



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 32: Consideration of measures for the strengthening of international security: report of the Secretary-General (<i>continued</i>)	1

Chairman: Mr. Andrés AGUILAR M. (Venezuela).

AGENDA ITEM 32

Consideration of measures for the strengthening of international security: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/7922 and Add.1-6, A/7926, A/C.1/1003, A/C.1/L.513-518)

1. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): As I already announced at the meeting this morning, I shall proceed to call upon representatives who have indicated their wish to exercise their right of reply in connexion with certain statements which were made during the general debate.

2. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): My delegation has participated in the debate on the item under discussion, keeping in view the need to bring into focus the general principles relating to the strengthening of international security that are either explicit or implicit in the Charter of the United Nations. Like many other delegations, we took care not to bring national or regional issues into this debate.

3. It therefore came as a great surprise to us when the Indian representative introduced Indo-Pakistan issues into our discussion. He chose to use this forum to attack Pakistan in connexion with the fact that the United States of America has decided to resume supply of a limited number of arms to Pakistan on a reimbursable basis, not as a gift, but on the same basis as that whereby India also received arms from the United States of America in the 1950s—in other words, on the basis of payment—and in order to enable Pakistan to meet certain deficiencies resulting from the Indian attack across the international frontier of Pakistan in 1965.

4. The facts relating to Indo-Pakistan problems are well known and therefore I shall not take advantage of this opportunity to bring them once again in detail to the attention of this Committee.

5. Suffice it to say that India is a country of 550 million people; Pakistan has a population of 125 million. India has four times the area of Pakistan. In any situation of military conflict India has the greater advantage of defence in depth.

India's gross national product is four or five times that of Pakistan. It has considerable defence production capacity. According to authoritative estimates, the ratio of India's military defence establishment compared to that of Pakistan is five to one. Further, India has been arming itself to the teeth in the recent past by acquiring arms and equipment from all quarters. India has its own military production facilities and produces sophisticated military equipment such as tanks, armoured vehicles and aircraft. Pakistan has no such military establishments.

6. Despite these facts, India finds it intolerable that Pakistan should seek to acquire the barest minimum of means of self-defence. The concept of security in the regional context of South Asia means to India a military ratio, vis-à-vis Pakistan, of five or six to one; in other words, a Pakistan without the slightest capacity for self-defence. The inference is obvious: India would like Pakistan to accept its hegemony over South Asia, give up espousing the cause of self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir and rest content with a satellite status.

7. As I said before, it is not the desire of my delegation to enter into an argument with the representative of India on this question, but, since the Indian deputy Foreign Minister has attempted to distort the facts, I have been constrained to exercise my right of reply. I leave it to the members of the Committee to draw their own conclusions on this question, and I hope it will not be necessary for me to intervene again.

8. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America): We have listened very carefully to the statements made thus far in the Committee on the strengthening of international security and my delegation has been impressed by the generally high level of debate which has until now characterized our consideration of the item currently before us. This is true even of the first intervention of the representative of the Soviet Union on 28 September [1725th meeting]. For this reason we were surprised by the harsh and intemperate attack delivered by Mr. Malik [1738th meeting] on the statement given by the United States representative in this Committee on 9 October [1734th meeting].

9. Now Mr. Malik, of course, is justly famous in the United Nations for his cold-war rhetoric—indeed, I think few can equal him in this respect. Perhaps he is less well known for his accurate restatements of positions adopted by the United States. We are certain that members of this Committee are all aware that his characterization this morning of the United States attitude towards the subject before us is totally false. I do not propose to take up the time of the Committee in a lengthy rebuttal, but I should

like to recall two key paragraphs in Mr. Yost's statement of last Friday, namely:

"I should like, therefore, to appeal to all of my colleagues to unite in this Committee on a simple resolution clearly based on the Charter, the whole Charter and nothing but the Charter, omitting controversial and divisive elements." [*Ibid.*, para. 176.]

10. Then further, Mr. Yost made the following appeal:

"And let us, in regard to our present item, unite on what unites us and put aside, for the moment at least, what divides us." [*Ibid.*, para. 177.]

11. Frankly, we wonder why the Soviet representative felt compelled after initially embarking on the high road to make this unwarranted attack, as he did this morning. In the view of my delegation, statements such as these are not conducive to efforts to reach a consensus on the important subject matter that is currently before us.

12. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I have listened carefully to the brief remarks of the representative of the United States, and I should like to answer him, exercising my right of reply. The emphasis laid on the power of the United States of America at the beginning of Mr. Yost's statement and his assertion at the end of his speech that restating the purposes and principles of the Charter would be a pointless waste of effort provided a basis for the brief observation which I made in my statement. We shall see during the formulation of the draft declaration, on which we shall all be working together, what position the United States will take on the question of collective efforts by all Members of the United Nations.

13. Mr. SEN (India): I rather suspect the delegation of Pakistan is running out of ideas, because all this restraint that the Ambassador of Pakistan has displayed today—or at least that he said he would display—was not present when he made a most detailed attack on India in the General Assembly's opening debate. In fact, he concluded some of his statements with exactly the same formulation of words that I had used in the General Assembly debate. I was gratified by this gesture.

14. It is not that we attacked Pakistan. We did not say a word about Pakistan. If anyone could take issue with us, it was the representative of the United States of America, who knows the situation much better than the representative of Pakistan, and he quite rightly decided to keep quiet about it. The United States representative did not say that Pakistan was being attacked by us or anything like that. In taking occasion of his right of reply, the Pakistan representative has none the less made several insinuations and vague allegations.

15. He has referred, for instance, to the arms supply from the United States of America, that is, the limited arms supply on a reimbursable basis and so on and so forth. I do not know the details of these supplies. Perhaps the representative of Pakistan could enlighten us. We go by what we know publicly and if public opinion is any guide, I should merely point out to the Committee that *The New*

York Times, last Sunday, carried an article on arms to Pakistan, containing many sentences that were critical of that move. However one sentence is perhaps worth repeating. "Additional American arms aid to Pakistan will not promote the security of Pakistan or stability in the area."

16. In 20 odd years we have been attacked three times. For 20 years Pakistan received \$US 3,000 million worth of military supplies from the United States. For 20 years Pakistan has continued to be a member of SEATO and CENTO. For years we were subjected to various threats and armed attacks, not singly, but in co-operation with China. Now we are told that we wish Pakistan to continue to remain a satellite of India. I do not know when Pakistan became a satellite. The question of remaining a satellite does not arise.

17. The whole process of building up arms aid is because of internal conditions in Pakistan, of which the American Government has taken full note, and it has decided, for whatever reasons, to increase tension in that area. Therefore, it is most pertinent, most relevant, I would submit, that when we are discussing international security, we decide and determine what are the moves which increase tension and what are the areas where this tension has increased.

18. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): It is rather painful to be compelled to speak again, but as we all represent our Governments, it is our duty not to let any statements of a tendentious and untrue nature pass unchallenged.

19. The representative of India has said that we attacked India three times in 20 years. We did not attack India. The Indian Government carried out a military occupation of the State of Jammu and Kashmir and tried to suppress the right of self-determination of the people of that area, which it was bound to respect under an agreement, and therefore, Pakistan was drawn into the fighting because of India's attempt to conquer the State of Jammu and Kashmir contrary to the basis of the settlement creating the two sovereign States of India and Pakistan in 1947.

20. Now the representative of India has said that Pakistan obtained military aid from the United States to the extent of \$3,000 million in 20 years. Well, apparently he has greater access to facts from the United States Government than I have, but certainly the quantum of military aid to Pakistan has been nowhere near that extent; it has not been even a fraction of the figure quoted by him. He will realize and admit that the United States completely stopped its military aid to Pakistan in 1965 and the United States made a statement that it was following an even-handed approach by also stopping military aid to India. But the facts of the situation were that all the military equipment that Pakistan had for self-defence was American, and the stoppage of American military aid to Pakistan made Pakistan defenceless; whereas the Indian military equipment was acquired from Britain and the Soviet Union, and therefore the effect of the American action, though ostensibly even-handed, made Pakistan militarily helpless even to defend itself.

21. And let me tell this Committee that at no time has the military strength of Pakistan exceeded even one third of the military strength of India; our efforts have been aimed at

maintaining a defensive posture, at least to the ratio of one-third of India's military capability. But when that ratio has been whittled down to the extent of five to one—meaning that India has become five times stronger than Pakistan—surely Pakistan, as a sovereign State, has a duty to acquire some equipment to maintain an army. Otherwise, is Pakistan a sovereign State or is it not? Should Pakistan completely disband its armed forces? Can the United Nations provide a system of collective security? Can any declaration issuing from this august Assembly on the twenty-fifth anniversary assure the security of Pakistan?

