; therefore, it was a decision of the Committee. In order to alter that decision a two-thirds majority is required.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall reply to the representative of Egypt because I think that the Chair has a right to defend its procedure. When I spoke of the order in which the draft resolutions would be voted upon I said that I was not handing down a ruling from the Chair, but that I was acting in accordance with the rule of procedure which I took the precaution of having read out to the Committee. Therefore, with all due respect to the representative of Egypt, I must tell him that that could not be construed as a ruling of the Chair; it was only the application of rule 132 of the rules of procedure. Different interpretations may be given to that rule, but we cannot consider three draft resolutions as one entity. That would be wrong according to the rules of procedure, as well as according to logic. Therefore, there has been no ruling of the Chair, nor is such a ruling before the Committee for discussion. There is only the strict observance of rule 132.

Mr. SERRANO (Philippines): My delegation wishes to raise a point of order from two aspects: the amendment proposed to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.167, and the motion for priority.

My delegation has listened carefully to the points raised by the representatives of the Sudan, Syria and Egypt, as well as the answers given by the Chairman. We wish, however, to have our point of order on record, including our reasons in support thereof.

We feel that if the amendment is accepted by the Chair at this stage of the proceedings, the normal procedure on matters of this nature will be disrupted completely. This would be the first time that an amendment to any draft resolution was presented after the voting had begun on one of the several previous amendments. I cannot imagine how such procedure could be sanctioned without causing chaos in our proceedings because the result would be that once an amendment had been introduced, consideration of the amendment would be revived again. We would revert to the general debate on the amendment. We cannot simply ignore the amendment as it is without considering it, and I think that the rule is well established whereby, once the voting has begun, nothing can disrupt it, except on a point of order on the order of priority. I must say that when the Chairman made a statement with reference to rule 132 regarding the order of voting, it was a hint to all the delegations that any request regarding the order of priority should be made at that time. Therefore, it seems to me that the request made by the representative of Cuba was a belated one after the Committee had expressed its acquiescence with the Chairman's statement with regard to the voting.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I am very sorry that the legal arguments, as well as the philosophical and common sense arguments which I have presented were not considered before the statement by the representative of the Philippines. Once again I must stress the fact that it would be contrary to the rules of procedure, contrary to common sense and contrary to the freedom of initiative on the part of delegations, and also contrary to the prudence of the Committee, to check the presentation of an amendment submitted by the co-sponsors to their own draft resolution. What the representative of the Philippines can do before we proceed to vote on the third draft resolution, is to request that the amendment should be put before the Committee for discussion, and I would not object to such a discussion. There, he would be right. But he is not right -- and what the Chair has to consider is the unjuridical concept -- in thinking that the three draft resolutions are being merged into one in order to vote upon them.

Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to refer separately to the two problems which have arisen following the statement of the representative of Cuba, namely, the question of the amendment and the question of priority in the voting.

Regarding the amendment, my delegation is happy to have heard the submission of that amendment by the co-sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.167. Normally, according to the rules of procedure, amendments must be submitted in writing. They have to be handed to the Secretary who, in turn, has them distributed among the delegations. Generally speaking, no amendment can be discussed or voted upon in a committee unless all delegations have received it in writing not later than the day preceding the meeting at which the vote is to be taken. According to the rule, however, the Chairman may "permit the discussion and consideration of amendments, or of motions as to procedure, even though these amendments and motions have not been circulated or have only been circulated the same day". This provision appears in rule 121, and it empowers the Chairman to put to the vote the amendment proposed by the representative of Cuba. Since it was submitted to the Committee today, it can be voted upon today. In this matter I agree entirely with the Chairman and I support the proposal of the representative of Cuba.

As far as priority is concerned, however, I am afraid that I cannot go along with what the Chairman has said. He has said that we cannot attempt to maintain a unity as far as a number of proposals are concerned. This is the situation today when we are confronted with three draft resolutions. We cannot maintain the unity if we are voting on each separately, as we are doing, but we can maintain an idea of unity when it is a question of priority, because there can be no priority on each draft resolution separately. Priority can be decided only if there are two or more draft resolutions. Priority means giving a preferential position to one against the others.

I shall not go into a discussion of the remarks of the representative of Egypt. He said that the Chairman had handed down a ruling that we should vote on the draft resolutions in the order in which they had been submitted -- first, A/C.1/L.165; next, A/C.1/L.166; and then A/C.1/L.167. Perhaps I did not listen too carefully, but I do not think that the Chairman handed down a ruling. However,

MW/mlw

A/C.1/PV.846
34-35

(Mr. Urquia, El Salvador)

you said, Mr. Chairman, that no ruling had been handed down on the question, and therefore I think that the matter is still before the Committee itself for decision. Rule 132, which the Chairman invoked, reads as follows:

"If two or more proposals relate to the same question, a committee shall, unless it decides otherwise, vote on the proposals in the order in which they have been submitted ..."

(Mr. Urquia, El Salvador)

It is not because we have already voted on one of these proposals that it appears to me that the Committee is unable to decide on the priority to be given either of the other two draft resolutions. I would suggest that the Chairman should put to the vote of the Committee the question whether priority is to be given to the five-Power draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I am glad that before the representative of El Salvador spoke, I had already told the representative of the Philippines that before the vote was taken on the five-Power draft resolution, time would be allowed to discuss the amendment. The representative of El Salvador will recall that that was what was said to the representative of the Philippines. So that before we vote on the five-Power draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.167, the Committee will be able to consider the amendment submitted by the representative of Cuba on behalf of the co-sponsors of this draft resolution.

With regard to priority, as I said, I handed down no ruling. That is why I had a rule of procedure read out first of all. It is the Chairman which can now decide between the two proposals submitted, as to which is to be given priority. I therefore accept the suggestion of the representative of El Salvador.

Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): Perhaps you made a slight mistake, Mr. Chairman. You said that it was the Chairman which has the power to decide on this point. But rule 132 of the rules of procedure says that the Committee is the one which has to decide on it.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Yes, but the Chairman, by instinct and by conviction, usually endeavours to follow the will of the Committee. Therefore, it was not a mistake on your part.

Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): I believe that at the moment we are confronted with a rather complicated procedure which may lengthen the debate. Mr. Chairman, you have considered the amendment submitted by the representative of Cuba as admissible and have said that it could be accepted and put to the Committee for a vote. I should like, very respectfully, to appeal against your decision to accept that for a vote. I would ask you to put to the

(Mr. Slim, Tunisia)

vote the following: At the present stage of matters, that is to say, after we have begun voting on the draft resolutions, can an amendment to a resolution be submitted? If the Committee decides in favour of the receivability of amendments at the present stage of matters, then at that moment I will take the liberty of proposing other amendments to the joint draft resolution submitted by Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Italy and Peru, so as to be able to discuss the amendments that I will suggest, take up the debate again, and then start a complete debate on the amendments. Secondly, at the present stage of the debate, where the vote has begun, I appeal against the proposal that you have accepted, namely the proposal of the delegation of Cuba asking for priority for its draft resolution. I do not think it is necessary to repeat all this, because the arguments have already been submitted by the representatives of Syria, the Sudan, the Philippines and Egypt.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I must say that I am astounded that serenity seems to have flown from us to the point where a situation is being created that is both contrary to logic and to the rules of procedure. Yet I have no objection to submitting to the Committee the question of ascertaining whether a proposal can or cannot be amended before it is voted upon. I did not want to take that amendment as being approved. I merely included that amendment before the vote so that it could be discussed and, if the Committee so decides, approved. I must tell the representative of Tunisia that in this matter the Chairman has acted with complete impartiality and, following the counsel of the Secretariat, has been proceeding consistently in the zealous tradition of respecting the rules of procedure.

Mr. de FREITAS-VALLE (Brazil): May I say that it has been a rule, I think for eleven years, in the United Nations, that the authors of any proposition may accept an amendment proposed by somebody else or may incorporate such amendment in the light of the discussions, as the sponsors of the resolution did today. We heard many speeches and I realize that you provoked some serenity into the discussions by encasing our proposition in the terms which are supported to be in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

(Mr. de Freitas-Valle, Brazil)

I do not want to divulge a secret to the Council but rule 132 has two sentences. The second sentence says the following:

"A committee may, after each vote on a proposal, decide whether to vote on the next proposal."

