



SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SECOND YEAR

1350th MEETING: 7 JUNE 1967

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1350)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 23 May 1967 from the Permanent Representatives of Canada and Denmark addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7902);	
Complaint of the representative of the United Arab Republic in a letter to the President of the Security Council dated 27 May 1967 entitled: "Israel aggressive policy, its repeated aggression threatening peace and security in the Middle East and endangering international peace and security" (S/7907);	
Letter dated 29 May 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7910)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

THIRTEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 7 June 1967, at 2.20 p.m.

President: Mr. Hans R. TABOR (Denmark).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, India, Japan, Mali, Nigeria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1350)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Letter dated 23 May 1967 from the Permanent Representatives of Canada and Denmark addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7902).
3. Complaint of the representative of the United Arab Republic in a letter to the President of the Security Council dated 27 May 1967 entitled: "Israel aggressive policy, its repeated aggression threatening peace and security in the Middle East and endangering international peace and security" (S/7907).
4. Letter dated 29 May 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7910).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 23 May 1967 from the Permanent Representatives of Canada and Denmark addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7902);

Complaint of the representative of the United Arab Republic in a letter to the President of the Security Council dated 27 May 1967 entitled: "Israel aggressive policy, its repeated aggression threatening peace and security in the Middle East and endangering international peace and security" (S/7907);

Letter dated 29 May 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7910)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions previously taken by the Council, I shall now, with the consent of the Council, invite the representatives of Israel, the United Arab Republic, Jordan, the Syrian Arab

Republic, Lebanon, Iraq, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Tunisia and Libya to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber in order to participate without vote in the discussion.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. Eban (Israel), Mr. A. El Kony (United Arab Republic), Mr. M. H. El-Farra (Jordan), Mr. G. J. Tomeh (Syria), Mr. S. Chammas (Lebanon), Mr. K. Khalaf (Iraq), Mr. A. T. Benhima (Morocco), Mr. G. Al-Rachach (Saudi Arabia), Mr. G. A. Al-Rashid (Kuwait), Mr. M. Mestiri (Tunisia) and Mr. W. El Bouri (Libya) took the places reserved for them.

2. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will continue its examination of the three items inscribed on its agenda, and will deal with the draft resolution submitted at the 1349th meeting by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Copies of that draft resolution have been circulated as document S/7940.

3. The representative of Canada has asked for the floor, but the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics wishes to raise a point of order.

4. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I am obliged to speak on a point of order.

5. First, I should like to draw attention to the fact that the Security Council itself does not strictly observe the decisions it has taken. A decision was taken a short while ago to interrupt our work until 2 o'clock, but we are resuming our work at half past two, which cannot be regarded as normal.

6. Secondly, the USSR delegation has proposed that the Council should vote immediately and refrain from a debate.

7. I should like, Mr. President, to repeat our insistent demand once again, and ask you to take account of our request and defer discussions and statements until later, after we have voted.

8. This is what was agreed. May I remind you of it once again.

9. The PRESIDENT: I am sorry for the delay in resuming the Council's discussion. However, the day before yesterday [1347th meeting] we decided to have a short recess for consultations, and that short recess lasted for eleven hours.

10. This morning, the 1349th meeting was convened for 12.30 p.m., but at the request of the representative of the

Soviet Union I delayed the opening of the meeting twice for ten minutes. The reason for the recess which we have just had was to give time for delegations to consult and to try to seek instructions.

11. I had a request for a short delay—of course, what constitutes a short delay is a relative question—and out of courtesy to the members of the Council I thought it fit to admit that short delay. I am, however, fully aware of the urgency of the situation and I hope we can avoid a further discussion of procedure.

12. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has insisted on having an immediate vote. However, the President has no special power to close the debate. A decision of the Security Council is required. I shall therefore ask the members of the Council whether it is their wish that we close the debate, or whether there is any objection to this proposal.

13. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): It is far from my wish to delay the vote on the draft resolution proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union and I am prepared to vote on it now. The purpose of my asking to speak was to draw the attention of the Council to the fact that in both of the resolutions we have before us—the one which we adopted yesterday [S/7935] and the draft which the representative of the Soviet Union introduced at noon today [S/7940]—paragraph 2 in both cases simply asks the Secretary-General to keep the Council promptly and currently informed. In order not to delay the vote on the draft resolution submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union, I was going to suggest that after voting on that draft resolution, the Security Council should take up as a separate draft resolution the following text:¹

"The Security Council,

"Noting resolutions S/7935, of 6 June 1967, and S/7940, of 7 June 1967,

"Requests the President of the Security Council, with the assistance of the Secretary-General, to take the necessary measures to bring about full and effective compliance with these resolutions."

