

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

NINTH SESSION
Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 754th

**(CLOSING)
MEETING**

**Thursday, 16 December 1954,
at 3 p.m.
New York**

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 57:	
The Tunisia question (<i>concluded</i>)	575
Completion of the Committee's work	577

Chairman: Mr. Francisco URRUTIA (Colombia).

AGENDA ITEM 57

**The Tunisia question (A/2683, A/C.1/L.128/
Rev.1) (*concluded*)**

1. Mr. SHUKAIRI (Syria) said that the revised draft resolution which had just been distributed (A/C.1/L.128/Rev.1) was the most moderate that its sponsors had been able to formulate and the most conciliatory that the General Assembly could accept on the Tunisia question. It had been drawn up in the light of the observations made at the previous meeting by a number of delegations, especially those of El Salvador and Mexico. The amendments proposed by the delegations of Costa Rica and Bolivia had also been studied with the greatest care, but the introduction of new wording might reopen the debate; furthermore, since the aim of those delegations was practically identical with that of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution, it had seemed better to keep to the original form.

2. The acceptance of the amendments was evidence of the conciliatory spirit of the sponsors and their ardent desire to see a happy issue to the dispute. The revised joint draft resolution should obtain the support not only of a majority, but of all Member States.

3. Mr. BOROOAH (India) said that his delegation would support the revised draft resolution.

4. Such a resolution was entirely consistent with the political line followed by India, which had always considered negotiation the best way of settling a dispute. Moderation was a sign not of weakness but of confidence in the strength of one's cause. There was every reason to believe that France, following the line laid down by its Prime Minister, and the representatives of the Tunisian people, would make every endeavour to find a solution for the Tunisian question.

5. Mr. BUTT (Pakistan) said that his delegation would have preferred the Committee to adopt the joint draft resolution in its original form (A/C.1/L.128), because that text had been unexceptionable and moderate, the latter characteristic having been commented upon and commended by all those who had intervened in the debate. However, Pakistan had decided to accept the suggestions that had emerged from discussions with delegations which, earlier in the debate, had put forward various alterations in the preamble of the

draft. In so doing, it had been guided by the sincere desire to achieve a greater unanimity on the Tunisian question.

6. Mr. Butt commended the French Government for entering into direct negotiations with the true representatives of Tunisia with a view to bringing the long outstanding dispute to a happy close. He also paid tribute to the representatives of the Tunisian people, who had shown great understanding, forbearance, and a spirit of accommodation.

7. The Reverend Benjamin NUÑEZ (Costa Rica) said that his delegation would support the revised draft resolution.

8. He suggested, however, that the word "hope", in the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.128/Rev.1), should be replaced by the word "confidence".

9. The word "hope" seemed to imply a shade of doubt. Unquestionably the Assembly would prefer to express "confidence" in France, which, as had been shown by the Prime Minister's statements, was more anxious than ever to settle the dispute in a friendly way. That confidence would also apply to the Tunisian people, which deserved it because of the spirit of tolerance, sacrifice and conciliation that it had displayed.

10. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) pointed out that his Government had always endeavoured to help the Tunisian people to regain its freedom. He was elated by the historic decision taken by the French Government and impressed by the Prime Minister's courageous efforts at conciliation. The Iraqi delegation considered that in present circumstances every effort should be made to avoid prejudicing the chances of success of the negotiations.

11. It would therefore support the revised draft resolution, which was very moderate and was in reality of a procedural nature only. The Iraqi delegation wished to express its confidence that the French Prime Minister would give the world a new proof of French generosity.

12. Mr. ECHEVERRI CORTES (Colombia) congratulated the Costa Rican delegation on its proposed amendment, since the policy followed by Mr. Mendès-France had created a new atmosphere of international confidence.

13. The Colombian delegation would therefore support the draft resolution with that amendment.

14. Mr. SHUKAIRI (Syria) accepted, on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution the amendment proposed by the Costa Rican delegation. Confidence was indeed a more positive sentiment than hope. The proposed amendment therefore improved the draft resolution. With that amendment, the draft resolution ought to be unanimously adopted in the Committee.

15. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) emphasized the conciliatory attitude of the sponsors of the draft resolution.

tion. Delegations could hardly fail to support a text which was, after all, only of a procedural nature.

16. The amendment proposed by the Costa Rican delegation exactly expressed the idea voiced at the previous meeting by the Salvadorian delegation. The Salvadorian delegation welcomed the proposal and would naturally support the amendment, which expressed the great confidence it felt in France and especially in the French Prime Minister.

