



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 62:	
Question of Algeria (<i>concluded</i>)... ..	207

Chairman: Mr. Víctor A. BELAUNDE (Peru).

AGENDA ITEM 62

**Question of Algeria (A/3197, A/C.1/L.165 to
A/C.1/L.167) (*concluded*)**

1. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) said that the purpose of his speaking again was to try to clear up some misunderstandings which might have been created as a result of the statements made by certain representatives regarding the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.166), of which his country was a sponsor. In particular, he referred to the statement made by the representative of Australia (844th meeting), which, he felt, epitomized the criticism and objections which had been made with regard to the draft.

2. The first objection to the draft resolution was that it assumed the competence of the First Committee and of the General Assembly to discuss the Algerian question. He replied that the three-Power draft in no way assumed the competence of the United Nations—of the Committee or of the Assembly. Regardless of the draft, however, the question of Algeria had been and was still before the United Nations, since the delegation of France had not opposed its discussion, and the General Assembly had included the item in its agenda.

3. The second point the Australian representative had raised was that the draft resolution implied that the negotiations would take place between France and the Algerian people. Mr. Khoman wished to say that negotiations implied that there must be two parties, for there could not be negotiations with only one party. In that connexion, he believed that the representatives of France had made it clear in their statements that they did not object in principle to negotiations. He reminded the Committee of a declaration by the Prime Minister of France, Mr. Guy Mollet, on 9 January 1957, in which he had said that the solution of the Algerian problem could result only from negotiations and free discussions between the representatives of the population of Algeria and those of all France. Furthermore, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of France had stated before the Committee, at its 843rd meeting, that the French Government had always affirmed that it was seeking a negotiated, and not an imposed solution, of the problem. Mr. Khoman drew the attention of the members of the Committee to the fact that negotiation was the normal method of solving differences—wherever they existed—in accordance with Article 33 of the United Nations Charter. The alternative to negotiation would be the use of force, which was contrary to the purposes and the provisions of the Charter.

4. He could not conceive that there could be any objection to the specific mention of the principles of the Charter in the three-Power draft resolution, since all members of the Committee were signatories of the Charter and believed in and respected its provisions. He noted that, in many ways, the three-Power draft was closely akin to the six-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.167). The only difference was that the latter was a little less comprehensive and a little more laconic than the three-Power draft.

5. In conclusion, he stated that, if the three-Power draft resolution in any way constituted an interference or an intervention in the domestic affairs of France, it would be the duty of every member to oppose it. But he was convinced that the three-Power draft in no way intervened in or interfered with the internal affairs of France.

6. Mr. DE THIER (Belgium) stated that he would vote against the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.166), as well as against the eighteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.165). There was no doubt that the former was drafted in more moderate terms than the latter, while paying tribute to the spirit of moderation which had prompted the three Asian delegations in submitting that draft, he felt that there were serious objections to it from the point of view of the competence which it seemed to attribute to the United Nations, in a manner which he felt to be contrary to the provisions of the Charter. As for the French Government's intention to engage in talks with freely elected representatives, it would appear that, according to the draft, what was proposed was to supplant such talks with talks between a State, France, on the one hand, and the Algerian people was a particularly complex entity. He held that a conception of that kind seemed to be less in accord with democratic principles than the solution offered by France. The only draft resolution which his delegation could support was the six-Power draft (A/C.1/L.167).

7. Mr. DE LEQUERICA (Spain) stated that his delegation would vote in favour of the six-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.167). He would vote against the draft submitted by the eighteen Powers (A/C.1/L.165), not because he did not understand their point of view or did not feel friendship for them, or because he lacked an understanding of the problems they were trying to solve, but for the reasons which he had expressed at length in the Committee (835th meeting) regarding his conviction that the United Nations should base its very existence on respect for Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter, in all its meanings. He stated that the word "self-determination" was very close to his heart and was contained in all the philosophies which he respected; nevertheless, the word must be very carefully applied or it would become an element of total anarchy.

8. The six-Power draft resolution was, in his view, more satisfactory than the other drafts. He would abstain in the vote on the three-Power draft resolution

(A/C.1/L.166) because he felt that he should not vote against it, and because it contained words which could be dangerous for the juridical status of the United Nations. He felt that the six-Power draft was much more compact and contained the essence of the entire debate. He felt that the First Committee should give priority to the six-Power draft and that the sponsors of the other draft resolutions should withdraw them and support the six-Power draft resolution.

9. Mr. GEORGES-PICOT (France) wished to recall that his delegation would 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 by the chairman of the French delegation in his final statement at the close of the general debate (843rd meeting).

10. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the draft resolutions which were before it and to the order in which they had been submitted: first, the eighteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.165); secondly, the three-Power draft (A/C.1/L.166); and thirdly, the six-Power draft (A/C.1/L.167).

11. In accordance with rule 132 of the rules of procedure, he requested the Committee to vote on the draft resolution submitted by Afganistan, Burma, Ceylon, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia and Yemen (A/C.1/L.165). At the request of the representative of Ecuador, a separate vote would be taken on each paragraph.

12. He put to the vote the first paragraph of the preamble.

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

13. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second paragraph of the preamble.

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, Afganistan, 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.

14. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 1.

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 Repub-

lic, 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.

15. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 2.

The paragraph was rejected by 34 votes to 33, with 9 abstentions.

16. The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to vote on operative paragraph 3.

17. Mr. NUÑEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba) said he could not see how the Committee could vote on paragraph 3 since paragraphs 1 and 2 had been rejected.

It was decided not to vote on operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

18. Mr. LOUTFI (Egypt) thought that no useful purpose would be served by taking a vote on the draft resolution as a whole, and proposed that the Committee should not take such a vote.

It was so decided.

19. Mr. NUÑEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba) declared that his delegation, together with the other sponsors of the six-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.167) had accepted the suggestion made by the representative of Mexico (845th meeting, para. 33) and other representatives that the words "in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations" should be added at the end of the operative paragraph of that draft. He also requested that priority in voting should be given to his draft resolution.

20. Mr. VITETTI (Italy), Mr. PEARSON (Canada) and Mr. MAURTUA (Peru) supported the amendment to the six-Power draft resolution and the motion for priority made by the representative of Cuba.

21. Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan) pointed out that, at the time when the Chairman had requested the Committee to proceed to the vote, priority had not been asked for any draft resolution, and the Committee had actually proceeded to the vote. A paragraph-by-paragraph vote on the eighteen-Power resolution had been taken, and the voting on the other draft resolutions should follow in the order of their submission. He pointed out that, when the voting had already started, representatives should not be permitted to ask for priority. He quoted rule 132 of the rules of procedure to support his arguments.

22. The CHAIRMAN reminded the representative of Sudan that the voting on the second draft resolution had not started.

23. Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria) wished to bring two points to the attention of the Chairman and the members

of the Committee. The first point was that the amendment which had been submitted at the last moment was not in order. The six-Power draft resolution to which it referred was not yet under discussion, and no amendment could be submitted to a draft resolution which was not before the Committee. The submission of the amendment was an abnormal procedure in his view. Secondly, regarding the question of priority, he regretted that the representative of Cuba and the other representatives who supported him had not explained why they wanted priority of voting on the draft resolution. Such priority would not be in order according to rule 132 of the rules of procedure. It stood to reason that the voting on the three draft resolutions should normally follow the order of their submission unless there was some substantive reason which could be brought forward to support a change in that order.

24. The CHAIRMAN stated that a discussion had centred upon the three draft resolutions, that the voting on the second draft resolution had not yet begun and that the moment for raising the question of priority or for submitting amendments could occur at any time before a draft resolution was voted upon.

25. Mr. LOUTFI (Egypt) endorsed what had been said by the representatives of Syria and Sudan. He noted that the Chairman had said earlier that the Committee was to vote according to the date of submission of the draft resolution in question. Since no one had objected at that time, the Committee had so decided. In order to alter that decision a two-thirds majority would be required.

26. The CHAIRMAN stated that there had been no ruling by the Chair, nor was there such a ruling before the Commission for discussion. There was only the strict observance of rule 132.

27. Mr. SERRANO (Philippines) wished to raise a point of order concerning two questions: the amendment proposed to the six-Power draft resolution, and the motion for priority. He felt that if the amendment was accepted by the Chair at the present stage of the proceedings, the normal procedure in matters of that nature would be completely disrupted. He pointed out that, when the Chairman had made the statement with reference to rule 132 regarding the order of voting, it had been a hint to all the delegations that any request regarding the order of priority should be made at that time. It seemed to him, therefore, that the request made by the representative of Cuba was a belated one, made after the Committee had expressed its acquiescence with the Chairman's statement with regard to the voting.

28. The CHAIRMAN stated that what the representative of the Philippines could do, before the Committee proceeded to the vote on the third draft resolution, was to request that the amendment should be put before the Committee for discussion. He had no objection to such a discussion. But that representative was not right in thinking that the three draft resolutions constituted a unit from the point of view of the voting.

29. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) stated that, in accordance with rule 121, the Chair was empowered to put to the vote the amendment submitted by the representative of Cuba. He agreed entirely with the Chairman and supported the proposal of the representative of Cuba. As far as priority was concerned, he did not share the views of the Chairman, who had said that one could not attempt to maintain unity as far as a number of proposals were concerned. One could not maintain

unity if a separate vote was taken on each draft, but one could maintain an idea of unity when there was a question of priority. Priority could be determined only if there were two or more draft resolutions. He suggested that the Chairman should put to the vote the question whether priority was to be given to the six-Power draft resolution.

30. Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) appealed against the decision of the Chair to accept the amendment submitted by the representative of Cuba as well as his request for priority for the six-Power draft resolution in the vote.

31. The CHAIRMAN declared that he had acted with complete impartiality and, following the counsel of the Secretariat, had been proceeding consistently in the zealous tradition of respecting the rules of procedure.

32. Mr. DE FREITAS VALLE (Brazil) supported the Chairman in everything he had said. He pointed out that it had been a rule since the inception of the United Nations that the sponsors of any draft resolution might accept an amendment proposed by somebody else, or might incorporate such an amendment in their draft in the light of the discussion.

33. Mr. RIFA'I (Jordan) sought further clarification with regard to whether the Committee had begun the process of voting in accordance with rule 129 of the rules of procedure.

34. The CHAIRMAN noted that from the beginning he had stated frankly that the present debate was quite contrary to the rules of procedure. There was no process of voting for all draft resolutions as one. Quoting the second sentence of rule 132 of the rules of procedure, he said that that meant that the vote on all drafts was not indivisible. The vote on each draft, however, was indivisible. Therefore the vote on the second and third draft resolutions required a decision on the part of the Committee.

35. Mr. URRUTIA (Colombia) stated that, during all previous years, the rules of procedure had been interpreted to mean that priority could be decided upon after the vote had been taken on each draft resolution. As far as amendments were concerned, every year ever since the United Nations had come into existence, the sponsors of draft resolutions had been allowed to submit amendments, even at the last moment. If, however, the Committee wanted to change its procedure, it could do so by a simple majority.

36. Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand) proposed that the Committee proceed immediately to consider the motion for priority on the six-Power draft resolution. A motion for priority was quite a common one and was in accordance with rule 132 of the rules of procedure. It was customary, by way of clarification, to add some words if the sponsors so agreed.

37. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that a number of representatives had stated that the six-Power draft resolution should be given priority. Unfortunately, he had not heard any reasons in support of that proposal. He wanted to know from the sponsors of the proposal for priority why it was that the Committee should give priority to a draft resolution which had been presented two days after the other draft.

38. Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan) moved adjournment of the meeting under rule 119.

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

39. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the motion by the representative of Cuba to give priority to the six-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.167).

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

40. The CHAIRMAN announced that, as a result of the vote, priority had been granted to the six-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.167) and that the Committee could now proceed to consider the amendment which had been submitted by the representative of Cuba and accepted by the sponsors of the draft resolution.

41. Mr. STRATOS (Greece), supported by Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan), proposed the following amendment to the six-Power draft resolution: after the first paragraph of the preamble, insert the first two paragraphs of the preamble of the eighteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.165).

42. Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) submitted an amendment which provided for the addition to the preamble of the six-Power draft of the following two paragraphs:

“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”.

43. In the procedural debate that developed in connexion with the introduction of the amendments in which participated Mr. STRATOS (Greece), Mr. NUÑEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba), Mr. SLIM (Tunisia), Mr. SERRANO (Philippines), Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador), Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan), Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria), Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. URRUTIA (Colombia) and Mr. WALKER (Australia), the question was raised as to whether it was permissible, under rule 121, to introduce amendments once the vote on a draft resolution had begun. It was suggested that such a procedure would amount to a reopening of the discussion. On the other hand, the view was expressed that rule 121 expressly empowered the Chairman to “permit the discussion and consideration of amendments... even though these amendments... have not been circulated or have only been circulated the same day”. The question was also raised as to whether reintroduction of parts of a draft resolution which had been previously rejected was permissible. It was pointed out that, since in accordance with rule 130 the eighteen-Power draft resolution had been rejected as a whole, reintroduction of parts thereof would be governed by rule 124, which would require a decision by a two-thirds majority. In opposition to that view, it was observed that rule 124 related to entire proposals and not to parts of proposals or to individual phrases or words of such proposals. Consequently, that rule would not forbid the resubmission of certain paragraphs in a draft resolution which had been rejected.

44. Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria) proposed that, in case it would be found impossible to resubmit the two paragraphs of the preamble of the eighteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.165), the six-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.167) should be amended by inserting after the first paragraph of the preamble the following two additional paragraphs:

“Having regard to the situation in Algeria,

“Recognizing the right of the people of Algeria to self-determination”.