I think we have to decide now on which proposal we are going to vote. Therefore, I believe that you were absolutely in order, Mr. Chairman, in everything you said until now.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I want to thank the representative of Brazil.

Mr. RIFAI (Jordan): Mr. Chairman, I request your tolerance in seeking a further clarification. Have we begun the process of voting or not? I understand the voting to be one action or, rather, a single chain of actions. Rule 129 of the rules of procedure reads as follows:

"After the Chairman has announced the beginning of voting, no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connexion with the actual conduct of the voting."

I note that the amendment goes beyond the terms of this rule. I should like to seek the clarification of the Chairman on this point.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): May I tell the representative of Jordan that from the very beginning I stated -- and, I believe, frankly, that this debate is quite contrary to the rules of procedure. However, I shall permit it to go on because I wish to pay due respect to the Committee. I have to be courteous to the Committee. Fearing that these difficulties would arise, I had rule 132 read out. There is no process of voting for all resolutions as one. That is an anti-juridical stand. I must beg the representative of Jordan to follow the words that were just spoken by the representative of Brazil and which I stated earlier. May I read the second sentence of rule 132 of the rules of procedure:

"A committee may, after each vote on a proposal, decide whether to vote on the next proposal."

AW/ns

A/C.1/PV.846
39-40

(The Chairman)

That means that the vote itself is not indivisible. The vote on each resolution is indivisible. The vote on the second and third proposals require a decision on the part of the Committee. They are separate entities according to the rules of procedure. Quite sincerely, and very honestly, I beg my colleagues who have made these observations to consider the juridical argument I have just raised. But I am going to ask for something else: Ponder and consider the moral consequences inherent in the approval of a resolution, and whereby, because the rules of procedure are being falsely applied, the words "in accordance with the principles of the Charter" might be deleted from a resolution. This would be inconceivable.

Mr. URRUTIA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): I think that this debate is somewhat superfluous for the following reasons. During all previous years, we interpreted the rules of procedure to mean that priority could be decided upon after the vote had been taken on each draft resolution. Very often after a vote had been taken on one draft resolution, the problem of deciding on the priority of the residual draft resolutions had arisen.

I can safely say that I had to face the same problem when I occupied the position that you, Mr. Chairman, are occupying today. I had to consider the views of delegations that asked for priority on certain paragraphs of draft resolutions after we had voted on one paragraph. When we came to vote on the next paragraph, they asked us to vote on operative parts and then on the preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution. So that there already is this usage by the United Nations.

As far as amendments are concerned, every year ever since the United Nations has been in existence, the sponsors of draft resolutions have been allowed to submit amendments, even at the last moment.

I say that this debate is superfluous because these rules of procedure were drawn up on one basis -- that is, that the Committee must be master of its own decisions and fate. Therefore, if the Committee wants, it can change its usage by a simple majority. Anything that has to do with procedure requires a simple majority, and the Committee can decide to change the procedure by such a vote.

The debate can be ended quite quickly. Why do you not consult the Committee, Mr. Chairman? If the Committee agrees, priority can be granted to one document over another. If the Committee agrees that this amendment is to be admitted, then, rules of procedure or no rules of procedure, we go ahead, because what the rules of procedure say quite clearly is that when the majority of the Committee wants to change something, something can be changed.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I agree that this debate is exhausted. Nevertheless, I will call on the representative of Iraq, thus sticking to my view that we have to hear all opinions on this matter.

Mr. JAMALI (Iraq): I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me a chance to speak, and I sympathize with you in your difficult position now, although it need not be difficult at all if you will kindly just listen to me.

You know very well that when we came to this meeting, we had some definite draft resolutions before us. We had already prepared our voting system. Our minds and our discussions were all ready for those draft resolutions as they are. You know very well that if we want to change a draft resolution, we need to have a new discussion and new consultations. You have been kind enough to speak about giving us the right to discuss; in other words, the debate is open again. We thought the debate on the draft resolutions was over. Now that there is an amendment or a revision, I submit that it is not enough. We may need further revisions since you have opened the door again if we want to vote. Are you opening the door? That is my first question.

Secondly, the priority requested is a very familiar procedure for strangulation of better draft resolutions. I consider the six-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.167) to be a soulless, blind, deaf and dumb resolution. Now the sponsors want to put a soul into it. If they want to put a soul into it, they need the eyes, the ears and all the other senses. The draft resolution is still defective and full of weaknesses.

It is a pity that they should ask for priority in respect of this draft resolution over a very fine draft resolution submitted by three Powers -- Japan, Philippines and Thailand. Therefore, it seems to me that if we are opening the subject again, opening the discussion and the consultations again, let us have it open.

Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand): I propose that we proceed immediately to consider the motion for priority on the draft resolution which has been lodged by Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Italy and Peru. You have before you, Mr. Chairman, pursuant to rule 132, a proposal that this draft resolution have priority over the previous one. That is a proposal which can be appropriately moved, and it has been moved.

I have had some experience in this Committee and most of my colleagues here have had a similar experience to mine. A motion for priority is quite a common one. You have it before you, Mr. Chairman.

(Sir Leslie Munro, New Zealand)

It is also true that this draft resolution has had some words added to it. It is customary by way of clarification to add some words if the sponsors so agree. They have agreed. I therefore ask you, in the exercise of your jurisdiction as Chairman of the Committee to put this proposal to the vote in accordance with the request of the sponsors and in accordance with rule 132. You have ample power to do so. It is in accordance with the practice of the Committee, and I ask you to do it.

Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): A number of representatives have already pointed out that the proposal of Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Italy and Peru should be given priority. A number of representatives have spoken in favour of such priority. Unfortunately, I did not hear any reasons in support of that proposition. May we ask the authors of this proposal for priority to tell us why it is that the Committee should give priority to a draft resolution which was presented two days after the other draft resolution? I would like to hear the grounds for such action which it is proposed that the Committee should take.

Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan): Under rule 119, I move the adjournment of the meeting. This motion does not need any discussion or debate, and I wish it put to the vote.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I accede to the request of the representative of the Sudan. I put to the vote the motion to adjourn the meeting.

The motion was rejected by 38 votes to 28, with 7 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I put to the vote the motion for priority made by the representative of Cuba with respect to the two draft resolutions before the Committee. This motion requests priority for the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.167.

MA/ns

A/C.1/PV.846
44-45

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): Point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We are in the middle of the vote. There can be no point of order.

The motion was adopted by 38 votes to 35, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Priority has thereby been granted to this document. Therefore, we shall consider the amendment submitted by Cuba. The amendment has been accepted by the co-sponsors of the joint draft resolution. The representative of Greece has requested the floor to speak on a point of order.

Mr. STRATOS (Greece)(interpretation from French): I think we are about to vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.167, as amended by the representative of Cuba, but there is one question --

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): May I interrupt the representative of Greece? Because of its urgency, it has not been possible to distribute revision 1 of this text. It is more than an amendment; it is a revision made verbally by the representative of Cuba, and I felt that it was not necessary to keep so closely to the legal terms of the rules when the discussion has gone along, because of the position I have adopted, and now I have to get back within the framework of the law. The meaning of the modification submitted by Cuba is such that it would fall under the heading of a revision of the document.

Mr. STRATOS (Greece)(interpretation from French): We are about to vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.167, as revised, but one question remains in abeyance, as I said. We have already voted in fact by roll call on the preamble of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.165. Of course, we were unable to vote on a complete draft resolution, because there was no operative part, but the preamble was adopted. In fact, it was adopted by a roll-call vote. I do not know what you think about this, Mr. Chairman. I see that the representative of Cuba is already shrugging his shoulders. My dear friend, let me have my say.

If this idea seems rather paradoxical, I would make a formal amendment to the five-Power draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.167. I ask that the preamble already voted on in document A/C.1/L.165 should be added to document A/C.1/L.167, and this should be done by roll call. The one in document A/C.1/L.165 has been already printed and distributed; therefore we know all about it. My proposal and my amendment are both formal.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We must have order here. Rule 130 of the rules of procedure reads as follows:

"A representative may move that parts of a proposal or of an amendment shall be voted on separately. If objection is made to the request for division, the motion for division shall be voted upon. Permission to speak on the motion for division shall be given only to two speakers in favour and two speakers against. If the motion for division is carried, those parts of the proposal or of the amendment which are subsequently approved shall be put to the vote as a whole. If all operative parts of the proposal or of the amendment have been rejected, the proposal or the amendment shall be considered to have been rejected as a whole."