17. Mr. QUIROGA GALDO (Bolivia) said that his delegation would support the revised draft resolution as amended.

18. The substitution of the word "confidence" for "hope" was a tribute to France.

19. Mr. KYROU (Greece) said that his delegation applauded the conciliatory spirit of the sponsors of the draft resolution. The Greek delegation would support the draft, which seemed likely to obtain a unanimous vote.

20. Mr. TOV (Israel) said that he had been glad to hear the Syrian representative several times use the word "moderation", and to observe that that moderation was reflected in the draft resolution.

21. The amendment the Costa Rican delegation had proposed was not a mere change of wording, but the expression of a real feeling of confidence in France, which had initiated negotiations in Tunisia. That feeling was the more justified in that the French Prime Minister, in his speech before the General Assembly (498th meeting), had reiterated the undertaking he had already given to do his utmost to settle the problem amicably.

22. The Israel delegation would therefore support the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.128/Rev.1), as amended at the request of the Costa Rican representative.

23. Mr. PEREZ PEREZ (Venezuela) said that his delegation would vote for the revised draft resolution, which was of a merely procedural nature.

24. The Venezuelan delegation would like to express its confidence in the French Prime Minister. It also paid a tribute to the conciliatory spirit shown by the sponsors of the draft resolution.

25. Mr. SERRANO (Philippines) felt that the revised draft resolution represented the smallest common denominator of the interests of the parties. In view of the fact that negotiations were in progress, the Committee should show at least as conciliatory a spirit as the parties.

26. In that spirit, the Philippine delegation would support the draft resolution and hoped that it would meet with the Committee's unanimous approval.

27. Mr. FRANCO Y FRANCO (Dominican Republic) said that his delegation would vote for the revised draft resolution, from which the third preambular paragraph of the original text had been deleted; the fourth preambular paragraph had also been amended, thus obviating any possibility of misinterpretation. The substitution of the word "confidence" for "hope" was also a wise change.

28. The latter amendment was not a meaningless change. When the question of Morocco had been under discussion, the Dominican Republic had never doubted France's intentions and had always emphasized that

confidence could be placed in the declarations of the statesman who was now at its head.

29. Mr. LOUTFI (Egypt) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had submitted the revised text in a spirit of compromise and in the light of the remarks made by various delegations.

30. The Egyptian delegation accepted the Costa Rican amendment, and thanked the Latin-American delegation for their support and advice.

31. The CHAIRMAN put the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.128/Rev.1), with the amendment accepted by the sponsors—the replacing of the word "hope", in the third paragraph of the preamble, by the word "confidence"—to the vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Luxemburg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Svria, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution was adopted by 54 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

32. Mr. VON BALLUSECK (Netherlands) said that he would have preferred no resolution at all, to obviate any risk of hindering the negotiations now in progress by a move that might be regarded as inopportune. However, since the sponsors of the draft resolution had shown evidence of moderation, his delegation had not wished to oppose the revised draft, particularly as it had been assured that it was procedural in nature and in no way prejudged the General Assembly's competence.

33. Mr. VAN LANGENHOVE (Belgium) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the revised draft resolution because it considered that it in no way prejudged the General Assembly's competence.

34. Mr. MUNRO (New Zealand) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution which he regarded as procedural. He wished to pay a tribute to the spirit of moderation shown by the Committee in a matter in which tension should be avoided.

35. At the seventh session, New Zealand had supported the text which had become General Assembly resolution 611 (VII), recognizing the existence both of Tunisian aspirations and of French interests, and expressing the hope that they could be accommodated to each other. That constructive resolution was still in force, and New Zealand was opposed to any attempts to go beyond that and to direct the conduct of Franco-Tunisian relations. Mr. Munro was confident that France had embarked on a positive course. In those

circumstances, further consideration by the General Assembly might well hinder rather than assist progress.

36. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would have preferred the First Committee to refrain from adopting any resolution at all. That was why the United Kingdom had abstained in the vote. In view of the courageous efforts of Mr. Mendès-France, the French Prime Minister, to find a solution to the problem, he should certainly be given time enough to accomplish that task.

37. Whatever certain representatives might think, the draft resolution that the First Committee had just adopted was not merely a procedural motion. Even in its revised form, the draft resolution was concerned with the substance of the question, which the United Nations was not competent to discuss.

