

UNITED NATIONS

UN/DA COLLECTION

MAR 6 1974



UN/DA COLLECTION

SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SIXTH YEAR

1601st

MEETING: 24 NOVEMBER 1971

NEW YORK



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1601)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Complaint by Senegal: Report of the Special Mission of the Security Council established under resolution 294 (1971) (S/10308)	1
Point of order raised by the representative of the United Kingdom	6

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.

SIXTEEN HUNDRED AND FIRST MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 24 November 1971, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Eugeniusz KULAGA (Poland).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Argentina, Belgium, Burundi, China, France, Italy, Japan, Nicaragua, Poland, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1601)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Complaint by Senegal:
Report of the Special Mission of the Security Council established under resolution 294 (1971) (S/10308).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Senegal

Report of the Special Mission of the Security Council established under resolution 294 (1971) (S/10308)¹

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): During previous meetings devoted to the consideration of the present item, the Security Council decided to invite the representatives of Senegal, Guinea, Mali, the Sudan, Mauritania, Mauritius, Togo and Zambia to participate, without the right to vote, in the Council's debate on the question before it.

2. In view of the limited number of places at the Council table, and in conformity with the usual practice, I shall invite the representatives of non-members of the Council wishing to participate in this debate to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the understanding that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when it is their turn to speak.

3. I call on the representative of Senegal to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. Fall, representative of Senegal, took a place at the Security Council table, and Mr. E.-H. A. Touré, representative of Guinea, took the place reserved for him in the Council chamber.

¹ Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Special Supplement No.3.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council will continue the consideration of the item on its agenda. I would remind members that a draft resolution has been submitted by Burundi, Sierra Leone and Somalia in document S/10395.

5. Mr. TERENCE (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): After the meeting this morning, consultations were held among various members of the Council with a view to reaching agreement on the draft resolution which we introduced at the 1599th meeting and which should be voted on this afternoon. Agreement was reached with some difficulty, because we were bound to note that while some delegations proposed amendments which the sponsors were able to study and accept, other delegations had to withdraw the amendments they proposed because they were not fully in accord with the tenor and the character of the draft resolution.

6. Now I should like to inform the Security Council of an amendment which has been proposed to operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. That paragraph, which I shall read in English, read as follows:

"Calls upon the Government of Portugal to take immediate effective measures:

"(a) So that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Senegal shall be fully respected;

"(b) To prevent acts of violence and destruction against the territory and the people of Senegal, in order to contribute to the safeguarding of peace and security in the region".

7. Another proposal was also submitted regarding operative paragraph 6 and I should like to inform the Council of it. The amended paragraph would read as follows:

"Calls upon the Government of Portugal to take without further delay the necessary measures, so that this inalienable right of the people of Guinea (Bissau) shall be exercised".

8. Those are the amendments of which we wish to inform the Council. Of course, as will be noted, in a spirit of co-operation and in the conviction that the Council must be collectively responsible and exercise joint authority, we have tried to show a willingness to make concessions although the new text is not completely acceptable, any more than the old one was. In other words, it was because there was no better alternative that, in order to retain the

team spirit of the Council we had to reject some proposals while accepting those that did not do grave damage to the spirit or form of the text. Therefore, we hope that all members will be able to support this text, which is at least quite harmless.

9. On the other hand, I should like to point out that we have held consultations with all the parties concerned. We therefore hope that the work we have done and the efforts we have made to reach unanimous agreement will produce results when the draft resolution is voted upon. If there are any questions concerning this draft resolution, we are of course prepared to reply to them.

10. The representative of Argentina this morning raised a very relevant point and since we have accepted it because we consider it to be well founded, we might ask him whether he could submit a paragraph concerning the work done by the Special Mission. Since both the President of the Council and the representative of Burundi were members of the Special Mission to Senegal, it would be a rather delicate matter for them to make a specific proposal on the subject. That is why a formulation by the representative of Argentina would be welcome.

11. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The addition I proposed this morning was very simple and read as follows:

“Expresses its appreciation for the work accomplished by the Special Mission of the Security Council established under resolution 294 (1971)”.

12. If it is accepted I believe that it should become operative paragraph 1, and the remaining operative paragraphs would then be renumbered accordingly.

13. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): As I understand it, the amendment just made by the representative of Argentina is acceptable to the sponsors of the draft resolution. May I take it that this is so?

14. Mr. TERENCE (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): The sponsors of the draft resolution accept the proposal submitted by the representative of Argentina and wish to thank him for the spirit of courtesy which prompted him to realize the need to acknowledge the work done by the members of the Special Mission, despite the difficulties they encountered. Hence, on behalf of the other sponsors and on behalf of my delegation, I should like to express our appreciation to him for the spirit of initiative which he has shown.

15. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before we turn to the explanations of vote, I should like to make it clear that the text before us, apart from the amendments read out by the representative of Burundi, would therefore contain an additional paragraph, operative paragraph 1, and the other operative paragraphs will be renumbered accordingly.

16. Mr. LONGERSTAEY (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, I should like to pay a tribute to the African delegations for their spirit of compromise, and

particularly to their spokesman, the Ambassador of Burundi, who facilitated the task of several delegations in voting on the draft resolution.

17. My delegation considered with particular interest the draft resolution submitted yesterday with such clarity and eloquence by the representative of Burundi on the complaints by Senegal against Portugal.

18. My country was a member of the Special Mission whose mandate consisted in going to Senegal

“to carry out an inquiry into the facts of which the Council has been informed, to examine the situation along the border between Guinea (Bissau) and Senegal and to report to the Security Council, making any recommendations aimed at guaranteeing peace and security in this region”.

My delegation actively participated in the consultations which have taken place these past few days between the six members of the Special Mission in order to achieve agreement on the text of a draft resolution.

19. Once again we should like to affirm in the Council that Belgium remains wedded to the idea of the exercise by the people of Guinea (Bissau) of its right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. We also solemnly reaffirm that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Senegal must be respected.

20. We would however, have hoped that the draft resolution could limit itself to drawing conclusions from the reports of the Special Mission. That Mission chose a particular drafting procedure because it had not found formal proof of the participation of Portugal in the acts which led to the adoption of resolution 294 (1971) of 15 July 1971. We therefore have some reservations as to the formulation of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. We would have hoped that it could be deleted.

21. Nevertheless, in view of the two principles mentioned at the beginning of my statement, namely, our firm support of the exercise by the people of Guinea (Bissau) of its right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Senegal, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

22. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (*interpretation from French*): The problem seems to us to be very clear. Here is a country, Senegal, which is a peaceful country traditionally attached to its independence and its freedoms, a country that is hard-working and serious and has a Head of State whose generous idealism is perfectly allied to a down-to-earth sense of reality and whose only ambition within the country is to work for the greater well-being of the peasants and the workers and, externally, to give concrete meaning to African fraternity. To consolidate and diversify its economy and open it up to the rest of the world, to find in very ancient traditions the basis for a modern and dynamic society—that is obviously the concern of the Government of Senegal. The complaints of which

our Council has been seized for nearly 10 years are there as proof that the tasks which the Dakar authorities have set for themselves have constantly been jeopardized by the many incidents in the area bordering on Guinea (Bissau), and the situation has worsened during the last few months. Hardly a week goes by without some villager of Casamance having his tranquility disturbed. Houses set aflame, cattle stolen, roads mined, even peasants kidnapped—that is the daily fate of the people of the area.

23. When the Council was informed of this situation in July, it decided to send an information mission to the spot. Because I was President of the Security Council at that time, I know how very much the Secretary-General and I tried to set up a mission with a sense of balance to cover all tendencies, all points of view and all ideologies. Senior military officers—experienced military experts—accompanied our colleagues. In short, nothing was spared so that we should be informed as completely, as accurately and as objectively as possible, and, in fact, the report which we have received and which was the result of long, careful and sometimes delicate drafting, under the patient and persevering authority of Mr. Sevilla-Sacasa, was unanimously adopted. It informs us of the particularly devastating attack on a village, of artillery bombardment and the emplacement of mines. It also indicates that these various incidents originated in Guinea (Bissau). As we have already had occasion to recall in the Council, if there is one point on which there can be no doubt, if there is one point which is unchallengeable, it is that Portugal, which considers itself responsible for that Territory, is thereby responsible for peace and good order in that Territory. It is therefore to Portugal that we must legitimately turn to put an end to the acts of violence and destruction.

24. We know beyond any doubt that there are profound causes for this insecurity. I already said so in July and I repeat today: it is caused by a situation which we all know and of which Portugal, as much as every one of us, must become conscious. In order to put an end to that insecurity, to restore peace, our African experience tells us that there is a means: that is to recognize for the people of Guinea (Bissau) the possibility of pronouncing itself on its own destiny. Portugal enjoys in the world and particularly in Africa a capital of sufficient confidence to be able without fear to take this course, which, we have no doubt, would open up for it perspectives of new and lasting friendships with the populations concerned as well as with the African spokesmen.

25. The draft resolution submitted to us gives an account of all these concerns. No doubt one could make reservations or might criticize certain points—a resolution is never perfect. However, the text, as drafted and with the amendments introduced into it, for which we are most grateful to the Ambassador of Burundi, his African colleagues and the Ambassador of Senegal, seems to us to give an exact account of the situation and to advocate the course which should be followed. It is for this reason that France is happy to lend its support to the draft resolution which is before us.