Therefore, according to this rule 130, we cannot talk of the non-existence of the entirety of the original proposal in document A/C.1/L.165.

Mr. NUÑEZ-PORTUONDO (Cuba)(interpretation from Spanish): I merely wanted to inform the representative of Greece that I was not shrugging my shoulders. I was trying to fix my earphones because I could not hear what he was saying. I was not making any gesture at all; I was merely fixing my earphones. I could not hear what he said anyway.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In spite of the fact that I am in favour of allowing spiritual tensions to run loose, I must ask everybody to be more quiet while we are carrying on our discussion.

Mr. STRATOS (Greece)(interpretation from French): Because I myself was not quite sure whether I was within the ambit of the rules of procedure, I presented a formal amendment to the proposal that is before the Committee. I asked for a roll-call vote on that amendment, which therefore has priority over the draft resolution as it stands.

Mr. SLIM (Tunisia)(interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, with all due respects, I have asked that you take the consensus of the Committee as to whether we can now consider amendments to the text before we take a vote. I request that you take the consensus of the Committee on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of Tunisia considers that we should not accept any amendment at this stage of discussion. I must tell the representative of Tunisia first of all that I have to give him the opinion of the Chair and the Secretariat on this point. According to the rules of procedure, nothing prohibits any representative from amending a draft resolution before the draft resolution is voted upon.

The representative of Cuba very correctly stated that the constant usage and the jurisprudence of the United Nations has been to accept amendments, especially revisions made by the co-sponsors of a draft resolution themselves, at any time before the vote is taken.

If, despite this friendly clarification, the representative of Tunisia still wants me to put his request to the vote, I shall do so out of courtesy, but once again I appeal to the wisdom and the knowledge of the representative of Tunisia.

Mr. SLIM (Tunisia)(interpretation from French): I am going to submit a formal written amendment.

Mr. SERRANO (Philippines): My statement is merely a follow-up of my original point of order, for the purposes of the record. I wish to be perfectly consistent about this matter. I am raising my point of order on the formal amendment introduced by the representative of Greece for the same reason that I am opposing the amendment presented by the representative of Cuba. I still maintain that no amendments at this stage could be introduced after the vote has been taken on any of the draft resolutions and after the closure of the debate, without reviving the discussion again on the same question.

Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): Would the Chairman be good enough to tell us exactly where we stand as far as the Cuban amendment is concerned? I heard him say that the co-sponsors of the draft resolution had done something in the nature of submitting a revised text -- adding certain words to the end of their resolution. I agree with that. But this is an amendment, and I argued that this amendment should be accepted and admitted. I based myself on rule 121 of our rules of procedure, and I also made reference to the same matters mentioned by the representative of Colombia when he reminded us of the constant jurisprudence of the United Nations.

According to rule 121, which I shall not read out now, the Chairman is empowered to "permit the discussion and consideration of amendments... even though these amendments and motions have not been circulated or have only been circulated the same day".

If that be the case, and if we have acted in that way with regard to the Cuban amendment, I see no reason why the Chairman should not act the same way in regard to the proposal of the representative of Greece and should not put up for consideration and vote a paragraph which the representative of Greece has taken from another draft resolution and which we therefore have before us in writing. Furthermore, we have already voted upon it. The Chairman said -- and I entirely agree with him -- that that vote is of no value whatever now, because the proposal as a whole was rejected. But the text is before us, and we can safely vote on it. Although there are some delegations that may not agree, I still feel that the Chair can decide to put before the Committee for consideration and vote the addition formally presented by the representative of Greece.

Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan): I agree with the words just said by the representative of El Salvador, which I was going to say myself: that the Chairman is the arbiter in the matter of admitting amendments which are not in written form and putting them before the Committee for debate. I am saying this because I also support the amendment suggested by the representative of Greece, and I want to make it very clear that the amendment is as follows:

After the first paragraph of the preamble of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.167, there should be added the following words:

(Mr. Mahgoub, Sudan)

"Having regard to the situation of unrest and strife in Algeria which is causing much human suffering and disturbing the harmony between nations, and

"Recognizing the right of the people of Algeria to self-determination according to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations,".

That should be followed by the present operative paragraph of the six-Power draft resolution, which reads:

"Expresses the hope that a peaceful and democratic solution of this question will be found."

In the same way in which the Chairman kindly allowed the amendment introduced by the representative of Cuba, I ask that this amendment be admitted and that it be placed before the Committee for discussion and voted on.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I sincerely feel that I am being impartial when I say that there is a revised text, including the verbal amendment of the representative of Cuba.

Two amendments have been submitted. The first, submitted by the representative of Greece, renews the paragraphs of the preamble of the resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.165, as just read out by the representative of the Sudan. Members of the Committee have those paragraphs before them.

The representative of Tunisia, in his turn, has submitted an amendment which calls for introducing two paragraphs, as follows:

"Considering the situation in Algeria, which has created unrest and strife and which is causing much human suffering and disturbing the harmony between nations, and

"Recognizing the right of the people of Algeria to self-determination".

These are the two amendments, and I do not feel that I have to put these two amendments before the Committee for consideration.

Mr. NUÑEZ-PORTUONDO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Rule 124 is very clear, and it is applicable to this case. It reads:

"When a proposal has been adopted or rejected it may not be reconsidered at the same session unless the committee, by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, so decides...".

(Mr. Nuñez-Portuondo, Cuba)

The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.165 has been totally rejected. This has been declared by the Chair, and this is the way it is. Therefore, in order to include at the present session words that have been totally rejected -- include them as an amendment or as a new proposal -- a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting would be required. This is crystal-clear.

I cannot understand how there can be any opposition to the addition to a draft resolution of words which say "according to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations". If I were the only sponsor, I would withdraw the amendment; I do not do so because the other sponsors have not so authorized me. But, frankly, it is inconceivable to me that it can give rise to protests or opposition on the part of anyone if it is proposed to add the words "according to the principles of the Charter" or "in conformity with the principles of the Charter" to a resolution in the United Nations.

However, I feel that the Chairman cannot admit an amendment containing words from a proposal that has been totally rejected, unless there is agreement by two-thirds of the members of the Committee.

Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): I should like to say a word about the text which I presented. A slight error is involved. My second paragraph should be exactly the same as the text of the second paragraph of the resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.165. Furthermore, in my text, which the Chairman surely has before him, I should like to add "accordingly". The Chairman probably omitted it by inadvertence, but the word "accordingly" should be there.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to apologize to the representative of Tunisia. He sent me his text in writing, and it contained the word "accordingly" in the last paragraph of the resolution that we are now discussing.

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): The representative of Cuba moved an amendment; he said it was an amendment, and he described the fact. There is no question of a revision or of trying to split hairs as between a revision and an amendment. There was a change or a modification of the draft resolution which, if admitted, should allow the admission of other amendments. The Chairman himself has spoken about the Cuban amendment and was ready to put that amendment before the Committee at this stage. Two other amendments were submitted -- one by the representative of Greece, the second by the representative of the Sudan, which is of the same tenor -- and, if I may say so, the amendment of the representative of Tunisia, which is slightly different from the first two.

The representative of Cuba said that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.165 had been defeated and that therefore a two-thirds majority was required to vote on the amendments which contain paragraphs from that resolution. But a resolution hangs together. Just a moment ago, the Chairman said that there is a unity between all resolutions. I wonder whether there is not a unity relating to the text of one single resolution. If that is the case, the resolution that has been voted upon separately has received a variety of votes and therefore can be considered separately at this stage.