45. Mr. URRUTIA (Colombia) moved that the Committee should decide to put to the vote the six-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.167) without any amendments.

46. Mr. NUÑEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba), on behalf of the sponsors of the six-Power draft resolution, withdrew the amendment to the operative paragraph which he had proposed earlier.

47. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal made by the representative of Colombia, namely that the six-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.167) should be voted upon without any amendments.

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

48. Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria), on a point of order, stated that the decision previously taken by the Committee to grant priority to the six-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.167) over the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.166) had lapsed. When the Committee had taken that decision, it had had before it the six-Power draft resolution with the amendment submitted by Cuba. Now that that amendment had been withdrawn, the six-Power draft resolution was not the same as that given priority in voting. The Chairman should therefore put to the vote first the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.166), which had been submitted prior to the six-Power draft.

49. Mr. JAMALI (Iraq), Mr. Charles MALIK (Lebanon), and Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported that motion.

50. Mr. URRUTIA (Colombia) moved that the Chairman consult the Committee to find out whether it agreed to proceed immediately to the vote on the six-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.167), without amendments and with priority.

51. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the question whether the Committee was in agreement with the interpretation of the Chair that the previous decision of the Committee had been that it should vote on the six-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.167) without amendments and with priority.

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

52. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Italy and Peru (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.

53. Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand) moved that the Committee should not take a vote on the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.166) since a further vote might not be conducive to the atmosphere which all members of the Committee, whatever might have been their particular votes, so much desired. He appealed to the representatives of Japan, the Philippines and Thailand, the sponsors of the three-Power draft resolution, to agree with his proposal.

54. Mr. Charles MALIK (Lebanon) appealed to the Chairman and to the representative of New Zealand to permit the Committee to vote on the three-Power draft resolution. He was sure that the nature of the division that had taken place in the Committee during the votes on the question before it was not a healthy one for the future development of the United Nations. The vote which had just been taken had shown a clear division between Asia and Africa on the one hand and the rest of the world on the other. It was therefore absolutely necessary that something should be done in the Committee in order to remove that situation in the United Nations and throughout the world. If a vote was permitted on the three-Power draft resolution, the General Assembly in plenary meeting might have before it two draft resolutions which could be combined in the interest of producing a healthier situation in the Organization.

55. Mr. SERRANO (Philippines), Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) and Mr. KASE (Japan) explained their reasons for not being able to withdraw their draft resolution (A/C.1/L.166) and expressed the belief that a vote on their draft might contribute to the creation of a better atmosphere than that which had prevailed in the course of the debate and the preceding votes.

56. Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran), Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria), and Mr. DE LEQUERICA (Spain) supported the view that the Committee should proceed to vote on the three-Power draft resolution.

57. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the motion made by the representative of New Zealand that the Committee should decide not to vote on the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.166).

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.

58. The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to vote on the draft resolution submitted by Japan, the Philippines and Thailand (A/C.1/L.166). He announced that the draft would be voted upon paragraph by paragraph and that a roll-call vote had been requested.

59. He then put to the vote the first paragraph of the preamble.

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.

60. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second paragraph of the preamble.

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.

61. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the operative paragraph of the draft resolution.

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.

62. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the 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.

63. Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom), in explanation of his vote, recalled that in his statement at the 834th meeting he had emphasized the importance which his Government attached to the Charter provision which precluded the General Assembly from intervening in the domestic affairs of Member States, his Government's fullest confidence in the desire and ability of the French Government to carry out the liberal policy in Algeria described to the Committee by the representative of France (830th and 831st meetings) and its conviction that the Committee should do nothing to complicate the task that the French Government had set for itself. In the light of those considerations he had voted against the eighteen-Power draft resolution and the three-Power draft resolution, although he fully appreciated the spirit of compromise and understanding which had moved the sponsors of the three-Power draft.

64. He was able, nevertheless, to give the six-Power draft resolution his support, as the sentiments expressed in it were strongly shared by his Government

and the draft involved no recommendation by the Assembly. In voting for that draft, his delegation did not, of course, concede that the General Assembly was competent to discuss the question of Algeria.

65. Mr. GARIN (Portugal) stated that his delegation had refrained from participating in the debate on the item since it had found itself in the difficulty of being unable to disregard a fundamental principle of the Charter in which it strongly believed and which it desired to obey. It could not, therefore, support the eighteen-Power draft resolution or the three-Power draft resolution. It wished, however, to pay homage to the good and sincere intentions of conciliation on the part of the sponsors of the three-Power draft, whose positions the Assembly had now grown used to respect and value.