26. Mr. SEVILLA-SACASA (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In the draft resolution of the representatives

of Burundi, Sierra Leone and Somalia we find reflected in general terms the conclusions which we, the members of the Special Mission, reached; and at the same time, it projects the recommendations of the report, which were adopted unanimously.

27. In the paragraphs of the preamble the background is mentioned, as well as documents which it is impossible to ignore. It states that the Security Council has considered the report, it reflects this Council's feeling of concern at the climate of insecurity and instability, fraught with the threat to peace and security in the region, and it affirms the need to guarantee the prerequisites for eliminating the causes of tension.

28. The operative part of the draft resolution takes note with satisfaction of the recommendations of the Special Mission, reaffirms the provisions of resolution 294 (1971) of the Security Council, deplores the lack of co-operation of the Government of Portugal and makes relevant appeals to that Government and expresses other ideas suitable to the case we are dealing with. For all these reasons, I shall vote in favour of the draft resolution with the proposed amendments.

29. As Chairman of the Special Mission I am bound to express my gratitude to Mr. Ortiz de Rozas for his kind initiative in suggesting that the resolution record the appreciation of the Security Council for the work accomplished by the Special Mission, an Argentine generosity which does not surprise us.

30. I am grateful to Mr. Jouejati, for his kind words in regard to me and to the work accomplished by the Special Mission, of which he was a member, rendering us the same excellent co-operation which the Chairman received from the other members of the Mission. Mr. Jouejati was a great friend to all because of the good judgement he contributed to our work. In like manner I am grateful to the representatives of Japan, the Soviet Union and the United States, and our esteemed President, the representative of Poland, as well as to the representatives of Burundi, France and Belgium, for their very cordial and friendly words concerning me and my conduct as Chairman. I appreciate it; they have greatly honoured me.

31. Every opportunity will be very propitious for me to reiterate my gratitude to the representative of France, Mr. Kosciusko-Morizet, for the confidence he placed in me when he was President of the Security Council during the month of July by designating me a member and Chairman of the Special Mission. To this honour I associate the satisfaction of having shared such important responsibilities with such eminent ambassadors as those of Poland, Belgium, Burundi, Japan and Syria.

32. I am grateful to all of them, recalling that it was exactly four months ago, on 24 July last, that we left for Senegal, honoured by the mission entrusted to us and very much aware that we would discharge our duties with a genuine sense of responsibility for the prestige of this forum of international peace and security.

33. I reiterate that I shall vote in favour of the draft resolution with the proposed amendments.

34. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): The report of the Special Mission to Senegal has already been praised by several speakers. My delegation fully shares the sentiments which have been expressed and thanks the members of the Mission for the way they have discharged their difficult task. Evidently much credit must be given to its sage guidance by its Chairman, Ambassador Sevilla-Sacasa, to whom we pay tribute.

35. The Mission is also to be congratulated on arriving at a unanimous report. Clearly, this was not easy. And I would observe in this respect that the work of translation from the original and authentic French text shows how difficult it is to bring out all the nuances. However, they did achieve unanimity.

36. The conclusions and recommendations are broadly acceptable to my delegation. We regard the draft resolution before us as being on the same lines as the report and its recommendations and we shall, therefore, vote for it.

37. In some respects the draft resolution appears to go beyond the cautious findings of the Special Mission, and in this connexion we would have preferred operative paragraph 4 (b) to refer to all acts of violence and destruction against the territory and people of Senegal, by whomsoever committed. Nevertheless, the amendments which the sponsors of the draft resolution accepted to paragraph 4, and for which we are most grateful, bring this paragraph more into accordance with what we regard as the intentions of the members of the Special Mission.

38. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): If no other representatives wish to speak in explanation of vote before the vote, the Security Council will now proceed to vote on the draft resolution contained in document S/10395 as amended.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Argentina, Belgium, Burundi, China, France, Italy, Japan, Nicaragua, Poland, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Against: None.

Abstentions: United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention.²

39. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

40. Mr. HUANG HUA (China) (*translated from Chinese*): The Portuguese authorities have for a number of years repeatedly committed armed aggression against the Republic of Senegal and threatened the territorial integrity and national security of that country. It has caused great loss of life among the Senegalese people, thereby creating a state of tension endangering the peace in that region.

41. We have noted, too, that the Portuguese authorities have also perpetrated armed aggression against the territories of the Republic of Guinea, the United Republic of Tanzania and the Republic of Zambia. They have carried out violent repression of the struggle of the peoples of Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique for national independence. In collusion with the white colonialist rulers of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, they have actively carried out a policy of racial discrimination. The facts prove that the colonial policy practised by the Portuguese authorities is a threat to the sovereignty and security of the independent African States, a challenge to the national independence rights of the African peoples and a grave violation of the spirit of the United Nations Charter.