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

If it is not to be considered separately, then I beg to move an amendment in another form, which would read as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"Having regard to the situation in Algeria,

"Recognizing the right of the people of Algeria to self-determination" --

which is to be interposed between the first and second paragraphs of the Cuban draft resolution. This is not at all the same text which was voted on a moment ago.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall request the representative of Syria to be kind enough to submit that text in writing. I should like to tell him that I have been quite logical. The draft resolutions do not constitute one unit; they constitute different elements. What does constitute a unit, however, is the draft resolution itself: the preamble and the operative paragraphs together do make up one indivisible whole. That is why when the operative parts were rejected, there was nothing left. One cannot say, however, that there is a unity between a number of draft resolutions.

Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan): I should like to say most respectfully that what the representative of Cuba has said is incorrect, because the rules of procedure state that when a draft resolution has been rejected, that same draft resolution cannot be considered at the same meeting. That is granted. This, however, is not the draft resolution which was rejected.

What we have here are certain words which might have been in the draft resolution but which are put here by way of an amendment to a draft resolution which is still before the Committee. It has never been true that some of the words or parts of a rejected draft resolution cannot be introduced by way of an amendment to another draft resolution which is under debate.

I ask the representative of Cuba to point out the rule of procedure which states that amendments to a draft resolution before the Committee cannot contain words or paragraphs from the preamble of a rejected draft resolution.

Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I shall be brief, because we have lost too much time in the procedural debate. The representative of Cuba has requested the application of rule 124, that is that the amendment of Greece should require a two-thirds majority. The representative of Greece has taken two paragraphs from the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.165 and has presented them as an amendment to the draft resolution now before us. Since these are only two paragraphs and not the entire resolution in document A/C.1/L.165, it is quite obvious that the representative of Cuba has no right to invoke rule 124, because that rule speaks of entire proposals and not of parts of proposals or individual words from such proposals, which require a two-thirds majority once they have been rejected. That is the most important point.

If we follow the argument of the representative of Cuba, then he has no right to submit his additional words "according to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations". He cannot add these words to his draft resolution, because these same words were contained in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.165, which, in his opinion, was rejected as a whole. Therefore, any phrase therefrom cannot be inserted except by a two-thirds majority vote. If one looks at the second paragraph of that draft resolution, one will find the words "according to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations". Those are the same words which the representative of Cuba wishes to add.

In other words, if we follow the argument of the representative of Cuba, the Committee will find itself floundering in a sea of absurdity. The Committee would then have to object to the inclusion of words which might be found in some draft resolutions which were rejected by the Committee. All our resolutions, after all, consist of words in various combinations and with some variations. Therefore, the repetition of the same words in different combinations might have a completely different meaning.

I therefore object to the interpretation of rule 124 as given by the representative of Cuba.

I believe that the amendment of the representative of Greece is entirely in conformity with the rules of procedure. If the Committee has allowed an amendment to the basic draft resolution by the co-sponsors themselves, then a fortiori the

(Mr. Sobolev, USSR)

Committee should not deny the right of the representative of Greece to submit his amendment and to have it voted upon in accordance with regular procedure.

Mr. URRUTIA (Colombia)(interpretation from Spanish): I should like to make an appeal to wisdom and common sense, because if we continue along the present road we shall get absolutely nowhere.

As we said a few moments ago, there can be no doubt at all that the Committee has the right to permit amendments to be submitted. However, in accordance with the same rules of procedure, we can also decide that no further amendments should be accepted. In these circumstances, why do we not return to the suggestion which we made a few moments ago? Let us decide to put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/L.167 without any amendments.

I should like to ask you, Mr. Chairman, to consult the Committee on this point: to put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/L.167 without any further amendment.

Mr. NUNEZ-PORTUNONDO (Cuba)(interpretation from Spanish): When we added to our draft resolution the phrase "according to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations", it was to complete a concept, and that was all. However, the argument of the representative of the Soviet Union has convinced me. It is the first time that the representative of the Soviet Union has managed to convince me by the use of an argument. I think that he is correct. Strictly in accordance with the rules of procedure, we cannot allow the inclusion of anything that had previously been rejected. The addition which I had proposed to my own draft resolution, therefore, cannot be admitted. On behalf of the co-sponsors of this draft resolution, I wish to withdraw the addition which I proposed and I shall support the suggestion made by the representative of Colombia.

Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador)(interpretation from Spanish): Basically, speaking I am in agreement with the statement made by the representative of Colombia. However, as the representative of Cuba seems to have changed his position, I should like to change the position which my delegation had taken in connexion with the interpretation of rule 121. At the end of rule 121, we find the following:

(Mr. Urquia, El Salvador)

"The Chairman may, however, permit the discussion and consideration of amendments, or of motions as to procedure, even though these amendments and motions have not been circulated the same day."

I think that the experience of this afternoon on this draft resolution should convince us that we are mistaken when we think that it is still possible to present amendments or revised texts once the vote on a draft resolution has begun. That would, in effect, reopen the debate. All that this part of rule 121 states is that the Chairman may permit the discussion and consideration of amendments, and that would signify that the debate was reopened. It is illogical, however, to consider that once the vote has begun, one can interrupt the vote to discuss an amendment. That interpretation would make our debates endless. This part of rule 121 should be understood to mean that amendments can be submitted up to the moment when the vote is begun, that amendments can be submitted even though they have not been circulated and that the debate may be prolonged somewhat merely so as to study the amendments. However, once we have embarked on the process of voting, no further amendments can be submitted. I believe that this is the interpretation which should be followed in the future.

Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan): The representative of Cuba has every right to withdraw his amendment, but I am not withdrawing mine, because we had already begun the process of submitting amendments and I submitted mine. The rule is before the Chairman, and he can allow me to submit my amendment. Again, if the representative of Cuba withdraws his amendment then the vote on priority has to be retaken, because when it was taken originally it was in the light of the new amendment presented by the representative of Cuba. That amendment has now been withdrawn, and I ask that the vote on priority be retaken.

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): I wish to raise the same point as the representative of the Sudan. Priority was accorded to the Cuban draft resolution on the basis of the amendment. It was a very strange procedure indeed to allow the submission of an amendment even before the draft resolution was before the Committee, but the Chairman saw fit to act in that manner. Therefore, we should follow the consequences of that action and, since the Chairman has accepted an amendment to that draft resolution, he should accept any other amendment as well.

Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): I should simply like to add the following. First of all, there is one small point of clarification. Rule 124, which has been invoked against the acceptance of the Greek, Tunisian and Sudanese amendments, is, in my opinion, inapplicable because the argument is based on the contention that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.165 has been in some way voted upon, whereas I should like to point out that in fact that draft resolution has not been voted upon as a whole. We voted on some of its paragraphs, but before the last paragraph was put to the Committee, and before a vote was taken on the draft resolution as a whole, we heard a proposal to the effect that the voting should not be continued. The Chairman took the sense of the Committee, and the Committee agreed that no useful purpose would be served by continuing the vote on the draft resolution. Therefore, as I have indicated, there was no vote on the draft resolution as a whole. It was, unfortunately, withdrawn because of the rejection of two out of three of its substantive proposals.

The representative of Cuba is free to withdraw his amendment at any time before the voting has begun, but my delegation presses its amendment. We argue that our amendment represents part of a whole which was never voted upon or rejected as a whole, so that therefore the two-thirds majority rule does not apply. When the Committee adopted the principle of accepting the addition of the phrase "according to the principles of the United Nations Charter", that phrase also existed in the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.165. Thus, either one accepts the principle of inserting some part of that draft resolution, or else the whole principle is rejected. As to whether the Cuban delegation has withdrawn its amendment, it is its absolute and ineluctable right to do so. But my delegation maintains its amendment and, in fact, presses it.

Mr. WALKER (Australia): I am sure that all members of the Committee have been greatly impressed by the extreme courtesy and fairness with which the Chairman has allowed representatives to continue this discussion, which I myself feel has covered a good many unprofitable aspects. There is no doubt whatever that the object of our rules of procedure and our traditions in this Committee is to enable us to discuss a problem, to have before us proposals, to decide the order in which we shall vote upon those proposals, and then proceed to the vote, and it would be a bad innovation if we began amending draft resolutions extensively just at the very moment before they were put to the vote.

In all the circumstances, I think that the Committee would be very well guided if it followed the advice of the representative of Colombia and put to the vote immediately the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.167. As far as the Australian delegation is concerned, it requests the Chairman, with all respect, to proceed to a vote on that proposal.