22. It is an impossible, astonishing argument that the Indians bring to international forums, to the effect that Pakistan is acquiring certain military material from wherever it can get that material. And what about the military material acquired by India? Do I have to name those countries? We also have certain figures. It appears that to India's way of thinking Pakistan is not a sovereign State, that we have no right to place ourselves in a posture of minimum self-defence, and that even the pittance of military supplies that we get from one country or the other should be completely stopped. That is an extraordinary mentality, and it is responsible for the bad relations and tensions between our two countries. We would appeal to India to be reasonable in this regard.

23. Now, as to Pakistan's membership of SEATO and CENTO for 20 years, let me tell the representative of India that his country derived very great satisfaction from the fact that SEATO did not even lift a little finger to do anything when Pakistan came under attack in 1965. SEATO members were under the obligation to consult together if any one of them was attacked by a non-communist Power, and SEATO refused even to meet or discuss and consider the matter. So we are utterly disillusioned with those military pacts; it is no secret that we are following a policy of friendly relations with all countries, regardless of military pacts and I hope do not have to talk about them any more.

24. I think it is a matter of great regret that the representative of India should have said—at least I thought I heard him say—that Pakistan had joined with China in attacking India. Surely, that is the unkindest cut of all. We did not attack India when it was involved with China. And if India does not acknowledge this fact, and comes here to this international forum to make a statement of that kind, how, and on what basis, can we deal with a country like India to establish friendly relations? I think the references made by the representative of India to internal conditions in Pakistan are really out of court. Our internal conditions have nothing to do with the sale of arms by the United States of America. After all, we are purchasing those arms; they are not being given to us free. And I make this statement: that arms were sold by the United States of America to India from 1950 to 1965. Therefore, what have we done? What has the United States of America done?

25. Mr. SEN (India): I do not know whether the Committee is getting bored, amused, or entertained, but none the less, since this whole plaintive story about being a victim of Indian machinations and hostility has been mentioned by the representative of Pakistan, I shall merely ask two questions: Why did the United States Government

stop the supply of arms in 1965? And why did SEATO never lift a little finger to protect Pakistan?

26. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): The representative of India should address those questions to the United States of America and to SEATO.

27. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): With these statements, the Committee has concluded the general debate on the item.

28. I should like to inform members that the delegation of Senegal has become a sponsor of the draft declaration in document A/C.1/L.518.

29. The Committee will now start consideration of the draft resolutions and amendments that are before it. The first is the draft declaration in document A/C.1/L.513. As will be recalled, the delegation of Thailand submitted amendments to this draft, and they are to be found in document A/C.1/L.515. Secondly, the Committee has before it draft resolution A/C.1/L.514. In connexion with this draft, the delegation of Thailand has submitted amendments, which are to be found in A/C.1/L.516. Thirdly, we have draft resolution A/C.1/L.517. And lastly, there is the draft declaration contained in document A/C.1/L.518.

30. If any delegation wishes to propose any other amendments to the draft resolutions to which I have referred, I shall be pleased to call on it.

31. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): As the Committee may recall, on 6 October my delegation had the pleasure of introducing two sets of amendments [A/C.1/L.515 and 516] in regard to draft resolutions A/C.1/L.513 and 514. In the statement I made to the Committee on that day I did say that the amendments by Thailand should not be construed as being applicable exclusively to the two drafts then before the Committee. [1729th meeting, para. 99.] I quote from my statement:

“My delegation expresses the hope that the ideas behind our amendments will not be lost sight of and that the final draft, irrespective of its origin and authorship, will include the concept which is incorporated in the proposed amendments.”

32. On 7 October the representative of Brazil introduced a draft resolution [A/C.1/L.517] on behalf of the Latin American group, and I presume that because of lack of time the Latin American group was unable to give any thought to the ideas contained in my proposed amendments. As a result, draft resolution A/L.517 did not include the ideas or the concept that I had proposed the day before.