14. The PRESIDENT: A request has been made by the representative of the Soviet Union for an immediate vote on the draft resolution which he submitted this morning [S/7940]. He would like to have this vote without any debate. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to this.

It was so decided.

A vote was taken by a show of hands.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.²

15. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): As has always been the

practice in these cases in the Security Council, members of the Council should receive a written text, so that they can study it properly and decide on their positions.

16. Accordingly, Mr. President, I should like to ask that members of the Council should be provided with this text in the usual manner, and in the meantime we could hear statements by the parties which, we understand, are intending to express their respective views.

17. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union has proposed that a text of the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Canada be circulated, and that pending the distribution of the text we proceed with our debate.

18. The representative of Bulgaria has asked to speak on a point of order.

19. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): We have just adopted a resolution calling for a cease-fire. We are awaiting the adoption of another draft resolution, submitted by the representative of Canada, designed to enable certain members of the Security Council and the Secretariat to take action.

20. In the meantime, while the debate continues, I believe that it is the President's duty to take immediate measures to ensure that the resolution we have just adopted [234 (1967)] is communicated to the parties concerned and put into effect. Similarly, it is the Council's duty to request him to take such action. In due course we may be able to adopt the Canadian draft resolution, but I urge that the measures I have mentioned be taken immediately. This is a point of order.

21. The PRESIDENT: May I inform the Council that measures to accelerate the work are already in progress. Cables will be sent immediately. The Secretariat has already started work on the matter.

22. I now invite the representative of the United Arab Republic to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

23. Mr. EL KONY (United Arab Republic): My Arab colleagues yesterday drew the attention of the Council to the hysterical atmosphere which has been created here in New York against us, the Arabs. I trust that I may be permitted at the outset to say also a few words to express, on behalf of my delegation, our feelings of resentment and sorrow at being subjected, in the City of New York, to all kinds of intimidation and unjust treatment.

24. The Council must have noticed how everything connected with the Arabs, victims of a treacherous aggression, has been falsified and how we have been vilified during the present crisis. This becomes more glaring when the aggressors are favoured and glorified. I am not going to mention the various threats that we often receive, as I am sure that the representatives to the United Nations, in the performance of their duties, do not heed these intimidations. I cannot but register my protest against this unfair and ungenerous treatment in a city which is supposed to be the host to this universal Organization.

¹ Later circulated as document S/7941.

² See resolution 234 (1967).

25. Eleven years ago, in 1956, a treacherous aggression took place against my country. Israel prepared for it and connived for its execution, and fired the first shot. At those moments the connivers were the British Government and the Guy Mollet Government. The whole world remembered, and definitely still remembers, how much was said to establish the innocence of that unholy alliance. Yet it is no longer a secret that that plot was carefully studied, examined and hatched.

26. The avalanche of books and memoirs has clearly unveiled how that tragedy was engineered and executed. In fact, those books have shown clearly the falsehood of the denials of those days that there was no collusion. We are hearing today the cries of categorical denials, but time will again prove, as it has done in the past, the falsehood of these cries.

27. The Council will remember that two days ago I stated before the Council [*1347th meeting*] that history was repeating itself. Indeed, the happenings of yesterday proved beyond a shadow of doubt the collusion between Israel, the United Kingdom—a former partner—and the United States.

28. I have also had occasion, as recently as two weeks ago [*1342nd meeting*], to say that the many acts of aggression committed by Israel against the Arab countries could not have been attempted without outside encouragement and support, and that such support invariably alternates between one source and another. I added that, in the present case, it comes from the United Kingdom and the United States. It has been proved beyond doubt that both the United States and the United Kingdom participated in the air operations of the Israel aggression, assisting Israel on a large scale in its attacks against the Egyptian, the Jordanian and the Syrian fronts. Moreover, they provided an air umbrella over Israel. In spite of all the categorical denials by both Governments, the fact remains that there has been collusion between the three Governments.

29. This, I submit, is the consistent policy of hypocrisy and antagonism towards the Arab nations practised by the United States in the Middle East.

30. This is not a case which is of concern to the Arab countries alone. It is a new pattern of international relations which affects small countries, all countries emerging from the era of colonialism, all the developing countries. This, in fact, is a sad lesson for all of them—that the self-styled international policeman is there for them to obey. He is the one to make the rules and he is the one to enforce them.

31. Can we forget that the United States was the driving force behind the Bay of Pigs invasion in Cuba? Can the reasons behind the flagrant intervention of the United States in the Dominican Republic remain secret? Those are only a few examples of the sombre deeds of the United States Government in this respect.

32. Those who have declared that they guarantee “the independence and territorial integrity of the States in the Middle East” have tolerated one expansion of Israel after another, despite the United Nations resolutions regarding Palestine and its people that have been repeatedly adopted.