Mr. URRUTIA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to clarify two points. First, the fact that an amendment has been withdrawn does not mean that we have to be called upon to vote on others. And, in accordance with the final part of rule 132, I would request the Chairman to put to the Committee the proposal that it should not accept any amendment but proceed to vote immediately on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.167, unamended. We have the power so to decide, and if we have a majority then we have to abide by its will.

Second, I would ask the Chairman, in accordance with rule 118 of the rules of procedure, to be good enough to declare this debate closed and to take a vote immediately on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.167.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I have given proof of my inexhaustible courtesy and my desire to hear all viewpoints in the Committee. We have many obligations, and I think that this matter has been sufficiently thrashed out. Accordingly, I must say that I agree with the view expressed by the representative of Colombia, but I do not feel that I am authorized to give a ruling on this question. Therefore, I would ask the Committee to make up its mind on the subject, and would ask it to vote on the proposal that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.167 be voted upon now without any amendment.

The proposal was adopted by 38 votes to 32, with 6 abstentions.

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): On a point of order. When priority was accorded to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.167 the amendment was before us. The Chairman then ruled that that amendment was in order, and it was accepted by the co-sponsors of the draft resolution. Since priority was accorded in those circumstances, it no longer holds good and we should revert to the original state of affairs, which means that the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.166) submitted by Japan, the Philippines and Thailand should be voted upon first.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee voted to give this draft resolution priority. It would require a two-thirds majority to revoke that decision. I trust that the representative of Syria will not insist on his point.

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): The draft resolution that we now have before us is not the same as the one to which the Committee voted to give priority. Therefore, with all due respect for the opinions which have been expressed, I must say that I feel that our procedure today has been somewhat strange. I think that we should abide by the rules of procedure. If we are not to abide by the concepts of the Charter, let us at least abide by the rules of procedure.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The amendment did not alter the meaning of this draft resolution. I would also note that, implicitly, all of the activities of the United Nations are based on the spirit and the principles of the Charter. Hence, the only thing which the Committee can do now is to vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.167.

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): I should like to submit that the question whether an amendment changes the meaning of a draft resolution is a question to be decided by the various delegations seated at this table, not a matter of procedure to be decided by the Chairman.

In my opinion, the amendment does change the meaning of the draft resolution. The Committee gave priority to the draft resolution as amended. The addition was called an amendment; the Chairman himself called it an amendment and admitted it. I therefore do not think that the decision which the Committee took on the question of priority is applicable now. That decision was a mistake, and it can be corrected, as other mistakes have been corrected.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I must say this to the representative of Syria: I have before me the results of the last vote which the Committee took. In that vote, the Committee decided -- with thirty-eight delegations in favour and thirty-two against -- to vote now on this draft resolution.

Mr. URRUTIA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): I was going to make the same observation as the Chairman has just made. What I proposed was that the Committee should immediately proceed to the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.167. There were thirty-eight votes in favour of that proposal; it received a majority; the matter has therefore been settled once and for all. If any representative has any doubts on this score, he can challenge the Chairman's ruling. There is, however, no reason to go on discussing this question. If the Chairman's ruling is challenged, the Committee will decide the matter by a vote.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of Syria has the right to object to my decision, if he so desires. I shall have no objection to putting to the vote any challenge which is made to my ruling. I do not, however, think that the representative of Syria wishes to challenge the ruling, and I now ask the Committee to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.167.

Mr. JAMALI (Iraq): I wish to raise a point of order. I have had my hand up, asking to be recognized, on several occasions -- both before the vote and after the vote -- and no attention has been paid to me.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of Iraq knows that I always take pleasure both in seeing him and in hearing him. Unfortunately, I did not see that he had his hand raised.

Mr. JAMALI (Iraq): I am bewildered. In my long experience in United Nations bodies, I have never seen this kind of procedure, in which an amendment is submitted and then withdrawn or cancelled out before being discussed and before the authors agree that it should be withdrawn.

This afternoon, we have seen two very strange procedures which are really contrary to the rules of the game. The first concerns the matter of priority. I have already said that that priority was not at all necessary. I have said that the six-Power draft resolution is soulless, blind, deaf and dumb.

A soul was added to the draft resolution. Very good. Then attempts were made to add eyes, ears and a mouth. But now the whole thing has been spoiled. That is my first point.

My second point is this: We wish to see that we are all treated on an equal basis. If there is a point of view which has political pressure behind it, let our point of view be given equal treatment. Let us see that there is fair play. Let our point of view be respected, too; let our point of view be given the same chance as other points of view.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Unfortunately, the observations of the representative of Iraq do not change the position. The Committee has taken a decision, and I cannot revoke that decision. I therefore ask the Committee to vote now on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.167.

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): I am very sorry to have to insist on this point. In view, however, of the developments that we have witnessed this afternoon in this Committee, I must challenge the Chairman's ruling on the question of priority.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I made no ruling on the question of priority. If he so wishes, however, the representative of Syria can object to the last ruling which I made -- namely, that the Committee should now vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.167, in accordance with a decision which the Committee adopted by thirty-eight votes to thirty-two. I would ask the Committee to vote on the challenge to my decision that the Committee should vote now on that draft resolution.

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): I wish to raise a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall allow the representative of Syria to speak, but first I wish to say this to him: The representative of Syria should bear in mind the fact that public opinion is watching us. I would ask him to note that everything that has happened here this afternoon

has been extremely serious. The representative of Syria knows full well how scrupulous I am with regard to anything relating to the Charter and the rules of procedure.

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): It is because I fully realize that world public opinion has its eyes on us, because I fully realize that there is a wide, decent section of public opinion that is watching us, that I am bringing these matters to the Chairman's attention.

My objection was not to the vote: it was to the ruling made by the Chairman, to the effect that the draft resolution remained the same even though an amendment was made to it and then withdrawn. I hold that the draft resolution is not the same text as the one to which we decided to give priority, and, therefore, the vote on priority no longer is valid. Hence, the three-Power draft resolution should be voted upon first. That is my contention, and I would ask the Chairman to put it to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of Syria may state his opinion of my decision; he may challenge my decision; but what he may not do is tell the Chairman what that decision was. That would be going too far.

I now put to the vote the objection to my ruling which has been made by the representative of Syria.

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon): I should like to ask the Chairman a question, and whether I challenge his answer will depend on what that answer is.

This is my question: When the Committee decided on the order of priority and decided to put a certain document to the vote ahead of another document, was that priority granted to document A/C.1/L.167 as originally presented, or to document A/C.1/L.167 as amended? That is my question, and, as I have said, I shall decide whether to challenge the Chairman's answer after I have heard it.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I think that the priority ~~was~~ voted upon by the Committee; at least, I am sticking to the record kept by the Secretary of the Committee. The sponsors withdrew their amendment, and because of that we followed the suggestion made by the representative of Colombia and all the amendments were discarded by decision of the Committee. How does the representative of Syria want me to put the question of priority to the vote? Does the representative of Lebanon want me to do that? I do not think he can want that, because the priority has already been voted upon.

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon): I put a very simple question to you, Mr. Chairman, a question which is susceptible of a simple answer of "yes" or "no". My question was this: when the vote on priority was taken, was it taken on document A/C.1/L.167 as you now want to put it to the vote or on that document as amended? That is a very simple question which does not need any explanation on the part of the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The suggestion was made by the representative of Cuba that an amendment be included in the draft resolution, and this was supported by the other sponsors and by other delegations. The representative of Lebanon wants to know whether or not we voted in favour of priority. That priority was decided upon and, therefore, I reply affirmatively to the representative of Lebanon.

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon): I did not ask whether priority was decided upon, I know it was. I am asking whether it was decided on one document or on another. In other words, I am asking on what the priority was decided.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): It was granted to document A/C.1/L.167. That was the decision taken by the Committee.

Mr. URRUTIA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): Can I once and for all clear up this matter? Would you, Mr. Chairman, be good enough to ask the Committee, since it is the master of its own procedure, if it agrees with the interpretation given by you that the Committee will vote on document A/C.1/L.167, without any amendment, and that it be given priority over other documents. That is the question that the Committee has to vote upon.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): But this question was decided upon by 38 votes in favour. I very clearly put before this Committee the question of whether this draft resolution, without any amendments, should be given priority over the other. That was decided by 38 votes in favour to 32 against. I shall now put the draft resolution to the vote.