33. Then last night the representative of Zambia introduced another draft resolution on behalf of thirty-two Powers [A/C.1/L.518], which contains an idea similar to that expressed in our amendments. I am referring to the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, which has a provision referring to the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security under the Charter. Unfortunately, from our point of view, the part of my amendment referring to the

permanent members of the Security Council has been left out of that preambular paragraph. Unfortunately, too, the operative part of draft resolution A/C.1/L.518 does not have a similar provision. So what I really want to say is that the amendments that my delegation proposed in regard to documents A/C.1/L.513 and 514 should be considered as applying to documents A/C.1/L.517 and 518 as well. I am of course, grateful to the thirty-two sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.518 for having taken our ideas into account in the preambular paragraph, but I would very much like them to give further consideration to the matter and perhaps to reinsert the reference to the permanent members, as well as to include that provision in the operative part.

34. May I just clarify further what we have in mind? In my statement on 6 October I referred to the statement made by my Foreign Minister on 23 September to the General Assembly. I also referred to the replies given by several Governments [see A/7922 and Add.1-6], including Burma, France and Sweden, in response to the request of the Secretary-General. I referred to the reply of the Government of Sweden in which it said that the great Powers, in their capacity as permanent members of the Security Council, had a special responsibility for the safeguarding of international security, a responsibility that those Powers should constantly be aware of [see A/7922/Add.4]. I then went on to say that this is what my delegation has attempted to do in its amendments in documents A/C.1/L.515 and 516, and that we intended to remind the permanent members of the Security Council of their special obligations, and so on.

35. It is not the intention of my delegation to accord a special status to the permanent members. Special status has already been accorded to the permanent members by the Charter itself. They have been vested with permanent membership of the Security Council and they have also been vested with the right of veto. My delegation always stands firm against giving special status to anybody else, as I said in my statement when referring to operative paragraph 15 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.514. We are against according the right of second echelon permanent members to any other countries that are not declared to be permanent members of the Security Council. The permanent members already have that special status, but they also have the special obligation which they should be constantly reminded of: as we all know, there are many critically troubled areas in the world and we believe genuinely and sincerely that without the co-operation of the permanent members, without those members carrying out their special obligations, the problems, whether they exist in our part of the world, in the Middle East, or in southern Africa, have no chance of being solved.

36. In short, we would very much like our ideas to be incorporated *in toto* in the final version of the draft resolution and we plead with the Committee to bear in mind the ideas we have put forward.

37. Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan): In my delegation's intervention on 9 October in this Committee [1734th meeting] we spoke on the item under discussion in general terms. We also offered my delegation's views on the three texts [A/C.1/L.513, 514 and 517] that had been submitted up

to that date. My delegation is gratified to see that the non-aligned countries, whose aspirations Pakistan fully shares, have taken an initiative and have submitted a draft declaration in document A/C.1/L.518. My delegation is impressed with the effort made by the non-aligned countries in producing a comprehensive draft which attempts to reconcile the existing differences. It is our view that for a resolution on the strengthening of international security to be effective it should command unanimous or near unanimous support of the members. It is our hope that the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned countries will serve as a point of departure for the attainment of that goal.

38. In order to be generally acceptable, a resolution on international security must reflect the general and common aspirations of all Member States. It should not emphasize one set of principles at the expense of others. Above all, it must not reflect the preoccupations of one State or group of States while ignoring the views of other Member States. We note with satisfaction that the draft declaration submitted by the non-aligned countries is largely free of individual predilections. However it is obvious, and I am sure the sponsors will agree with me, that this resolution could be strengthened and perhaps improved both in content and form. The objective of my intervention is to assist our friends and colleagues, the sponsors of this resolution, in evolving a generally acceptable resolution. It is in a spirit of co-operation and mutual accommodation that I am going to offer my delegation's comments and suggestions.

39. Taking first the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft declaration submitted by the non-aligned countries, we note that the "self-determination of peoples" has been followed by the phrase "and their right to freedom and independence". I must point out that the wording of this paragraph is inadequate and does not fully reflect the accepted modes of implementation of the right of self-determination of peoples. As members know, the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples has been elaborated in the draft Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.¹ The relevant provision of that declaration reads:

"The establishment of a sovereign and independent State, the free association or integration with an independent State or the emergence into any other political status freely determined by a people constitute modes of implementing the right of self-determination by that people."

40. It is the view of my delegation that the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft declaration should be in harmony with that provision. This can be achieved if we slightly modify the last phrase of the fourth preambular paragraph. The amended paragraph would read as follows:

"Determined to develop friendly relations and co-operation among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and their right to freedom, independence"—

¹ For the text, see resolution 2625 (XXV).

and here we add—

“and free association or integration with an independent State and emergence into any other political status freely determined by them”.