42. For those reasons we strongly condemn the Portuguese authorities for their aggression against the Republic of Senegal and their brutal suppression of the people of Guinea (Bissau) who are fighting for national independence.

43. We support the draft resolution submitted by Burundi, Sierra Leone and Somalia, but in view of the past record of the Portuguese authorities we must harbour no illusions as to the actual result of this resolution. The nature of the colonialists will never change. Who can ensure that this resolution will not meet the same fate as the previous resolutions that have met only with contempt, resistance and sabotage from the Portuguese colonialists? Who can ensure that the colonialists will cease their aggression and destructive activities against the territory and people of Senegal?

44. The Chinese Government and people resolutely support the peoples of Senegal, Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique in their just struggle to win or safeguard national independence. Their struggles have the broad sympathy and support of all countries and peoples opposing colonialism. We firmly believe that their struggle will finally be victorious.

45. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): As has been previously stated, the United States Government strongly supported the essence of the draft resolution, and although we should have preferred slightly different language, the United States Government could have gone along with and supported almost the entire draft resolution as presented. However, it had difficulty with some of the language of the draft resolution, and with certain omissions to which we referred at this morning's meeting. In view of that difficulty we were obliged to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

46. Operative paragraph 2 constituted for us a particularly difficult problem, one which I explained in some detail and which from past discussions is well known to members of this Council. In view of our inability to achieve the changes we sought—and I want to thank those who responded to our request this morning and permitted us to have the opportunity and time to attempt to work something out—the United States delegation found it necessary to abstain in the vote.

47. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet delegation has

² See resolution 302 (1971).

frequently stated the Soviet Union's fundamental position with regard to the continuing acts of aggression committed by the Portuguese colonialists against the African States of Senegal, Guinea, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia. The Soviet delegation has also stated its point of view regarding the reasons for this, and regarding the necessary steps which must be taken by the United Nations to put an end to the aggressive policy of the Portuguese colonialists. From this point of view it seems to the Soviet delegation that the resolution just adopted by the Security Council is weak and not sufficiently effective; it was weakened even further in the course of the consultations which took place between the morning and the afternoon meetings, in particular by the deletion from the original text of the draft resolution of a reference to a historic document, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, a document which is generally recognized to have played an extremely important role in the struggle of the peoples of the colonial Territories against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism.

48. However, in view of the fact that the sponsors of the resolution—the delegations of Burundi, Sierra Leone and Somalia, and also the delegation of Senegal, as was clear from the statement of the Ambassador of Burundi—agreed to the amendments proposed to the original text of the draft resolution, the Soviet delegation felt that it was able to vote in favour of the resolution.

49. Mr. MIGLIUOLO (Italy): We conclude today our consideration of a complaint by Senegal which the Council began to consider four months ago, in July, when it decided to set up a Special Mission to carry out the necessary investigations. We read the report of the Special Mission with attention and great interest. I should like to join in the praise of the report which has been expressed by previous speakers. It is a well documented report, written with skill and impartiality, and it shows the great amount of work done by the Special Mission to gather relevant information. We are indebted to the members of the Mission, the representatives of Belgium, Burundi, Japan, Poland and the Syrian Arab Republic, and particularly to Ambassador Sevilla-Sacasa of Nicaragua, who led the Mission to its successful conclusion.

50. The success of the Mission would not have been possible without the efficient assistance of the Senegalese authorities. The Government of Senegal deserves praise for having readily accepted the decision of the Security Council to dispatch a Special Mission to the site of the incidents and for having provided it with full co-operation in the fulfilment of its task. We only regret that it was not possible for the Mission to complete its work with an investigation on the Guinea (Bissau) side of the border; the more so since it appears from the letter of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Portugal dated 29 September 1971 [S/10343] that the Government of Portugal had some information to convey to the Council which would have been given more weight if it had been properly investigated by the Mission.

51. The report gives clear evidence of two main facts. The first is that Senegal is firmly committed to peace. We read

in paragraph 123 of the report that "it is clear that it is a strict principle of the foreign policy of the Republic of Senegal to avoid any engagement with Portuguese forces other than for the actual defence of its territory", and in paragraph 114 that "On its tour of the border on the Senegalese side, the Special Mission saw no fortifications or artillery pieces in the area covered by it". And further on, in paragraph 127, the report affirms that the frontier between Senegal and Guinea (Bissau) is "an area in which, according to the observations of the Mission, PAIGC is not engaging in any military activity".