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon): What are you putting to the vote?

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall put to the vote the draft resolution itself, since it was decided by 38 votes to 32 to give priority to the draft resolution, without any amendments.

Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Chairman has just told us that the Committee decided to vote upon resolution A/C.1/L.167, without any amendments. However, that was not the way in which the vote was taken. The vote was taken in another form. The vote was upon whether or not any amendments to the draft resolution should be entertained, and the Committee decided by 38 votes to 32 not to entertain any amendments. When that decision was taken, the Committee still found itself with two draft resolutions before it, those contained in documents A/C.1/L.166 and 167. Since the priority was given to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.167, as amended, by the representative of Cuba, an amendment which was accepted by the co-sponsors, this draft resolution no longer exists. Consequently, the priority which was previously given to the amended draft resolution has lapsed. Therefore, the question of priority must be raised again.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I believe that we are confusing this issue. The representative of Colombia put a proposal very clearly before the Committee that we should vote immediately and forthwith on the five-Power draft resolution, without any amendments. That clear proposal to vote forthwith on the unamended document was accepted by 38 votes in favour to 32 against. The Chair cannot do anything but follow the wishes of the Committee and, therefore, I am forced to fulfil that decision of the Committee.

Mr. URRUTIA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): I think the situation in which we find ourselves is as follows. The Chairman has interpreted the decision of the Committee, and I agree with that interpretation. However, that interpretation has been objected to, and may I beg you, Mr. Chairman, to consult the Committee to find out whether it agrees that we should immediately proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.167, unamended and with priority.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In order to satisfy everybody, despite the fact that the question has been decided, I have no objection to putting the following question to the vote: is the Committee in agreement with the interpretation of the Chair that the previous decision of the Committee was that we should vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.167, unamended and with priority?

The Chairman's interpretation was upheld by 40 votes to 32, with 5 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee will now vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.167.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China.

Against: Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon.

Abstaining: Turkey, Bolivia, Cambodia.

The draft resolution was adopted by 41 votes to 33, with 3 abstentions.

Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand): I have a point of order. I am going to propose, with great earnestness, that we do not take a vote on the draft resolution in A/C.1/L.166. We have had a long discussion this afternoon, and we have had the good fortune to sit under your admirable Chairmanship, Sir, and I think it can be said that everybody, in the course of the last few days, has expressed himself very fully on this momentous question. Whatever may have been the particular votes here, I make bold to say that there is nobody in this whole Committee who does not express the hope, and the belief too, that a peaceful and democratic solution of this question will be found. If that is the view of the Committee, as I believe it to be, I think that it would not conduce to the atmosphere which we all so much desire if we proceeded to vote on this draft resolution, and I am going to have the courage

(Sir Leslie Munro, New Zealand)

to suggest to the representatives of Japan, the Philippines and Thailand that they do agree with the proposal which I make. In any case, I make it formally, that we do not vote on this draft resolution, because I cannot see what profit there will be, if we vote on it with further divisions, to the cause which we all have at heart.

Therefore, at this late stage in our deliberations, I make this proposal, that we do not vote on this draft resolution.

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon): The Committee has just taken a decision before which, of course, we bow. The decision was reached by a vote of 41 to 33, with 3 abstentions. I have listened to the statement made by the representative of New Zealand; but the situation is a little more complicated than he would have us believe.

If we think for a while about the political implications of this whole matter, I am sure that the representative of New Zealand will be the first to agree with me that the nature of the division that has taken place in the Committee this afternoon is not a healthy one for the future development of the United Nations.

We see in the vote a clear division between Asia and Africa, on the one hand, and Europe and the Western Hemisphere, on the other. I ask the representative of New Zealand, as well as every other representative at this table, whether that is a good thing for the future of our Organization. It is not enough to reach a decision. We have been labouring for days to reach some kind of decision which would break that unhealthy division that exists today between Asia and Africa, on the one hand, and the rest of the world, on the other. Therefore, it is absolutely politically necessary that something be done in this Committee in order to remove that situation in our minds, in the United Nations, and throughout the world.

If I press this argument, it becomes perfectly clear that, far from desiring -- as does the representative of New Zealand, and perhaps others -- to proceed immediately to the next item on our agenda, we should, on the contrary, do our utmost to ameliorate the situation in such a way as to give some satisfaction to these thirty-three delegations which have voted against the resolution just

MW/bd

A/C.1/PV.846
78-80

(Mr. Malik, Lebanon)

adopted, which resolution, with the division that has taken place in the Committee, will, in my opinion, produce something that should never have been allowed to happen here today. Therefore, I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the members of the Committee, to permit us to vote on the second draft resolution before us, and I hope that some of those forty-one delegations which have voted for the other resolution will vote for the text in this one, so that when we have two texts in our hands, we shall be able, at the plenary meeting, so to combine them, so to integrate them one with the other as to produce a healthier situation in this whole Organization. I am convinced that the division concerning this issue, or any other issue, into Asia and Africa, on the one hand, and the rest of the world, on the other, is not good, and all of us should work against it.

Therefore, I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, to the representative of New Zealand, and to every other representative here to permit us to vote on the other text. Furthermore, I hope that some of those who voted for the resolution which has just been adopted will also vote for the draft resolution in A/C.1/L.166 which, I hope, will be put to the vote of the Committee.

Mr. SERRANO (Philippines): The representative of New Zealand has offered a proposal to avoid any vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.166, of which my delegation is a co-sponsor. The request was coupled with an appeal to the sponsors on this matter, and certainly I would be lacking in my obligation of utmost courtesy to the representative of New Zealand if I were not to make my response now. I must state, in all candour, that if the circumstances which surrounded the order of priority as regards the resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.167, together with the voting, were not such as to make me feel unhappy about the whole thing, and had I felt the sentiment of the Committee to be manifested in the sense of approximating a situation where the composition of differences was the prevailing spirit, and where a spirit of amity had characterized this debate, I would have yielded willingly to the appeal.

On the other hand, the passions demonstrated in the course of the procedural debate, the lack of substantive reasons adduced for giving priority to the resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.167, and the precipitate decision taken by this Committee thereon will create some kind of very unsatisfactory feeling among those who believe that there should be an opportunity to vote on the draft resolution. This will exacerbate the situation.

I will therefore make a counter appeal to the representative of New Zealand that in the interest of satisfying all delegations, every opportunity should be given to them to express themselves on a matter which is so replete with potential political implications. We might as well give the Committee an opportunity to express itself on the draft resolution. It is with this appeal that I address myself to the representative of New Zealand.

Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand): I am going to say only a few words and I will speak only on behalf of my delegation. Of course, I have heard the statement just made by one of the co-sponsors, the representative of the Philippines, but I do not know what is the view of the representative of Japan. However, as far as my delegation is concerned, may I say that I have heard the appeal made by the representative of New Zealand and, personally, I would very much like to heed his appeal. But, in this connexion, the draft resolution which my delegation and two others have submitted before the Committee no longer belongs to us. It is not our property; it is the property of the Committee. The decision to withdraw it

(Mr. Khoman, Thailand)

or not to press for the vote does not rest with us. It is for the Committee to decide whether to press on with the vote or take a different decision in accordance with rule 132 of the rules of procedure.

Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) (interpretation from French): I should like to join in the moving and eloquent appeal just made to us by the representative of Lebanon. I wholeheartedly share his point of view and I should like to add the following: If the draft resolution which we have just adopted had obtained a two-thirds majority, then the other sponsors would not have pressed for a vote on their draft resolution. True enough, from the point of view of the Committee the resolution has been adopted. But the Committee knows very well that in the General Assembly a two-thirds vote will be required. Therefore, we should try to put the third draft resolution to the vote, and then we can see what sort of an effort will be required.