33. For the last nineteen years—may I ask the representative of the United States—what has his country done to make Israel abide by the United Nations resolutions? While the United States keeps asserting its devotion to those resolutions, the question arises—and it is now being tested in the glaring realities in the Middle East—whether Israel’s display of territorial ambitions, which has always been evident, would be tolerated by the United States.

34. Is the United States asserting today, by deed or action, that it will not allow Israel to annex an inch of Arab territory? Yet, nowhere do we hear from the higher authorities in the United States, or from the representatives of the United States, a clear-cut statement asserting that Israel will not be allowed to use brutal force for their malicious aims.

35. Our understanding of resolution 233 (1967) adopted by the Council yesterday is that Israel, the aggressor, should cease its aggression and withdraw behind the armistice demarcation lines and points prior to the outbreak of hostilities.

36. While we note that Jordan has accepted the cease-fire call, Israel has continued its aggression and is still occupying territories in Jordan. Israel also is still continuing its aggression on United Arab Republic territory. Moreover, it has not withdrawn from that territory. Thus, it has not implemented the decision of the Council.

37. Hence, it is clear that Israel has not respected the Council’s resolution, and thus it has become of no value. The Council should therefore correct this situation immediately before it worsens.

38. My delegation asks the Council to condemn Israel, and to order it to cease fire immediately and to withdraw to positions prior to the outbreak of hostilities.

39. The PRESIDENT: I now invite the Foreign Minister of Israel to take a place at the Council table and make a statement.

40. Mr. EBAN (Israel): Nothing more absurd has ever been said at an international forum than that the United Kingdom and the United States took part in the military operations with which Israel was involved this week. Israel received not one single ounce of help from anybody in repelling the aggressive design to which I referred yesterday.

41. A second thesis that has been developed here, both by the representative of the United Arab Republic and, before him, by the representative of the Soviet Union, is that Israel is the aggressor. As I said yesterday [*1348th meeting*], the central theme of the Arab-Israel conflict is clear and simple. There are Member States that desire to destroy another Member State. This is the heart and the crux of the problem. There are those who deny the existence, the sovereignty, the national personality and the territorial integrity of a Member State, and who both proclaim and at times carry out measures for the destruction of its independence and its integrity. There is neither any historic basis nor moral justification nor juridical foundation for that assertion. The Security Council has not, of course,

identified itself with this doctrine in all the discussions that it has had in recent days about the conflict.

42. I now seek to come to the issue which is before the Council, namely that of the cease-fire. Since I addressed the Security Council last night, I have had the opportunity of reviewing what I then said. I have little of substance to add. The Government of Israel is totally united in its central purposes. These are to repel the attempt which was mounted three weeks ago to procure our encirclement and strangulation, and thereafter to work with our neighbours to build a better and more stable system of relationships. These are our objectives; these are our aims.

43. Now these objectives require that the fighting stop. Therefore, when the Security Council adopted resolution 233 (1967) last night, the normal expectation was, first, that all Governments would immediately clarify that they welcome and accept the cease-fire. There should, in fact, have been a response of principle, and second, having so agreed, they would then co-operate for the effective implementation of that resolution.

44. Now what in point of fact happened? The first Government to pronounce its attitude was that of Israel. I said that we welcomed the cease-fire resolution. I invited other Governments to indicate their acceptance. That was our position; that is our position. We welcome, we favour, we support, we accept the resolution calling for immediate measures to institute a cease-fire.

45. Now I believed, innocently, that it should have been possible to make progress immediately even before the Secretary-General's cables went over the wires to other Governments. After all, the Governments concerned are all represented here, some of them on Ministerial level. If they had come to this table last night, or even so far this afternoon, and indicated their acceptance of the cease-fire resolution, we would already have made some advance, leaving only the logistic problems to be solved.

46. Since the cease-fire resolution was adopted by the Security Council last night, the representative of Syria has spoken, the representative of Iraq has spoken, the representative of the United Arab Republic has spoken. I have heard and studied every word that they have said. I cannot find in any of those speeches one single sentence saying that "We, Syria, we, Iraq, we, the United Arab Republic, welcome and accept the cease-fire resolution".

47. I listened with special care to the distinguished representative of the United Arab Republic this afternoon. Surely there is only one thing that the world community wants to know from the States in the area at this time: whether they accept the resolution which the Security Council adopted last night.

48. Having heard nothing from the United Arab Republic at this table, we are forced to rely upon press reports, one of which tells us of a Cairo Radio broadcast:

"A United Arab Republic spokesman said that Egypt today rejected the United Nations Security Council resolution for a cease-fire in the Middle East.