38. The abstention of the United Kingdom delegation could not of course be construed as a refusal to join in the general expression of confidence that the negotiations in progress would bring about a solution. On the contrary, that abstention showed the utmost confidence of the United Kingdom in the French Government's intentions and ability.

39. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America) said that although his delegation would have preferred to see no resolution adopted so long as the negotiations between France and Tunisia were in progress, it had been glad to vote in favour of the revised draft resolution. It believed that by expressing confidence in the two parties, the General Assembly was in effect saying that it trusted the parties to carry their negotiations forward to a successful conclusion. The draft resolution could not fail to maintain the favourable atmosphere in which those negotiations were now being conducted.

40. Mr. LAWRENCE (Liberia) said that because he had been unavoidably detained, he had been unable to announce his vote when the draft resolution had been put to the vote. He wished to indicate Liberia's vote in favour of the draft resolution.

41. Mr. MARQUES CASTRO (Uruguay) said that his delegation's affirmative vote on the revised draft resolution should be regarded as a tribute to the constructive efforts of the French Government, the spirit of moderation shown by the sponsors of the draft resolution and the aspirations of the Tunisian people.

42. The CHAIRMAN stated that the First Committee had now concluded the discussion of the last item on its agenda.

Completion of the Committee's work

43. Now that the Committee's work was ending, the CHAIRMAN wished to express his gratitude, and that of the delegations, to the members of the Secretariat for their faithful service. He particularly wished to thank Mr. Tchernychev and Mr. Protitch, as well as the officers of the Committee, Mr. Thorsing and Mr. Johnson, for the valuable assistance that they had given him in the performance of his duties.

44. On behalf of the offices of the Committee, he also thanked all the representatives for their friendly and courteous co-operation. Although history would be the judge of the work accomplished, the atmosphere of sincere co-operation that had prevailed in the First

Committee during the ninth session was a matter for present congratulation. Of the eight items on the Committee's agenda, two very important ones had been disposed of by draft resolutions adopted unanimously, and the discussion of two other, very difficult, items had led to draft resolutions adopted without opposition; as for the draft resolution on the Korean question, many of its paragraphs had been adopted unanimously, among them the clause relating to paragraph 62 of the Armistice Agreement. Those results justified confidence that a solution might be found in the near future to the problems which were still pending.

45. Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador), speaking on behalf of the Latin-American delegations, paid a tribute to the Chairman, whose qualities of versatility, firmness and calm had enabled him to cope with the difficult problems with which he had been confronted.

46. Mr. Urrutia came from a family of diplomats and statesmen who were a credit to Colombia; as Chairman of the Committee, he had further enhanced the prestige of Colombia and of Latin America as a whole. Mr. Urrutia belonged to that new class of great international civil servants who, imbued with a new spirit, were contributing to the attainment of the ideal of a world united, to which all aspired.

47. Mr. Trujillo also wished to pay a tribute to the other officers of the Committee: to the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Johnson, and to the Rapporteur, Mr. Thorsing; as well as to the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Protitch, and to all the members of the Secretariat.

48. Mr. KYROU (Greece), Mr. HOPPENOT (France), Mr. SAPER (Turkey), Mr. MUNRO (New Zealand), speaking on behalf of the delegations of the British Commonwealth, Mr. SHUKAIRI (Syria), speaking on behalf of the delegations of the Arab States, Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America), Mr. LALL (India), Mr. VON BALLUSECK (Netherlands), Mr. TSIANG (China), Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland), Mr. BARRINGTON (Burma), Mr. VAN LANGENHOVE (Belgium), Mr. BRILEJ (Yugoslavia), Mr. BORBERG (Denmark), speaking on behalf of his country, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, Mr. SUDJARWO (Indonesia), Mr. ZARUBIN, (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on behalf of the Soviet Union, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Mr. TOV (Israel), Mr. LUDIN (Afghanistan), Mr. PETRZELKA (Czechoslovakia) and Mr. LAWRENCE (Liberia), associating themselves with the Ecuadorian representative's tribute to the Chairman, expressed their congratulations and gratitude for his outstanding performance of his duties.

49. They also join in the tribute to the officers of the Committee and the members of the Secretariat.

50. The VICE-CHAIRMAN and the RAPPOURTEUR thanked the members of the Committee for having included them in the tribute paid to the Chairman, and expressed their pleasure at having had the opportunity to collaborate with him.

51. The CHAIRMAN thanked the members of the Committee and expressed the hope that the Committee's debates at its following session would take place in the same atmosphere of mutual trust and esteem.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.