Even though the task of the First Committee may be finished, the problem is far from settled. Outside of the walls of the Committee, a new, ardent and warm effort will have to be made to achieve some sort of compromise and to present the General Assembly either with a new draft or with amendments likely to command the two-thirds majority for a draft resolution. In order to do so, the third draft resolution will have to be put to the vote so that we may have the sense, the consensus, of the Committee regarding this resolution. The results of that vote may assist us in the efforts which we will have to undertake in the next few days to find and present new amendments or a new draft resolution to the plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

Mr. KASE (Japan): As one of the co-sponsors of the three-Power draft resolution, may I say just a few words. I am sorry that I have to differ with the representative of New Zealand, with whom I am generally in agreement. As the representative of Iran pointed out, I am not quite sure whether the resolution just voted on will muster the necessary two-thirds majority in the plenary meeting. Moreover, I heartily agree with the wise remarks made by the Foreign Minister of Lebanon.

(Mr. Kase, Japan)

The temper of the Committee this afternoon was something which I did not relish. I would like to say that this very difficult question as regards this area will be dealt with and settled by an atmosphere conducive to general pacification. May I, with that remark, humbly request the Chairman to allow us to go to the vote on the three-Power draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): May I ask the representative of New Zealand whether he desires to press his proposal that the Committee should not vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.166, submitted by Japan, the Philippines and Thailand.

Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand): I do ask that my proposal be put to the vote, and I put it again with great earnestness, because I say that having adopted one resolution, which I think is a fruitful one, which expresses, I believe, the conscience of us all, no matter how we may have voted particularly on it, I consider that a vote on the other draft resolution would not help to achieve the amity and peace which we in this Committee desire.

Therefore, speaking with great solemnity, I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to put my motion to the vote.

Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): As we now have a formal proposal before us and since the appeal made to the representative of New Zealand was not accepted by him, it is necessary to explain why there are many delegations around this table who would like to see the three-Power draft resolution voted upon.

Some facts have become clear in this Committee this afternoon. One fact is that we voted upon the first resolution so as to have it defeated, and then move for priority on the second resolution as amended, and then withdraw all the amendments and return to the old proposal as it was. The whole discussion, I think, throws light upon the proposal made by the representative of New Zealand. It amounts

AW/ns

A/C.1/PV.846
84-85

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

to the following: that while an expression of opinion by a vote was allowed to take place as regards the last proposal which was voted upon, such an expression of opinion through the vote of the Committee is not being allowed as regards the three-Power draft resolution. The expression of opinion is not a matter of individual expression only through the debate; the major and principal expression of opinion is that which the Committee as such and each Member State may express through its vote. Therefore, they should have the possibility of expressing that opinion by their vote on this draft resolution.

(Mr. Zeineddine, Syria)

We seek to create an atmosphere which is conducive to a better understanding on this problem. Unfortunately, such an effort has to be made again because such an atmosphere needs greater effort in order to come about.

I do not believe, as the representative of New Zealand wants us to believe, that the resolution which was voted upon was fruitful. Had thirty-three Members of the United Nations thought it was fruitful, they would not have voted against it. The fact that they voted against it does demonstrate that they believed it was not fruitful.

Furthermore, there are two proposals -- a resolution which has been voted upon and a draft resolution which is before us. There are many Members who would like to vote who prefer the three-Power draft resolution to the one already voted upon. They would be denied the possibility of taking such a stand through another procedure, as has been expressed by the representative of New Zealand, following the previous stages of procedure that we have seen this afternoon. I appeal to fair play and to courtesy, as well as to the meaning of the vote to the Committee to allow this draft resolution to be voted upon here.

Mr. de LEQUERICA (Spain)(interpretation from Spanish): I should like to make a comment. We oppose the proposal of the representative of New Zealand, and we intend to abstain on it. I have said this before and I am not going to hide it. We thought that we would vote in the negative on the eighteen-Power draft resolution, and we voted in the affirmative on the other proposal. But I said that we would not vote in favour of the Argentine proposal if it came to us with any mention in it of stopping discussion on this question. I agree with the representative of Lebanon that it would be a grave error at this moment to close the door on a very interesting train of thought, with which we might be able to come to an agreement.

We should like the other nations to make known their views. They can never say that we have closed the door to a very important world, with which the European and Western worlds can come to an agreement and co-exist in a common task. Therefore, I formally request that the draft resolution submitted by Japan, the Philippines and Thailand be voted upon.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We have before us the motion of the representative of New Zealand that, in accordance with rule 132, no vote be taken on the proposal submitted by Japan, the Philippines and Thailand. A roll-call vote has been requested. Those who are in favour of not holding a vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.166 please signify.

Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): As I understand it, we are now voting on the proposal of the representative of New Zealand to the effect that the Committee decide not to vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.166. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): That is quite correct. The vote will begin with Czechoslovakia.

Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia): I did not hear the formulation of the Soviet representative. I would like it to be repeated.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We are going to vote on the New Zealand motion, which is that the Committee take no vote on the draft resolution of Japan, the Philippines and Thailand.

Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia): That means for the proposal or against?

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): No, we are going to vote on whether a vote is to be held on that proposal. We are going to fulfil the conditions of rule 132, which says:

"A committee may, after each vote on a proposal, decide whether to vote on the next proposal."

A motion has been put before the Committee that we do not take a vote on this next proposal. Those in favour of that motion of New Zealand will say "Yes", and those who are against will say "No".

Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia): Those who are in favour say "No"?

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): May I tell the representative of Czechoslovakia he has to vote "No".

Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran)(interpretation from French): You might avoid misunderstandings by explaining this: those who want the three-Power draft resolution to be put to the vote should vote "No", in other words, against the New Zealand motion. In this way there will be no confusion in the minds of people about the vote.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Well, I think that the formula is really the same. However, I shall not object. The question is extremely clear. The representative of New Zealand opposes a vote being held on this draft resolution. Therefore, those who want to hold a vote on it will say "Yes".

My first formula was better. The representative of New Zealand has proposed that no vote be held. Those who want a vote to be taken will say "No", therefore voting against the New Zealand motion.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Cuba.

Against: Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon.

Abstaining: Finland, Laos, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Austria, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica.

The motion was rejected by 43 votes to 24, with 10 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Therefore the motion of the representative of New Zealand has failed of adoption, and we shall have to vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.166. A vote has been requested paragraph by paragraph. Does the representative of El Salvador want a roll-call vote on each paragraph?

Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): No, just the first one.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of El Salvador has asked for a roll-call vote on the first paragraph, which begins with the words, "Having regard to the situation," and ends with the words "loss of lives".

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon): If there is to be a vote paragraph by paragraph, I request that there be a roll-call vote for every paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Then there will be three roll-call votes, one on each paragraph. The first roll-call vote will be on the first paragraph, which begins with the words, "Having regard to the situation ..."

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan

Against: Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Israel, Italy

Abstaining: Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Spain, Sweden, Venezuela, Austria, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland

The paragraph was adopted by 42 votes to 18, with 17 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee will now vote on the second paragraph, which begins with the words "Believing that the unsatisfactory situation ... "

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece

Against: Israel, Italy, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Honduras

Abstaining: Iceland, Ireland, Mexico, Norway, Peru, Spain, Sweden, Venezuela, Austria, China, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Guatemala

The paragraph was adopted by 37 votes to 25, with 15 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We shall now vote on the third paragraph, beginning with the words "Expresses the hope that".

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya.

Against: Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Laos.

Abstaining: Mexico, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Spain, Sweden, Austria, China, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland.

The paragraph was adopted by 37 votes to 23, with 17 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee will now vote on the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.166) as a whole.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bolivia.

Against: Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Haiti, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil.

Abstaining: China, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Mexico, Norway, Peru, Spain, Sweden, Austria.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 37 votes to 27, with 13 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I now call upon the representative of the United Kingdom for an explanation of the vote.

Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom): When I spoke on 6 February, I emphasized the importance which my Government attaches to the Charter provision which precludes the General Assembly from intervening in the domestic affairs of Member States. I also said that my Government had the fullest confidence in the desire and ability of the French Government to carry out the liberal policy which my friend, Mr. Pineau, has set out here with such clarity. I said that we must do nothing to complicate the task that the French Government has set for itself, and I supported Mr. Pineau's plea that the Committee should not vote for any resolution on the subject. It was in the light of these considerations that I voted against the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.165 and A/C.1/L.166, the eighteen-Power draft and the three-Power draft.

I should like to say, however, that we fully appreciate the spirit of compromise and understanding which moved the three sponsors of the second draft.