"Cairo Radio broadcast the rejection of the cease-fire call."

The *Associated Press* from Cairo:

"Cairo Radio declared today that the Arab countries are determined to carry on the war against Israel despite the cease-fire call from the United Nations Security Council.

"Teach the Israelis a lesson, drive them out of the land, said the Egyptian Government radio in a new call for all-out war."

49. This, I think, is the crux of the situation—that there is a unilateral and so far unreciprocated acceptance of the cease-fire. Nothing astonished me more than that the United Arab Republic representative could come to this table this afternoon, after the acceptance of two resolutions, without saying the simple words that the United Arab Republic accepts the two resolutions that have been passed, to say at least that it accepts them in principle, subject, of course, to reciprocity and to the elaboration of the necessary details and the co-ordination of the cease-fire on the ground.

50. I draw the attention of world opinion to the fact that this has not been said. That is the reason why the crisis was not solved as a result of last night's resolution.

51. The central fact is that there has been a cease-fire resolution that Israel has accepted and that the United Arab Republic and Syria and Iraq have rejected, or, at the very least, have neglected an opportunity to accept.

52. There has, of course, been one element of progress. The Government of Jordan has accepted the cease-fire. However, there is here a complication which arises from the fact that the Jordanian acceptance is not paralleled by Egyptian acceptance, for, as the Security Council no doubt knows, it is Egyptian command that now operates over the armed forces of Jordan. The absence of a United Arab Republic acceptance of a cease-fire certainly has a negative effect on the Jordan Government's acceptance of the cease-fire. This is not simply a question of theory; it is also a question of fact. Let me illustrate this by two facts which have emerged since the Security Council met last night.

53. This morning, that is to say many hours after the adoption of the Security Council resolution, an Egyptian commando force stationed in Jordanian territory attacked Israel traffic in the vicinity of Nahshon, near the Jerusalem-Tel Aviv road. The road between Jerusalem and Tel Aviv is the main artery of civilian communication in Israel. Here were Egyptian commando units operating from Jordan coming into the central artery of communications in Israel and undertaking a military engagement in which many were killed and in which a senior Egyptian commando officer was taken prisoner. His statement is that his mission was to carry out acts of sabotage against airfields in the southern part of Israel. His statement was recorded and will soon be available here.

54. This indicates that United Arab Republic acceptance is crucial not only for what happens on the Egyptian-Israel

front, but also for what happens on the Jordan-Israel front. Therefore, both in respect of the situation in the south and in respect of the situation on the Jordan front, the absence, to this very hour, of any acceptance in general, in principle, as policy, of the cease-fire resolution by the United Arab Republic must cause grave anxiety, unless perhaps there is opportunity still for the United Arab Republic representative to correct this obscurity. There may be some misunderstanding. Perhaps he wished to express his acceptance of these resolutions and I did not catch that acceptance. But it is a fact that as of this day it is Israel alone that has accepted the cease-fire resolution, and Jordan also has accepted it, but the value of that acceptance is, as it were, eroded by the absence of acceptance by the United Arab Republic Government, which actually commands the operations in Jordan itself.

55. Another instance of the anomaly arising from the non-acceptance of the resolution is that despite Jordan's acceptance the firing still goes on in Jerusalem. Many hundreds have been injured on the Israel side of Jerusalem. Some people ask: why was it not possible to silence that fire? The reason is that the Egyptian commander has ingeniously placed his guns so close to the Holy Places that he has immunity from fire. That is why fire has continued intermittently and sometimes constantly into Jerusalem.

56. Let me again summarize my Government's attitude. We stand by the undertaking that I gave last night. If we could have an immediate acceptance of the cease-fire resolution at this table, I think that very little time would be needed to bring it into effect, although there are, as I have said, problems of co-ordinating the actual cease-fire to ensure that advantage is not gained by either side. That, however, is a logistic problem and not one for the Council itself. If there is no cease-fire at this moment, it is because Israel has accepted the cease-fire and the United Arab Republic and Syria have rejected it. Jordan is not in a position to carry it out without a parallel Egyptian acceptance.

57. I would also point out that there are other Arab States whose troops have been involved and are still involved in the fighting. There are Algerian troops and there are troops from Kuwait. It seems to me that the cease-fire resolution should be communicated to every State whose troops are taking part in the fighting in any sector, and I would recommend in respect of both resolutions that the list of the recipients of the Security Council's resolutions should be enlarged so as to include every State which can reasonably be regarded, on the strength of its own pronouncements, to be taking part in the conflict.

58. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States in exercise of his right of reply.

59. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): Just a few minutes ago, the Council heard once again from the representative of the United Arab Republic, Mr. El Kony, accusations against my country of participation in the unhappy conflict which is taking place in the Near East.