In other words the word “and” should be deleted from the words “freedom and independence”, and the last phrase would then read:

“... their right to freedom, independence and free association or integration with an independent State and emergence into any other political status freely determined by them”.

41. As regards the fifth preambular paragraph, we fully support its contents but are of the view that it could be made more comprehensive. It is a fact that the evil of racial discrimination divides human society and endangers not only regional peace but also world peace and security. At the same time, the existence of religious discrimination and the persecution of religious minorities are constant reminders that the world community must adopt remedial measures against that evil. The General Assembly itself considers this item almost every year. I would therefore suggest that, after the words “and the elimination of all forms of”, in the fifth preambular paragraph, the words “religious and” should be inserted. The paragraph would then read as follows:

“*Convinced* that peace built upon justice will bring about stability and security conducive to the achievement of rapid social and economic development by all States and the elimination of all forms of religious and racial discrimination including *apartheid*.”.

42. As regards the sixth preambular paragraph, it is a fact that the causes of international tension include the existence of military conflicts, acts of aggression, threats or use of force, foreign occupation of territories and interference in the internal affairs of other States. But this list is by no means exhaustive. An equally, if not even more important cause of international tension is the fact that some States in their international conduct are not abiding by the provisions of international agreements into which they freely enter. Further, some States openly disregard and flout the decisions of the Security Council. That fact is so self-evident that I will not belabour this point. My delegation is of the view that the sixth preambular paragraph should be further amplified and the phrase “. . . as well as disregard for international agreements and the decisions of the Security Council” should be added after the words “the internal affairs of other States”. The paragraph would then read as follows:

“*Deeply concerned* that military conflicts, acts of aggression, threats or use of force, foreign occupation of territories, and interference in the internal affairs of other States, as well as disregard for international agreements and the decisions of the Security Council, create tension and threaten universal peace and security”.

43. Coming to the operative part, my delegation is of the view that operative paragraph 2 is superfluous and has no place in this text. The Declaration on Principles of

International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, like many other declarations adopted by the General Assembly, is related to the questions of international peace and security. But its mention in the present draft is not necessary, as that Declaration will be adopted separately by the General Assembly. However, if for some reason a reference to that Declaration is to be included in the present draft declaration, then it will be incumbent upon us to include references to other and perhaps more important declarations on subjects related to the present item, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty [*resolution 2131 (XX)*]. This list is by no means exhaustive, as some other declarations may also deserve to be mentioned in our text in addition to the Declaration on Friendly relations. It is obvious that such an enumeration of related declarations would considerably increase the contents of this proposal without serving any useful purpose whatsoever. My delegation would therefore suggest that, in order to avoid all those difficulties, operative paragraph 2 should be deleted.

44. As regards the contents of operative paragraph 5, my delegation congratulates the sponsors for having drafted it with great care. We fully endorse it. However, there is a risk that the term “established frontiers” used in this paragraph may be misinterpreted by some interested countries by equating this concept with the concept of the demarcation or cease-fire lines which have arisen as a result of hostilities and have been frozen over a period of time due to the non-settlement of the disputes involved. Further, the concept of established frontiers, for reasons which need no elaboration, has not been used in the Declaration on friendly relations. The relevant provision of that Declaration reads:

“Every State has the duty to refrain from the threat or use of force to violate the existing international boundaries of another State or as a means of solving international disputes, including territorial disputes and problems concerning frontiers of States.”

45. The expression employed, I must emphasize, is “international boundaries”. In order to avoid any possibility of misinterpretation, my delegation would suggest that in operative paragraph 5, instead of using the expression “established frontiers”, we should use the formulation used in the Declaration on friendly relations, that is to say, “existing international boundaries”. The first phrase of operative paragraph 5 after this change would read as follows:

“*Adhere strictly* to the principle of non-use of force as a means of settling international disputes and principles of the inviolability of existing international boundaries . . .”.

The rest would remain unchanged.

46. Lastly, my delegation feels that the formulation of operative paragraph 13 is inadequate. Its main merit is that it is brief. I am sure that representatives will agree that

brevity at the expense of clarity is not a virtue. My delegation is of the view that this paragraph needs elaboration and strengthening. We therefore suggest that this paragraph should be revised and should read as follows:

“Settle their international disputes peacefully by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements or other peaceful means of their choice, in accordance with Article 33 and other relevant provisions of the Charter . . .”.

