

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 488th
MEETING

Monday, 13 December 1965,
at 11.40 a.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 101:</i>	
<i>Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects (concluded):</i>	
<i>(a) Report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations;</i>	
<i>(b) The authorization and financing of future peace-keeping operations</i>	<i>1</i>

Chairman: Mr. Carlet R. AUGUSTE (Haiti).

AGENDA ITEM 101

Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects (concluded) (A/SPC/L.117 and Add.1 and 2, L.121/Rev.1, L.122 and Add.1, L.124):

- (a) Report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations (A/5915 and Add.1, A/5916 and Add.1, A/5972, A/6026);
- (b) The authorization and financing of future peace-keeping operations (A/5966/Rev.2)

1. Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) said that in the hope of finding a satisfactory solution to the difficult situation in which the Committee had found itself at the previous meeting, several delegations, including his own, had agreed on the text of a draft resolution (A/SPC/L.124) which he wished to submit to the Committee for consideration. Its main purpose was to permit the Committee to continue its debate on peace-keeping operations in an atmosphere of harmony and co-operation. The Committee was invited not to vote at the present stage on draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1, but to refer it, along with all the other suggestions and proposals, to the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations. He hoped that all delegations would be able to vote for the new draft resolution and he appealed to the Soviet Union representative not to insist on the proposal he had made at the previous meeting, under rule 132 of the rules of procedure, that it was unnecessary to put draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1 to the vote. In conclusion, he asked the Committee to accord priority in the order of voting to draft resolution A/SPC/L.124.

2. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would not insist on an immediate vote being taken on the Soviet Union proposal provided that priority was now given to draft resolution A/SPC/L.124. If, however, that resolution was not adopted, his previous proposal would again apply.

3. Mr. PONNAMBALAM (Ceylon) said that without wishing in any way to disturb the spirit of harmony

and co-operation that had so far prevailed in the Committee's debates, he felt that draft resolution A/SPC/L.124 was out of order, since the Committee had now reached the stage of voting on draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1. Furthermore, the Committee should be given time to acquaint itself with the provisions of the new draft, which was in many respects a repetition of draft resolution A/SPC/L.122 and Add.1, on which the Committee had already taken a decision. He therefore thought that precedence should be given to the Soviet Union proposal and, depending on the results of the vote, to draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1.

4. Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) said that although under rule 121 of the rules of procedure proposals should normally be submitted twenty-four hours in advance, draft resolution A/SPC/L.124 was really a procedural motion. The whole question had already been thoroughly discussed, and the terms of the draft resolution had been unofficially communicated to several delegations. Since the Soviet Union representative had offered to give precedence to the new draft, he appealed to the representative of Ceylon not to ask for a vote on the Soviet Union proposal.

5. Mr. PONNAMBALAM (Ceylon) said it was not his intention to postpone the discussion for twenty-four hours; he merely wished to give the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1 time to consider the new proposal. He therefore suggested that the meeting be suspended while consultations were held.

6. Mr. VINCI (Italy) assured the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1 that the sole purpose of the new draft resolution was to strengthen the spirit of harmony and co-operation that had prevailed throughout the work of the twentieth session. The merits of their proposal were recognized in the new text, which also took into account the reservations expressed by many representatives. The Italian delegation itself, while approving the principles behind draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1, had certain reservations with regard to operative paragraph 2 and could not vote in favour of it. He believed that many delegations were in a similar position. It was because he considered that a vote at the present stage would reduce the proposal's validity that he had agreed to co-sponsor draft resolution A/SPC/L.124.

The meeting was suspended at 12.5 p.m. and resumed at 12.25 p.m.

7. Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) informed the Committee that Denmark wished to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.124.

8. Mr. AIKEN (Ireland) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1 had agreed that

a vote should be taken on the Soviet Union proposal. By stating that he intended to reintroduce his proposal if draft resolution A/SPC/L.124 was rejected, the representative of the Soviet Union had indicated that he was unwilling to accept the Committee's decision.

9. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the representative of Ireland had misunderstood the Soviet Union position. In order to comply with the spirit of co-operation prevailing within the Committee, as evidenced by draft resolution A/SPC/L.124, he had agreed not to insist on a vote on his own proposal. The Committee now had to decide whether it wished to vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.124. If it did so, and if that draft resolution was adopted, the question would then be concluded. If, however, draft resolution A/SPC/L.124 was not given priority, or if it was rejected, the Soviet Union proposal would still be applicable.

10. Mr. PONNAMBALAM (Ceylon) pointed out that the Soviet Union proposal was of a procedural nature and, as such, should be given precedence over draft resolution A/SPC/L.124. The Soviet Union representative had reserved his right to resuscitate his proposal should the vote go against the new draft resolution. In other words, his proposal had not been unconditionally withdrawn, and therefore should be voted upon before the new draft resolution.

11. Mr. DOSUMU-JOHNSON (Liberia) agreed with the representative of Ceylon. The sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1 had already demonstrated their willingness to co-operate by granting priority to draft resolution A/SPC/L.122 and Add.1. The introduction of draft resolution A/SPC/L.124 represented an attempt to prevent draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1 from being put to the vote, and if that attempt was allowed to succeed it would constitute a dangerous precedent.

12. Mr. EDWARDSSEN (Norway), speaking as a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/L.124, agreed with the representative of Italy that its purpose was to preserve the integrity of the proposals contained in draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1. A vote taken on that proposal under the present circumstances could only lead to a division, thereby diminishing its authority. Since draft resolution A/SPC/L.124 would be meaningless unless voted upon first, he wished to maintain its claim for priority.

13. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) said that it was his understanding that the Soviet representative had withdrawn his proposal, leaving only draft resolutions A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1 and A/SPC/L.124 before the Committee. The latter should be put to the vote first, for if it was adopted it would be unnecessary to take a vote on the other draft resolution. If draft resolution A/SPC/L.124 was rejected, the Soviet representative or indeed any other representative could submit a proposal similar to that withdrawn by the Soviet representative.

14. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), replying to a question put by Mr. AIKEN (Ireland), confirmed that he had withdrawn his proposal. As the representative of Guinea had said, however, he or any other representative would have the right

to submit a similar proposal if draft resolution A/SPC/L.124 was rejected.

15. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) pointed out that when the Tunisian representative had introduced draft resolution A/SPC/L.124 no representative had requested that it be ruled out of order. It was his understanding that if draft resolution A/SPC/L.124 was adopted draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1 would not be put to the vote but would be referred to the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations.

16. Mr. PHILLIPS (Ghana) recalled that many representatives had stressed the need for harmony during the Committee's discussion of the question of peace-keeping operations. The sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1 had proved their desire to promote a spirit of harmony by agreeing to requests that they make changes in the text and by according priority to draft resolution A/SPC/L.122 and Add.1. The introduction of draft resolution A/SPC/L.124, however, was bound to cause disharmony, since it would prevent the Committee from taking a vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1, as the sponsors wished.

17. The CHAIRMAN said that since the representative of Tunisia had requested priority for draft resolution A/SPC/L.124 and the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1 maintained that that draft should be given priority, it would be necessary to put the question to the vote. He therefore invited the Committee to vote on the request that draft resolution A/SPC/L.124 be accorded priority.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Hungary, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Against: Zambia, Ceylon, Costa Rica, Ghana, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Liberia, Malaysia, Malta, Nepal, Peru, Philippines, Somalia, Thailand, United States of America.

Abstaining: Albania, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Congo (Democratic Republic of the), Dominican Republic, France, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Iran, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, New Zealand, Panama, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela.

The proposal to accord priority to draft resolution A/SPC/L.124 was adopted by 44 votes to 19, with 34 abstentions.

18. The CHAIRMAN put draft resolution A/SPC/L.124 to the vote.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Mali.

Against: Nepal, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Somalia, United Republic of Tanzania, Albania, Ceylon, Chile, Costa Rica, Ghana, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Liberia, Malta.

Abstaining: Morocco, New Zealand, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Austria, Burma, Canada, China, Congo (Democratic Republic of the), Dominican Republic, France, Guinea, Haiti, Iran, Israel, Kenya.

The draft resolution was adopted by 54 votes to 18, with 23 abstentions.

19. The CHAIRMAN invited delegations which wished to do so to explain their votes.

20. Mr. COMAY (Israel) said that although he recognized that the resolution which had just been adopted represented a sincere effort to find a way out of the difficulty confronting the Committee, he had voted against giving it priority because he had felt that the desire of the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1 to have their text put to the vote should be respected. For that same reason, he had not been able to vote in favour of resolution A/SPC/L.124 after the Committee had decided to give it priority. He had not, however, wished to oppose its adoption and he had therefore abstained when it was put to the vote.

21. Mr. TINE (France) explained that he had abstained in both votes because he felt that the text just introduced by the Tunisian delegation deserved more careful study and he could not take a stand on it without knowing how it was interpreted by other Members. The value of the text would depend to a large extent on the interpretation given it by the various members of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations when it resumed its work. However, in view of the stage which the proceedings had reached, he had refrained from calling for a discussion on the newly introduced text.

22. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) said that his delegation had not taken part in the debate on the item, and had intended to set forth its position in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1 when explaining its vote, although it had had certain reservations with regard to that text, particularly operative paragraph 2 (a) (iii). He had felt that the matter was one which should be decided by an overwhelming majority so that the action taken pursuant to that decision would have general support. In the course of the debate it had become apparent that the Committee as a whole was not ready to take a vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1. In view of that fact and of the conciliatory efforts made by a number of delegations over the week-end, his delegation had abstained in the two votes just taken. The adoption of resolution A/SPC/L.124 would leave the door open for the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations to take into account the provisions of draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1—which would not have been the case if that text had been put to the vote and rejected.

23. Mr. ANYAOKU (Nigeria) said that although his delegation was a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/L.124 it had felt that there was nothing it could add to the remarks about that text made by the representatives of Tunisia, Italy and Norway. However, after hearing the Liberian representative's interpretation of the purpose of the resolution he felt it was necessary for him to explain why his delegation had joined in sponsoring it. It had not been its intention to prevent any group of States from expressing its views, for Nigeria prized the freedom of all delegations to express their views and vote as they saw fit on any issue. It had decided to co-sponsor resolution A/SPC/L.124 because it felt that a decision on the substance of draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1 should not be taken until that text had been considered by the Special Committee. His delegation wished to pay a whole-hearted tribute to the sponsors of that text and he hoped that they would interpret Nigeria's action as reflecting not a judgement on their draft resolution but simply a difference of opinion with regard to timing.

24. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that apart from the position of principle which he had already stated in his remarks on draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1, he had voted in favour of resolution A/SPC/L.124 because it was in conformity with the resolution previously adopted, i.e. resolution A/SPC/L.122 and Add.1, and because its adoption would not prejudice the position of any delegation.

25. Mr. PHILLIPS (Ghana) observed that whatever the intention of the sponsors of resolution A/SPC/L.124, the effect of its adoption had been to prevent those who wished to vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1 from doing so.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.