60. Yesterday I attempted [1348th meeting] in the most precise terms to deny, repudiate and reject those accusa-

tions totally. I did so on the highest authority of my Government. But I did more than that. I issued an invitation to the United Nations to investigate those charges fully and impartially, as the United Nations would do. That invitation still stands. It is notable that those who propagate these totally unfounded and unsubstantiated charges do not in any way refer to or accept the concept that the United Nations, an impartial agency, should investigate in order to submit an objective report about the truth or falsity of those charges. They are false charges, and the only reasonable conclusion which anyone can draw is that the authors of the charges know full well that they are false.

61. Reference was also made to our Press and its treatment of the issues we are debating. Our Government takes great pride in the fact that we have a free Press, but I should like to point out that our Press fully reports all aspects of this situation. If we look—as we all do here in New York—at *The New York Times* of this morning we see dispatches from all of the capitals involved, from Cairo, from Damascus, from Jerusalem, from Tel Aviv, from Baghdad, which fully report the events which are taking place there and give the viewpoints about this conflict of the countries concerned. I am quite content to rely on the manner in which our free Press handles this matter—in contrast to what the controlled Press in some of those capitals is saying about this situation.

62. Finally, statements were made about diplomatic courtesy and usages. This is a matter which concerns me very much. At the present moment, as the result of false and inflammatory charges against my country, United States embassies in certain capitals are being sacked and burned, while in New York and in Washington our Government, strongly committed to the immunity of diplomatic Missions, has taken every step and every precaution to ensure that no such action can take place here.

63. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): After the vote on the resolution we adopted a few moments ago I should like to express my delegation's views on a number of points raised during the discussion.

64. Despite the resolutions adopted by the Security Council, the Israel aggression continues; as we have just learned from Press reports, hostilities have not ceased. According to those reports, Israel, the aggressor, is still trying to take advantage of its surprise attack, so as to provoke situations enabling it to create *faits accomplis* that would constitute advantages and a bonus for aggression. However, the Security Council cannot allow this aggression to continue, much less permit situations to be created that would provide the aggressor with opportunities and reward aggression.

65. This unprovoked aggression has caused enormous suffering and devastation, loss of human life and material damage that no one can ignore or underestimate. The resolutions we adopted yesterday and today are only the first step towards the restoration of calm in that region.

66. Just now, we heard the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel state that his country, if I understood him correctly, has already agreed to abide by the Security Council

resolution adopted yesterday. However, we have neither seen nor heard anything to indicate that that is so. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel also stated that it was not Israel, but the United Arab Republic and the other countries that were unwilling to accept the Security Council resolution. But only a few minutes ago we heard the representative of the United Arab Republic state that he understood that resolution to signify that Israel's aggression must cease; that is our understanding also, and the understanding of all those who realize that the aggression must cease immediately. The aggressor cannot demand that resistance to his aggression should cease before he himself will arrest aggression; it is the aggression which must cease if resistance to it is to come to an end. You cannot ask a people not to resist aggression against its own territory; you cannot ask a people not to defend its national sovereignty. It is the aggressor who must be asked to stop his aggression. Despite the appeals of the Security Council, a country would be failing in its national duty if it did not defend itself against aggression.

67. For that reason I believe we must take urgent measures now to put an end to aggression. Aggression can only lead to resistance, which must continue. Furthermore, that is in conformity with Article 51 of the Charter, which states that countries, individually or collectively, may defend themselves against aggression until the necessary measures have been taken to stop the aggression. It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I would request you, respectfully and earnestly, to ensure that measures are taken to that end.

68. I should now like to make a few comments on the draft resolution which has just been submitted by the representative of Canada [S/7941], the operative paragraph of which reads as follows:

"Requests the President of the Security Council, with the assistance of the Secretary-General, to take the necessary measures to bring about full and effective compliance with these resolutions".

In principle, we agreed to study this draft resolution in order to see in what context we could accept it. We should, however, like a little time to study also the context in which, technically, we could anticipate this draft resolution, seeing that we adopted another resolution [234 (1967)] a few moments ago. Furthermore, if I am not mistaken, the latter resolution calls for a cease-fire at 2000 hours GMT and should be put into effect within a few hours. Would it not be advisable to adjourn our meeting? That would give us time to study the new draft resolution, and when the Council reconvenes the President could tell us whether the cease-fire has actually been put into effect, and explain what the situation is and in what conditions we could proceed to the vote. Moreover, the draft resolution may call for amendments or additions.

69. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United Kingdom in exercise of his right of reply.

70. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I would have very much wished not to have to intervene again in this debate in exercise of my right of reply, but I must say one

word in reply to what was said earlier by the distinguished delegate of the United Arab Republic.