52. The second fact is that the acts of violence and destruction are, according to paragraph 127 of the report, the responsibility of Portuguese forces in Guinea (Bissau) and are "the consequence of the special situation prevailing" in that territory. This special situation is an anachronistic one, due to costly efforts to preserve against the tide of history a form of domination whose colonial nature no verbal definition or formal qualification can conceal. It is a situation from which no body derives any benefit; rather it is contrary to the interests of Portugal and of the African populations concerned, which should be allowed to exercise freely their right to self-determination.

53. The resolution which has just been adopted and which was very ably drafted by the sponsors is based entirely on the report of the Special Mission and duly takes into account the two main facts that I have mentioned. My delegation, which endorses the purpose of the resolution, has therefore cast its vote for it.

54. We wish to avail ourselves of this opportunity to express the hope that the Government of Portugal will secure the utmost restraint from the authorities of Guinea (Bissau) in order to avoid a repetition of the actions which brought violence, destruction and death to the territory of a peaceful neighbour. In fact, we have learned with great concern of new incidents that allegedly occurred after the publication of the report of the Special Mission.

55. Mr. JOUEJATI (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from French*): This morning my delegation had the honour to announce that it would support the draft resolution submitted by our eminent African colleagues. We have just voted in favour of that text, which now becomes a decision of the Security Council. However, we should like to give some clarification with respect to paragraph 6.

56. This afternoon the paragraph was amended so as to omit mention of the modalities for the exercise of the right of self-determination by Guinea (Bissau), modalities which are perfectly explicit in the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) concerning the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. This omission would have called for serious reservations. But, since the resolution in its operative paragraph 2 "*Takes note with satisfaction of the recommendations of the Special Mission*" and, on the other hand, the Special Mission recommended in its report respect for the principle of self-determination and independence with regard to Guinea (Bissau), a principle which is defined in particular by General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), we did not hesitate to vote in favour of the draft resolution, in

the conviction that those provisions of resolution 1514 (XV) would remain fully in force to govern the exercise of the right of self-determination by the people of Guinea (Bissau).

57. Mr. SEVILLA-SACASA (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to state first that the resolution we have just adopted, being based on the recommendations of the Special Mission, represents a gesture of recognition of the task accomplished by the six members of the Mission. At the same time, I should like to express to our colleagues, the Ambassador of the United Kingdom and the representative of Italy, my gratitude for their generous words about me personally and about my activities.

58. I should like to take advantage of the fact that you have called upon me, Mr. President, to ask you to transmit to the Secretary-General our cordial greetings and the good wishes of all of us for his prompt recovery.

59. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): It will be a pleasure for me to transmit to the Secretary-General the kind wishes that the representative of Nicaragua has asked me to convey to him.

60. I call on the representative of Senegal.

61. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of my Government, I should like to thank all the members of the Security Council that have supported my country in this time of test and challenge through which the population of Senegal in the region of Casamance is at present living.

62. It is true that the text of the resolution is relatively weak: doubtless my Government would have preferred a firmer attitude on the part of the Council. Portugal's permanent defiance of the international community is clearly a threat to peace and security. However, it was necessary to take into account the various considerations expressed by individual members of the Security Council. We refused to compromise on one point—that which explicitly condemned Portugal.

63. We clearly understand that it was not possible for those who buried mines on Senegalese territory to leave their visiting cards behind them. Nevertheless, the members of the Special Mission were able to determine that no military facilities exist in Senegal that could bring about the destruction to be found in the Casamance region. It was clear that any military elements capable of causing such destruction could come solely from Guinea (Bissau). Whether they belong to the Portuguese Army, or whether they belong to uncontrolled bands, as claimed by Portugal, it is nonetheless clear that the authority responsible officially and in practice for that area is the Portuguese Government.

64. We understand, of course, that Portugal has friends that hesitate to express themselves against the Portuguese Government, and to condemn its Government. But we should like to ask those friends of Portugal to use their ties of friendship in order to bring about a greater acquiescence

by the Lisbon Government with the decisions of the representatives of the world community.

Point of order raised by the representative of the United Kingdom

65. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

66. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): I am raising a point of order on the assumption that we have finished our business for today.

67. I have asked for permission to speak on this point of order to refer to the request which I made for a meeting of the Council at 11.30 tomorrow morning, or as soon as possible thereafter, in connexion with the matter of which the Security Council is seized concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia. The text of the letter containing that request has been circulated as document S/10396.

68. Rule 2 of the Security Council's provisional rules of procedure provides that "The President shall call a meeting of the Security Council at the request of any member of the Security Council."