I felt able, in spite of what I said in my earlier statement, to give the six-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.167) my support, as the sentiments expressed in it are strongly shared by my Government and the resolution involves no recommendation by the Assembly. In voting for this resolution, we do not, of course, concede that the General Assembly was competent to discuss the question of Algeria.

Mr. GARIN (Portugal): My delegation has refrained from intervening in the general debate since it was our opinion that, in this case, we could not bring any valuable contribution to it, as we found ourselves before the difficulty of being unable to disregard a fundamental principle of the Charter in which we strongly believe and which we desire to obey. On account of this, we could not support the eighteen-Power draft resolution, and we were likewise unable to support the joint draft proposed by Japan, the Philippines and Thailand. However, in relation to the latter, we wish to pay homage to the good and sincere intentions of conciliation on the part of the sponsors, whose positions the Assembly has now grown used to respect and value.

In view of the foregoing, my delegation could only find its way to support the draft resolution presented by the four Latin American countries and Italy, in which notice is taken of the fact of the discussion which we heard in this Committee, a discussion which was not opposed by the French delegation.

(Mr. Garin, Portugal)

Many representatives here have rightly proclaimed that peace is the first and main objective to attain in that part of the world. We strongly agree with their view, and we trust that France, with all her great spiritual and liberal traditions will, with time, be able to fulfil her general and praiseworthy aims in regard to the Algerian question. The Portuguese people can only pray and hope that peoples with whom they have so many and so old ties of friendship will, in not too distant a future, find their way to peace and understanding, for the sake of their mutual interests and of the indispensable co-operation between Europe and Africa.

Mr. SERRANO (Philippines): As regards the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.165, my delegation voted in favour of the first preambular paragraph for the following reason. Although we were reluctant to pass over the issue of domestic jurisdiction raised by the French Government and without regard to the sentiment of this body as to whether or not it has competence to deal with this question, there is absolutely no reason, in the view of our delegation, why this body should not be concerned with the situation of unrest and strife in Algeria which is causing so much human suffering and loss of life. Without expressing our views on the competence of this body, we are of the view that we cannot avoid our expression of concern over what is taking place in Algeria.

We abstained on the second paragraph of the preamble, for the following reason. If the second paragraph of the preamble is to be considered as a statement of the recognition of the right of the people of Algeria to self-determination under the principles of the Charter, in a general way, we are in favour of it. But if it is to be interpreted to mean the immediate application of that right to Algeria, disturbing the normal, peaceful and orderly process of its application, we are not prepared to state our position thereon. It is for that reason that we abstained.

We abstained on the remaining paragraphs of that draft resolution because we considered that it would disrupt and disturb the philosophy which underlay our draft resolution (A/C.1/L.166), a philosophy which is to promote amity and good will with a view to enabling the parties to negotiate a peaceful solution of the problem.

In connexion with the draft resolution submitted in document A/C.1/L.167, it was the original intention of my Government to abstain. However, we deeply regretted the conditions under which it was accorded priority by the Committee. We are of the view that the position taken by the Committee in granting that priority was contrary to the rules of procedure. It was also improper because, although the representative of the Soviet Union asked at least for an explanation, that request was never heeded despite the substantive and cogent reasons which prompted it. For that reason, we were compelled to vote against the draft resolution.

So far as our own draft resolution is concerned, we feel that its approval was the triumph of justice, sobriety and fair play.

Mr. NUÑEZ-PORTUONDO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): The Cuban delegation voted against the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.166), which obtained thirty-seven favourable votes against twenty-seven. It, too, failed to win a two-thirds majority, and even including the abstentions the votes in favour would still not represent two thirds of the General Assembly. We voted as we did because we felt that the proposal was inconsistent with the Cuban view with regard to the competence of the General Assembly in making this type of recommendation and in going so far.

We voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Cuba, for obvious reasons. After all, it was the product of our own work and it was the proposal that received the greatest majority in this Committee -- with forty-one votes in favour, or four more than the three-Power draft resolution. We voted against the eighteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.165) because we felt that it infringed the essence of Article 2 (7) of the Charter.

I should like to say also that, although some representatives have said that we were manoeuvring for priority, as far as Cuba is concerned, at least, the presentation of the amendment was not a manoeuvre to secure priority. A number of Latin American nations and other nations came to the Cuban representative, and I think that it was the representative of Mexico who suggested that we should add the words "in accordance with the principles of the Charter". We were very glad to accept that suggestion. Thus, this was not a Cuban idea, nor was it a manoeuvre on the part of Cuba when it accepted the amendment. But since total opposition was expressed with regard to our amendment, and since it was felt, as the representative of the Soviet Union said, that we had no right to present such an amendment under the rules of procedure, and that its withdrawal would not weaken or detract from the draft resolution, we did in fact withdraw it. We felt that it was not important, and our action certainly was not one of manoeuvring for position. The Committee itself accorded priority to the draft resolution, without the amendment, and this is the first time in the history of our Organization that the First Committee has had to vote three times on a question of priority.

That is the way in which Cuba has acted in connexion with this problem, and we are in favour of any proposal that will lead to agreement -- but only if that proposal obtains a two-thirds majority. As things stand, neither draft resolution will obtain that two-thirds majority in the General Assembly, and if that situation persists there will, in fact, be no draft resolution at all on the question of Algeria.

Mr. de la COLINA (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): In my statement this morning I said that I thought that the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.166) submitted by the representatives of Japan, the Philippines and Thailand contained very

valuable elements, some of which might safely be included in the draft resolution of the six Powers. Unfortunately, the complicated procedural discussion this afternoon made it impossible to include the words I had suggested -- words which the co-sponsors of that draft resolution had been kind enough to accept and suggest for insertion in their revised text. Despite that, I voted in favour of the six-Power draft resolution for the reasons I gave in my morning statement. I also voted in favour of putting the three-Power resolution (A/C.1/L.166) to the vote because I felt that that was in keeping with the custom of the United Nations of according equal treatment to all draft resolutions. However, I abstained on the substance of that proposal.

Once again I should like to appeal to the sponsors of the two draft resolutions which have been adopted to stint no effort so that when we go to the plenary Assembly we may have before us one text that can be supported by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting, as required by the rules of procedure.

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on the eighteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.165). We voted in favour of that proposal because we co-sponsored it and because we believed in what it said. We thought it was the right thing to do; accordingly, we co-sponsored it, and then voted for it. However, the Committee did not agree with our view, and we certainly bow before the Committee's decision.

We voted against the six-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.167) because we sincerely believed that, while what it says is true and we have no objection in principle thereto, it does not say enough to make it really expressive of the consensus of this Committee. We felt that a better text would do more justice to the common opinion of the Committee than this six-Power text.

Then, when we came to the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.166), presented by Japan, the Philippines and Thailand, we voted in favour of that text because, as I pointed out earlier, once the six-Power draft resolution had been adopted by the Committee we felt it was only fair to have something else that would be more expressive of the consensus of the Committee.

(Mr. Malik, Lebanon)

I think that the result of the voting has proved that we were right. A vote of forty-one to thirty-three is less expressive of the consensus of the Committee than a vote of thirty-seven to twenty-seven -- which is the result of the vote on the three-Power draft resolution.

Thus, the Committee now has adopted these two draft resolutions as the fruit of its labours. We must now look forward to the plenary meeting of the General Assembly on this subject. We hope that, between now and the date of that plenary meeting, we can all put our heads together and arrive at a text which will be conciliatory in spirit and in language and which will receive the necessary two-thirds majority in the General Assembly.

I think that only if we create such a resolution out of our labours here will we produce the kind of positive and healthy climate in the United Nations with regard to this thorny matter which will cut across the unhealthy divisions to which I referred in my first statement.

Finally, I wish to say that, in acting in the manner which I have just described, we have been motivated by absolute and perfect goodwill towards France and the Algerian people. It is only in so far as we maintain this goodwill towards both France and the Algerian people -- and we, ourselves, are certainly going to maintain it -- that we shall be able in the future developments of this case to help restore peace, security and trust to that troubled area of North Africa.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to announce that the General Committee, which was to have met this afternoon at five o'clock but could not do so because the meeting of the First Committee had not been adjourned by that time, will meet tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.