71. I am sorry that he has repeated charges which have been adequately denied before. He goes back many years for his evidence. However, we are speaking not about past years, but about the facts of the situation in 1967. I am sure that he himself will be convinced by the evidence—which is clear—that from the beginning of this debate and during the series of events which we have been discussing, my country at every stage has made every effort, first of all to prevent a war, and then, when it broke out, to stop it.

72. The evidence is there, that we were perhaps the first to wish to convene the Council. We were amongst the first to back support for the Secretary-General's appeal. We were amongst the first to call for a cease-fire on Monday, 5 June, when hostilities broke out, and we had greatly hoped that the call could be made earlier than it was. That is the evidence. Yesterday I repeated in the Council [1348th meeting] the policy which had been declared and accepted in my own country by the Foreign Secretary in the House of Commons.

73. I have no need to go further into those clear statements which I have already made, but I have one other reason for speaking in right of reply on the matter which was raised by the representative of the United Arab Republic. I wish to read the text of a letter which I have today addressed to you, Mr. President:

"I wrote on 6 June about reports carried by official Middle East news media which alleged that British aircraft took part in the recent fighting in the region on the side of Israel. In that letter I made clear that these reports were malicious fabrications.

"I am now instructed by my Government to inform Your Excellency that they would welcome an immediate impartial investigation of these charges by the United Nations. My Government would be prepared to offer the United Nations investigating officials all necessary facilities. In addition to such an investigation, my Government is prepared to invite United Nations officials to visit British aircraft carriers, as well as the airfields in the sovereign base areas in Cyprus and our installations on the airfields in Malta.

"I should be grateful if Your Excellency would have this letter circulated immediately as a Security Council document." [S/7939.]

74. The PRESIDENT: Steps have been taken to circulate the letter to which the representative of the United Kingdom just referred. I call on the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

75. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): At the meetings of the Security Council in the course of the past few days the representatives of certain countries have, as we have seen, made liberal use of fine words to create an impression that their intentions are honest and their behaviour magnanimous. But, if their statements are compared with the facts,

then the unmistakable conclusion emerges that there has actually been some kind of distribution of roles, and that someone is trying to pull the wool over the Security Council's eyes.

76. In his many statements yesterday and today the United States representative, with his marathon speeches about Washington's peaceful intentions, is creating a screen, as it were, behind which in the meantime the aggressive forces of Israel, disregarding the Security Council's decision that the military invasion must cease immediately, are to this verbal accompaniment continuing to violate the sovereignty of Arab States, conquering the land of their Arab neighbours with sword and fire and carrying out their predatory plans by armed force.

77. As we watch attentively what is being said and what is being done, we should like to remind those whom it may concern of a pointed and apposite saying: "Do not burn false incense before the true Buddha."

78. The USSR delegation considers it necessary to draw the Security Council's attention to a statement issued by the USSR Government on 7 June 1967, in view of its important nature. Today, 7 June, the USSR Government has addressed the following statement to the Government of Israel:

"Information is being received from various sources that the resolution of the United Nations Security Council [233 (1967)] calling for an immediate cease-fire and a cessation of all military activities is not being complied with by the Israel side. Israel is grossly and demonstratively violating this resolution and continuing its war on the Arab States.

"The position thus adopted by the Government of Israel is further proof of the aggressive nature of your policy, which disregards elementary rules of international relations and openly defies the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

"The USSR Government has warned the Government of Israel in no uncertain terms against pursuing a policy of aggression and military adventures. But Israel's leaders have not listened to the voice of reason. If the Government of Israel does not now comply at once with the concerted demand of States for an immediate cease-fire, as expressed in the Security Council's resolution, the Soviet Union will reconsider its attitude to Israel and will take a decision concerning the further maintenance of diplomatic relations with Israel, which by its acts is setting itself against all peace-loving States.

"The USSR Government will, of course, consider and take other measures made necessary by Israel's aggressive policy."

79. The PRESIDENT: It has been brought to my attention that the Secretary-General has received new information on developments in the area. I believe that all members of the Council will wish to hear the Secretary-General before we proceed with our debate.

80. I now give the floor to the Secretary-General.

81. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: During the recess of the Security meeting this afternoon, I received the following report from General Odd Bull, Chief of Staff of UNTSO:

"1. Situation report at 10 a.m. Greenwich Mean Time. Report on situation in Jerusalem City area during the night of 6/7 June:

"(a) Israel forces continued bombardment of Mount Scopus and reducing Jordan strongpoints.

"(b) Augusta Victoria Hospital burnt out.

"(c) Citadel on west side walled city also received heavy weapon attack during the morning of 7 June.