66. His delegation had only been able to support the six-Power draft resolution, in which notice was taken of the fact of the discussion which had taken place in the Committee and which had not been opposed by the French delegation.

67. His delegation strongly agreed with the view of the many representatives who had rightly proclaimed that peace was the first and main objective to attain in that part of the world. It trusted that France, with all its great spiritual and liberal traditions would, with time, be able to fulfil, in general, its praiseworthy aims in regard to the Algerian question. The Portuguese people could only pray and hope that peoples with whom they had so many and such old ties of friendship would, 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.

68. Mr. SERRANO (Philippines) stated that his delegation had voted in favour of the first paragraph of the preamble of the eighteen-Power draft resolution because it felt that the Committee could not avoid expressing its concern over what was taking place in Algeria. At the same time, that did not imply passing over the issue of domestic jurisdiction.

69. His delegation had abstained on the second paragraph of the preamble, through it was in favour of a general statement of the recognition of the right of the Algerian people to self-determination under the principles of the Charter; it was, however, not prepared to state its position on the question whether that right should be given immediate application in a manner that would disturb the normal, peaceful and orderly process of its application.

70. His delegation had abstained on the operative paragraphs of that draft resolution because it had considered that they would disrupt and disturb the philosophy which underlay the three-Power draft resolution, a philosophy which was to promote amity and goodwill with a view to enabling the parties to negotiate a peaceful solution of the problem.

71. It had been the original intention of his Government to abstain on the six-Power draft resolution. In view, however, of the conditions under which that draft resolution had been accorded priority by the Committee, his delegation had been compelled to vote against it.

72. So far as the draft resolution of which it was a sponsor was concerned, the Philippine delegation felt that its approval was the triumph of justice, sobriety and fair play.

73. Mr. NUÑEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba) explained that his delegation had voted against the three-Power draft resolution because it had felt that the draft was inconsistent with the Cuban view of the competence of the General Assembly to make such a recommendation.
74. His delegation had voted in favour of the six-Power draft resolution, which had been the product of its own work; the draft had obtained the greatest majority in the Committee.
75. It had voted against the eighteen-Power draft resolution because it considered that that draft infringed the essence of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.
76. He wished to deny that, in introducing an amendment to the six-Power draft resolution, his delegation had manoeuvred for position in order to obtain priority in the vote. That amendment had been suggested by the representative of Mexico and had been gladly accepted by the Cuban delegation. In view, however, of the opposition which had been expressed in the Committee, and believing that its withdrawal would not weaken or detract from the draft, his delegation had decided to withdraw it.
77. He pointed out that neither of the two draft resolutions adopted had obtained a two-thirds majority, and that even including the abstentions, the votes in favour of neither would represent two-thirds of the General Assembly. If that situation were to persist in the plenary, there would, in fact, be no draft resolution at all on the question of Algeria.
78. Mr. DE LA COLINA (Mexico) regretted that the complicated procedural discussion in the Committee had made it impossible to include the words which he had suggested (845th meeting, para. 33) and which the sponsors of the six-Power draft resolution had been good enough to accept, and to insert them in the draft resolution. Despite that, he had voted in favour of the draft for the reasons he had stated at the 845th meeting.
79. He had also voted in favour of putting the three-

Power draft resolution to the vote, because he felt that it was in keeping with the custom of the United Nations to accord equal treatment to all draft resolutions. However, he had abstained on the substance of that draft.

80. Once again he wished to appeal to the sponsors of the two draft resolutions which had been adopted to stint no effort so that the General Assembly might have before it one text that could be supported by a two-thirds majority.

81. Mr. Charles MALIK (Lebanon) stated that his delegation had voted in favour of the eighteen-Power draft resolution, of which it was a sponsor, because it had believed it to be the right thing to do.

82. It had voted against the six-Power draft resolution because it had sincerely believed that, while what it said was true and it had no objection in principle thereto, the draft did not say enough to make it really expressive of the consensus of the Committee.

83. It had voted in favour of the three-Power draft resolution because it felt that it was only fair to have something that would be more expressive of the common opinion of the Committee than the six-Power draft.

84. Now that the Committee had adopted two draft resolutions as the fruit of its labours, he hoped that it would be possible to arrive at a text which would be conciliatory in spirit and in language and which would receive the necessary two-thirds majority in the General Assembly.

85. Finally he wished to say that his delegation had been motivated by absolute and perfect goodwill towards France and the Algerian people. It was only through maintaining that goodwill towards both France and the Algerian people—and the Lebanese delegation itself was certainly going to maintain it—that it would be possible in the future developments in the case to help restore peace, security and trust to that troubled area of North Africa.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.