69. I know, Sir, that you have consulted all the other members of the Council in connexion with the request to which I referred. It was my assumption in making that request that all members of the Council would wish to hear a full statement from me, as soon as I was in a position to make one, explaining the details of the agreed proposals designed to achieve a settlement of the Rhodesian problem which were signed in Salisbury yesterday. Indeed, throughout this last week in the United Nations, in numbers of Committees, we have continually had requests addressed to us for information on precisely what was happening. It was for that reason that I asked for a meeting of this Council to coincide as closely as possible with the time when the United Kingdom Parliament itself will be informed.

70. I should like to know now whether my assumption was correct; or, if not, which members of the Council object to meeting tomorrow for this purpose. If anyone objects, perhaps he should make a formal objection.

71. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Does any delegation wish to speak on this?

72. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, I understand the position to be as follows: it is proposed that we discuss an item on the agenda of the Security Council, that item being the situation in Southern Rhodesia. If that is the case, the Soviet delegation is ready to discuss the question of the date for a meeting to consider this matter with you and with the other members of the Security Council. As I understand it, we are not considering convening a special meeting of the Security Council in order to listen to information on the results of the visit of a statesman of one country to one of that country's colonies. That is not how we understand the situation. There is no precedent for it and we should not create one. All sorts of visits take place,

and all sorts of talks are held, and the Security Council is not convened just to listen to information from one delegation or another as to the results of such visits.

73. I should therefore like to make it quite clear that if we are talking about discussing the question of the situation in Southern Rhodesia exactly as formulated in the agenda of the Security Council, then we are prepared to discuss both the date on which that meeting should be held and the time, and we have no objections. I should like to have your reply on this point.

74. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (*interpretation from French*): I do not quite understand the objective of this discussion. There is an item on the Security Council's agenda concerning the situation in Rhodesia, which we will be discussing; on the other hand, there is the request which has been made by the representative of the United Kingdom, As Sir Colin Crowe stated, any member of the Security Council, on the basis of rule 2 of the rules of procedure, may ask for a meeting of the Security Council and make a statement at such a meeting. That is the way I understood the request of the British delegation.

75. I would add that, for us, the question is of great importance; I believe it is of interest to all members of the Council without exception; and it would be rare even for a member of the Security Council to be so courteous as to make a statement to the Council at the same time as a similar statement was being made in his Parliament.

76. In any case, I think that all the members of the Security Council will be interested in what the representative of the United Kingdom will say. Whatever our individual judgement on what will be said, we shall, as a result of it, have a greater amount of information available to us on the subject of Rhodesia, as our Soviet colleague pointed out.

77. Consequently, as far as the French delegation is concerned, we are in favour of hearing our British colleague as soon as possible. If I am not mistaken, he would like to be heard tomorrow towards the end of the morning. We can see only advantages in this procedure.

78. Mr. SEVILLA-SACASA (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to say that I have no objection to acceding to the request of the representative of the United Kingdom—that is, that we should meet tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock, as announced.

79. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to point out that we have not yet formally concluded our consideration of the item which is now on the agenda; that is to say, the complaint of Senegal.

80. The representative of the United Kingdom has raised the question of Rhodesia. After receiving this morning the letter from that representative—which has been distributed to all the members of the Council—I undertook consultations. Those consultations are continuing. I shall inform members of the Council of the results as soon as they are completed.

81. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I should like to make the

matter clear. Perhaps the representatives of France and Nicaragua did not understand me quite correctly. I should like to repeat that the Soviet delegation does not object to discussing the question of the situation in Southern Rhodesia at any time when it is considered useful to do so as a result of consultations between members of the Council. I repeat: the question of the situation in Southern Rhodesia.

82. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): In order to facilitate any consultations that might take place, I wish to say that our delegation has no objection whatsoever to meeting in accordance with the letter that was circulated by Sir Colin Crowe.

83. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): Earlier this week, on Monday in fact, the Security Council Committee on sanctions met to discuss an aspect of the question of Southern Rhodesia. It had been hoped that following that meeting it would be possible to arrange for a report to be submitted to the Security Council so that the Council would be seized of the question of Southern Rhodesia by the end of this week or by Monday or Tuesday of next week at the latest.

84. As the members of the Council know, the fourth report of the sanctions Committee is still waiting to be discussed by this Council. The statement to which the representative of the United Kingdom has referred is important and pertinent to the question of Southern Rhodesia as a whole. Now we do not know what that statement contains, but if it is of the dimensions now being talked about in the press, it will naturally provoke a debate immediately.

85. For that reason one would have thought that the time to be allocated for the consideration of such an important statement should be such as to allow the Council to enter into an immediate debate. Perhaps the representative of the United Kingdom could inform us whether the statement he intends to make relates to the Southern Rhodesia question and is a recommendation which his Government intends to place before the United Kingdom Parliament, or whether it is a decision which in any event will go forward. Our work will depend on the outcome of such a statement.

86. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): It will be a substantive statement. I cannot say what is in it before my Secretary of State makes his statement in the House. It will concern Southern Rhodesia and it will be a matter of interest to the Council, I am quite sure. I agree that it may well indeed lead to debate in the Council. But perhaps for that very reason members of the Council might like to hear and consider what I have to say, and then proceed to a debate at a future time. I do not imagine that it will all be completed in the course of one meeting. But, given that this is a matter that is on the agenda of the Security Council and, indeed, on the agenda of a number of Committees in the United Nations, given that the representative of the Soviet Union is prepared to have a meeting about Southern Rhodesia at any time, I would have thought that the Security Council would not wish to be shown to be so uninterested in the subject that it did not want to acquire as accurate information as possible from a source which is well qualified to give the information as to what is and will evidently be an important new development.

87. Therefore I felt, as a courtesy indeed to the Council, that rather than receiving press reports here and there, in bits and pieces, the Council would wish to have an authoritative statement of what in fact had taken place..

88. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Frankly, I do not understand the meaning of the debate which is beginning to develop in the Council.

89. We frequently hear, in this Council chamber and elsewhere in the Organization, criticisms because delegations are informed of what happens in the rest of the world through the press rather than through the official sources of information at the United Nations. This is the first opportunity we have to hear what has happened—and it may be very important—from the representative of the country which has carried out the negotiations in Salisbury. I believe that no one could have more authority than he to report to us, and I think that from every point of view it is in the interest of the Council to hear what he has to say. In any case, my delegation is the first to place on record that we have the greatest interest in hearing the information which Sir Colin Crowe has presented to us. This, of course, does not mean that other problems relating to Rhodesia—and there may be several—will not be considered and dealt with by the Council in due course. The Security Council Committee on sanctions concerning Southern Rhodesia is meeting. It has still not completed its debate in regard to an initiative which led to its meeting on Monday of this week. The report of that Committee has to be submitted to the Security Council for consideration. Therefore, I do not see what there is to prevent us from having another element on the basis of which to pronounce judgement, and if the Security Council believes it necessary to have a debate, we can have it when the time comes.

90. For all those reasons my delegation supports at once the convening of the meeting, and so that the President will have no difficulty in consulting my delegation, I wish to announce that I am very much in agreement that we meet tomorrow morning at 11.30.

91. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I apologize for speaking once again on this matter, but, as everybody knows, of course, it was not I who raised the question. I think that we should keep to the procedure usually followed in the Security Council, whereby questions of this type are resolved by consultations, which you have conducted very successfully and well, but since the representative of the United Kingdom has placed the matter before the Security Council, I must return to it once again.

92. The representative of Somalia rightly referred in his statement to the fact that the fourth report of the Security Council Committee on sanctions awaits consideration by the Security Council. We have not yet had the opportunity to consider it. It seems to me therefore that we should consider this document, too, or rather, that we should consider this very important document first at the Security Council meeting to discuss the question of the situation in Southern Rhodesia. As everybody sitting behind this table knows full well, other problems have arisen recently in connexion with Southern Rhodesia which we cannot ignore.

93. It is therefore the opinion of the Soviet delegation that the question of the situation in Southern Rhodesia should be discussed and that available Security Council material should be considered, including, first and foremost, the fourth report of the Committee on sanctions. Any member of the Council, including, of course, the representative of the United Kingdom may provide any information or make any statement he wishes. We shall listen to him as we listen to all other members of the Security Council. But what the Soviet delegation objects to is limiting the meeting just to information about one particular aspect of a vast problem which is being considered by the Security Council. I repeat—and here I wish to reply to the remarks made by the Ambassador of Argentina—the Soviet delegation does not object to holding a meeting tomorrow. We only object to being limited merely to hearing information relating to private talks of any kind whatsoever.

94. We maintain that if we begin to discuss the question of Southern Rhodesia, we should discuss it in all its complexity and not break off. Sir Colin Crowe's request, if I understand his letter correctly, is that we convene a meeting of the Council at 11.30; we must say quite frankly that it is a rather unusual time and naturally we shall not be able to do any more than hear one statement. After that, of course, the meeting will adjourn and we shall not be able to discuss the whole of this vast and important problem.

95. That is why the Soviet delegation thought that if we were to begin tomorrow, we should discuss the problem as a whole, leaving aside other questions which ought to be discussed, or that we should agree on some other procedure which would be acceptable to all members of the Council.