"(d) Sporadic fire, mostly mortar and machine-gun, has continued in the city.

"(e) Crest of Mount Scopus occupied by Israel in clear view of the city with clear fields of fire into the walled city.

"(f) Government House area allegedly received heavy mortar bombardment reportedly causing Israel casualties.

"(g) Mandelbaum Gate area placed under Jordan mortar fire for a short period in mid-morning.

"(h) Chairman of Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan—Israel Mixed Armistice Commission reports all quiet in the area at present.

"(i) Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan—Israel Mixed Armistice Commission house has been occupied by Israel forces. Senior Israel delegate has advised the Chairman that if he and UNTSO personnel at the Mixed Armistice Commission house wish to leave he will assist and accept full responsibility for the building and property. I"—that is, General Odd Bull—"have advised the Chairman to remain there for the present.

"(j) Situation in the city at 10.45 a.m. very quiet. I am watching the developments.

"2. Observers from Jenin and Latrun observation posts have returned under UNTSO control under Israel forces escort. Observers at Tulkarm are safe. Arrangements to recover them under discussion. Observers at Hebron are safe. I have radio contact with the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan—Israel Mixed Armistice Commission.

"3. At approximately 10.30 a.m. Greenwich Mean Time heavy Israel mortar bombardment placed on target area in the vicinity of Bethlehem.

"4. Cease-fire not effective."

That is the end of the cable.

82. I have just received a communication from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations. The text is as follows:

“Dear Mr. Secretary-General,

“I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of the copy of your telegram of last night addressed to the Minister for Foreign Affairs in Jerusalem.

“In this connexion, I wish to draw your attention to the statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs at the 1348th meeting [para. 179] of the Security Council on 6 June 1967, immediately following the adoption of the resolution [233 (1967)], as follows:

“‘Let me then say here that Israel welcomes the appeal for the cease-fire as formulated in this resolution. But I must point out that the implementation depends on the absolute and sincere acceptance and co-operation of the other parties, which, in our view, are responsible for the present situation. And in conveying this resolution to my colleagues, I must at this moment point out that these other Governments have not used the opportunity yet to clarify their intentions.’

“I have the honour to request you to bring this letter to the immediate attention of the Security Council.

“(Signed) Gideon RAFAEL
Permanent Representative”

83. The PRESIDENT: I thank the Secretary-General for his statement.

84. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): Earlier this afternoon, after I had suggested and read out my draft resolution, the representative of the Soviet Union quite properly requested a written text. I believe that all members of the Council now have the text. It is simple and straightforward and it is intended simply to fill an obvious gap in definition of responsibility in regard to the implementation of the two cease-fire resolutions which this Council has unanimously adopted. I commend it to the members of the Council because I believe that, as has already been made clear, there is a requirement to do more than simply inform the Council or keep the Council currently informed of the situation. There is a responsibility—which I believe you, Mr. President, and the Secretary-General have in fact been carrying out—to keep in touch with all the Governments concerned to see that the resolution is implemented and then keep the Council informed.

85. I understood the remark of my colleague and friend on my right, the representative of Bulgaria, to mean that he suggested there should be a suspension of the meeting so that the text could be discussed, as the previous one was. I suggest that under rule 33, paragraph 1, we suspend the meeting for ten or fifteen minutes so that the necessary consultations can take place with regard to the text, and that we then proceed to a unanimous vote, as we did on the previous resolution.

86. The PRESIDENT: A motion has been made under rule 33, paragraph 1, to suspend the meeting for fifteen minutes. Any motion for the suspension shall be decided without debate. I call upon the representative of Bulgaria on a point of order.

87. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): We submitted our proposal before the motion of the representative of Canada. I think that my colleague on the left—although he is not always on the left—has misunderstood my proposal, and I should therefore like to explain it more fully. I proposed that the meeting should be adjourned until the time when the cease-fire was supposed to go into effect, so that we could obtain additional information. I am not opposed to a discussion of the Canadian draft resolution and would favour it being adopted this very day, if possible, but we must have enough time to discuss it, revise it if possible, amend it. I already have several amendments to submit, but I cannot give a tentative formulation of them, as that would only complicate our work.

88. For that reason I would appeal to my colleague on my left to be good enough to agree that we should adjourn the meeting until a later time, today perhaps, so that we may have an opportunity to study his draft resolution, submit amendments to it and then hear the Secretary-General's report on the current situation in the field. For that reason I would request my colleague to respond to my appeal, for which I wanted to give him valid reasons. If he wants to make another proposal, however, that is another matter.

89. The PRESIDENT: The situation as I see it is as follows. If my memory is correct, the representative of Bulgaria asked a question in his earlier intervention; he said: “*Ne serait-il pas bon d'ajourner notre séance?*” I did not take that as a formal motion for adjournment.