47. It could be argued that the provisions of the Charter cover all the means I have just mentioned. In fact, I have just repeated, more or less, the provisions of Article 33 and other parts of the Charter of the United Nations. But if this argument is accepted, then logically we shall also have to accept the argument that all the contents of the draft declaration in document A/C.1/L.518 are also covered in the Charter and, consequently, there is perhaps no need to adopt this draft declaration. But as we have agreed in principle that in the present draft declaration we should bring into focus those principles which, though explicit or implicit in the Charter, have not received the attention they deserved during the last 25 years of the working of the political organs of the United Nations, it is necessary that this very important provision relating to the settlement of international disputes, which is disregarded more often than it is observed, should be included in full in the present draft. As I said at the beginning, and I repeat, our purpose in presenting these suggestions is to assist the sponsors of the draft declaration in document A/C.1/L.518 to strengthen it with a view to its adoption by, we hope, a unanimous vote. It is the hope of my delegation that the sponsors of that draft declaration will sympathetically consider our suggestions and include them in their draft. With that thought in mind, we are not submitting our suggestions formally as amendments at this stage, and we sincerely hope that it will not be necessary for us to do so. My delegation, moved by the spirit of mutual accommodation, is also willing and prepared to present and explain our suggestions in any working group which may be established. However, at the same time I must make it clear that my delegation reserves its right, if need be, to introduce our suggestions in the form of amendments, at an appropriate stage of our deliberations.

48. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): Does any other delegation wish to state its views on the draft resolutions or formally submit any draft amendments?

49. Mr. DOSUMU-JOHNSON (Liberia): I do not intend to refer to any of the draft resolutions. Some time ago, if my memory serves me right, the Chairman decided that at the end of the general debate he would conduct consultations to see whether it would be possible to have one draft resolution that would represent the views of the members of this Committee. Now of course I do not wish to disagree with your decision to invite further comment and discussion on all four texts, but as I see the procedure now, I am inclined to the opinion that if everyone at this meeting begins to submit his views, we shall never be able to get anywhere; it will really be just an exercise in futility. Of course, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to bow to any decision that you make in reference to this, but I think you

should be guided by your first thought, that of holding consultations with the various groups. Then, if it becomes necessary, we could, as has been suggested, appoint a group to work on these drafts. Otherwise we shall be talking endlessly here. Every one of us has some observations to make on one or another of the draft resolutions, and we shall never be able to get anywhere.

50. I am submitting this, Mr. Chairman, for your kind consideration, so that we do not have to stay here for hours and hours without any result at all. Surely there will be no result unless you are able to merge these resolutions into one. As I said in my statement, to support any one of these without the mechanical participation of the sponsors of the others would be an exercise in futility.

51. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to assure the representative of Liberia that it was not my intention to open up a debate at this time on the draft resolutions, but rather to try to determine as far as possible what are the texts that we shall have to consider, both of the draft resolutions and of the formal draft amendments, so as to have a clear picture of the problem before us. That is why I called on the representative of Thailand, who wished to introduce his ideas formally, and also on the representative of Pakistan. However, I certainly believe that we cannot expect to get through our work successfully this afternoon if we analyse each and every one of the draft resolutions before the First Committee.

52. Mr. FARTASH (Iran): I was going to raise the same point as the representative of Liberia, but he anticipated my thoughts. I wanted to say nearly the same thing he did, that if all or most of the delegations are going to make comments on the four drafts before us, there would, I think, be no end to the discussion. So I think his point was exactly the one I wanted to raise.

53. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): If you would allow me to, I should like to suggest a formula that has previously been submitted to the Committee, as the representative of Liberia was good enough to recall, and which was formally supported at the 1737th meeting by the representative of Saudi Arabia, Ambassador Baroody.

54. The idea is a very simple one. If the Committee agrees, its officers would be authorized to start consultations as early as possible with the various sponsors of the draft resolutions and amendments thereto, with a view to arriving at a common text. I believe there is a consensus that it would be desirable and appropriate to make an effort to arrive at a text that will meet with the support of the vast majority, if not of all, of the members of the Committee. Therefore, if no delegation objects to this procedure, we could proceed as follows: to authorize our officers to start consultations this afternoon with those who have sponsored the various draft resolutions and amendments, with a view to bringing them into contact among themselves for the purpose of producing, as far as is possible, a consolidation of the various texts into a single one.

55. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees with that procedure.

56. Mr. BOATEN (Ghana): I think I agree entirely with the sentiments expressed by the representatives of Liberia

and Iran. In fact, they do coincide very much with my own sentiments. Personally, I do get a little bit bored with speeches that restate the same points. However, in this particular instance I believe we should also consider the following: that although it would be appropriate to have consultations with the delegations that have sponsored draft resolutions, it should also be realized that not every delegation subscribes to one or another of the four drafts before the Committee. Therefore, although this might appear to be a waste of time, it is my view that it would assist in the long run if this matter were opened to general discussion, so that we might determine the areas of agreement and of disagreement. Then when we come to consultation, it would be possible to take all those areas into consideration. I believe that if we did so, it might ultimately facilitate our work; otherwise, if we agreed to consultations among the various delegations that have sponsored the four drafts, we might only come back to the Committee to find that other delegations who had not made their views clear in the Committee had objections to certain sections of the draft resolutions.

57. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to assure you that my impression is that the consultations with the authors of the various draft resolutions and draft amendments do not exclude the possibility of participation by delegations which have not formally submitted draft resolutions or amendments.

58. It seems to me that after these initial consultations we could very well start an informal system of consultations which would allow the participation of delegations who wish to contribute a special point of view during the preparation of the consolidated text.

59. Mr. DESCHAMPS (France) (*interpretation from French*): It was with great interest that my delegation heard the statements made by the representative of Liberia, the representative of Iran, and by the Chairman. It is obvious that our Committee must conclude this debate by adopting an important resolution which, as far as possible, will be adopted by the vast majority of the Members, if not by unanimous vote. My delegation stated this point of view in the general debate [1728th meeting] and expressed the opinion that since we probably would be confronted with several texts, a search for this desirable unanimity could probably be carried out within a working group. My delegation said it was ready to take part in such work and that it intended to submit written proposals which might facilitate a compromise.

60. My delegation would like to reaffirm this and say how impressed it was by the statements made a little while ago by the representative of Thailand, who was good enough to insist on the role which must be played by the permanent members of the Security Council in the field of the maintenance of international peace and security, a role which is recognized to them.

61. In the opinion of my delegation, it would be most desirable if there were consultations with a view to working out a single text and that the permanent members of the

Security Council be involved in those consultations, since this text is connected with the strengthening of international security.

62. I would add that all the draft texts presented here stress the need to reach an agreement on a very important element in the activities of this Organization, that of peace-keeping operations. And I think it is useful to recall that the question of peace-keeping operations is dealt with in a special committee and that this special committee itself set up a working group composed of the four permanent members of the Security Council. I think that these permanent members could contribute usefully to that search for the compromise which all of us wish to reach and which hopefully must lead to the drafting and adoption of a resolution by a quasi-unanimous vote.

63. Mr. LONGERSTAEY (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the six countries that submitted draft resolution A/C.1/L.514, I should like to state, Mr. Chairman, that I agree with the procedure which you outlined, to the effect that we proceed to general consultations with the sponsors of the four different resolutions. We have full confidence in you, and we believe that this procedure will considerably lessen the work of our Committee and we would like to believe that the Committee will agree with your proposal.

64. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I do not know whether I may take it that, with the remarks and observations which have been made by some delegations during the debate on this question, it is the Committee's decision that the Chairman and the officers of the Committee are authorized to begin consultations at once with the sponsors of the draft resolutions and amendments which have been submitted, and with those delegations which have indicated their interest in participating in those consultations, so as to try to arrive at a single text, if possible, which would have the support, as has already been said several times, if not of all delegations, at least of a majority.

65. If I hear no objections or comments, I shall take it that the Committee has so decided.

It was so decided.

66. Before adjourning, I should like to say that there are no meetings of this Committee scheduled for the commemorative period. However, it has been made clear that it is quite possible that we might have to have a short meeting of this Committee, before or after the Plenary, or even a night meeting, to consider any text which might result from the consultations or the work to be done by this informal group, which will be formed in order to try to come forward with a single text. Therefore, should there be a text which might meet with the support of the majority of the Committee members, then we would certainly convene a meeting of the First Committee during the commemorative period in order to consider it.

The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.