90. A formal motion for suspension of the meeting has now been made. A question has been put by the representative of Bulgaria, whether the representative of Canada would agree to the Council's adjournment and meeting again, even later today. I would address this question to the representative of Canada.

91. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): As you correctly say, Mr. President, the rules of procedure give priority to a motion for suspension of the meeting. I have in fact moved for a suspension of the meeting. If it is more convenient to my colleague from Bulgaria to have an adjournment for half an hour instead of fifteen minutes, that would be agreeable to me. I do not believe a suspension is made *sine die*, or simply to later in the evening; it is usually for a specific time, and I believe it would be within the rules to adjourn for a specific time, say half an hour.

92. The PRESIDENT: A motion has been made for an adjournment for half an hour. If there is no objection, the meeting will be adjourned for half an hour.

93. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): We are opposed to an adjournment that would last only half an hour. We feel that the meeting should be adjourned and that the President should reconvene the

Council when he feels he can give us further information. We must have at least an hour to take some refreshment and to work here at the United Nations.

94. It is not really urgent at this point to give the President powers such as are described here. I should like to understand this matter more fully. According to the Charter and the rules of procedure, the President already has all the powers he needs in order to act. We now want to give him special powers. It is for that reason that I think it would be useful to reflect a little more on the wording to be used in this draft resolution. That is why I appealed to my colleague on my left to agree that there should be another meeting of the Security Council today—I am not opposed to that, but I should like to study his proposal in more detail and obtain the information I need. There is no point in saying the same thing over and over again. The Security Council would meet almost continuously today, but there would be two meetings; that is all.

95. The PRESIDENT: A motion has been made to adjourn the meeting for half an hour. That would be a motion under rule 33, paragraph 3. If I understood him correctly, the representative of Canada agreed to change his motion from a motion to suspend the meeting to a motion for adjournment.

96. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): I am sorry, Mr. President, but I did not agree to changing my motion for suspension to one for adjournment. I asked if the representative of Bulgaria would accept my suggestion for a half-hour's suspension, which he did not. My motion for suspension therefore stands.

97. The PRESIDENT: In that case, then, there is motion to suspend the meeting, under rule 33, paragraph 1, for fifteen minutes. I have to put this motion to a vote without debate.

98. I call on the representative of Ethiopia on a point of order.

99. Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): Would you allow me, Mr. President, to make an appeal by way of a point of order. It seems to me that we are departing from the spirit of co-operation that has characterized our work in the last few critical days. One welcome sign in the decisions we have taken so far in the urgent effort to halt hostilities is the unanimity that has characterized our action. This is a tendency which we should encourage, since it is a hopeful basis on which to work in the difficult and heavy task that awaits our urgent and serious attention . . .

100. The PRESIDENT: I am very sorry indeed to interrupt the representative of Ethiopia. I am in the hands of the Council; but a motion has been made for suspension of the meeting under rule 33, paragraph 1. According to this rule, any motion thereunder would have to be decided without debate. If the representative of Canada insists on this motion, I must bring it to a vote without debate.

101. I call on the representative of Ethiopia on a point of order.

102. Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): Speaking again on a point of order, I was hoping that the representative of Canada, whom I know to be a gentle and co-operative man, would not insist on rushing a draft resolution of this kind through the Council when one of his colleagues is making an appeal to him so that the Council may be able to continue in its concerted action. However, if it is your understanding, Mr. President, that the representative of Canada insists on a vote, then of course, just as you are in the hands of the Council, I am in your hands.

103. The PRESIDENT: A motion has been made by the representative of Canada—and I take it that it is maintained—to suspend the meeting under rule 33, paragraph 1.

104. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): In response to the appeal for unanimity made by the representative of Ethiopia, I would point out that this is not quite the same appeal as that made to me by the representative of Bulgaria. The request of the representative of Bulgaria was to adjourn the meeting for receipt by the Council of some kind of information which is supposed to be forthcoming from somewhere—I am not quite sure where. But in view of this appeal for unanimity, and in the belief that this draft resolution is a necessary complement to the two resolutions the Council has adopted, I suggest that we adjourn the meeting until we are ready to meet to adopt this draft resolution.

105. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Canada has now moved to adjourn the meeting under rule 33, paragraph 2, until such time as we can vote on the draft resolution, in accord with the appeal made by the representative of Ethiopia to pave the way for a unanimous decision. I shall have to put this motion to a vote without debate.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The motion was adopted unanimously.

106. The PRESIDENT: The meeting is adjourned.

The meeting rose at 3.50 p.m.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre librairie ou adressez-vous à: Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Приводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