96. Mr. TERENCE (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): It seems that by trying to be so very specific we run the risk of complicating the problem. As far as the delegation of Burundi is concerned, we feel that the customary procedure should be applied, namely, that when any delegation requests a meeting of the Security Council for valid reasons which warrant the request, the Council should meet.

97. On the other hand, it is my impression that in this case there is a risk of putting the cart before the horse. It seems to me, indeed, that we could hear the representative of the United Kingdom but at the same time proceed with the discussion of the problem of Rhodesia as such. I believe that we should not get lost in rather complex details. Actually, the request of the representative of the United Kingdom is warranted, and as a result of the consultations which you intend to hold, Mr. President, the request will be met as early as he wishes.

98. I would therefore propose that we adhere to the following method: you, Mr. President, should proceed to hold consultations, and the results of your consultations would then enable us to hear the representative of the United Kingdom. Summarizing my position in a few words, my delegation does not object in any way to the request of the United Kingdom.

99. Furthermore, the representative of the United Kingdom did not—or at least that is how it would seem from the

statement he made—wish to separate what he has to say from the remainder of the discussion of the problem of Rhodesia in general.

100. Finally, I think it is incumbent on the President to proceed to consultations, as is customary, and to convene a meeting of the Security Council as soon as possible, as requested by the representative of the United Kingdom.

101. Mr. MIGLIUOLO (Italy): Mr. President, when one of your aides kindly consulted my delegation about the request of the representative of the United Kingdom my delegation said that it did not see any objection to the convening of the Security Council tomorrow morning. In order to facilitate your consultations, I want to repeat that we consider that request to be fully consistent with the spirit and the letter of rule 2 of the rules of procedure. I will not expatiate on the reasons, because I would simply be paraphrasing what has been eloquently said by Mr. Kosciusko-Morizet and Mr. Ortiz de Rozas. I would add that we regard as a courtesy the gesture of the Government of the United Kingdom in informing the United Nations at the same time as it informs its Parliament, but this is not the only reason why we are in favour of a meeting tomorrow.

102. My Government, whose support for decolonization is very well known, will certainly be interested to know what the United Kingdom has to say in this forum on such an important subject. I may add that the Security Council can always decide tomorrow whether to confine itself to listening to the statement by Sir Colin Crowe or immediately proceed to a debate—whether to continue the debate on the statement or on the whole problem or to couple it with the report of the Committee on sanctions, regarding which, as far as my delegation knows, there has been no request for urgent consideration. The Council is master of its own procedures and it will be in a position to take the appropriate decisions after the statement of Sir Colin Crowe tomorrow.

103. Mr. NAKAGAWA (Japan): My delegation also wishes to associate itself with the statements of a number of previous speakers by saying that we are interested in hearing at first hand and at the first possible opportunity what the United Kingdom Government has to say on the problem of Rhodesia and what the Foreign Secretary has achieved in his talks with the Rhodesian authorities. I believe that the representative of the Soviet Union is not against that idea at all either. As far as I can gather, the main point is how to phrase the item to be put on the agenda tomorrow morning. I think it is for you, Mr. President, to decide how to phrase this item. So I do not think there should be much difficulty in concluding this debate promptly.

104. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): First of all, I should like to make it perfectly clear that my delegation does not in any way oppose the United Kingdom representative's imparting to this Council information relating to the Southern Rhodesian question. In fact, all along my delegation has felt that the responsibility for the welfare and the future of the people of Southern Rhodesia rests squarely on the shoulders of the United Kingdom Government, and that in

this regard it is only natural that we should receive any information which it considers important enough to give us. However, in order to meet this particular problem, I would suggest that in our agenda for tomorrow we should try to refer to the question as the "Resumption of consideration of the question of Southern Rhodesia", and then under that heading there would be three sub-items: (a) Communication from or statement by the representative of the United Kingdom; (b) Fourth report of the Committee on sanctions; and (c) Any other matters.

105. Mr. LONGERSTAEY (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): I might say that I am experiencing some difficulty in understanding the practical scope of this debate. We have heard a request made by our British colleague that we meet tomorrow to hear a statement on a matter which has been on the agenda of the Council for quite some time. I think that the rules of procedure confirm that we must accede to the request of our British colleague and listen to him. As I just said the Council has been seized with this matter for a long time. Moreover, it has been discussed by certain committees of the Assembly; even the Committee on sanctions has met on the subject. Consequently, we should grant this request and hear what the representative of the United Kingdom will tell us on the latest developments. Quite clearly, following the communication and statement a wider debate will take place. This is serious, but what we should do first is to hear what the British representative wishes to say. That would be a simple matter of common sense, of courtesy to him. Consequently I should like it to be recorded that we are in favour of a meeting of the Council to hear Sir Colin Crowe. Then we shall wait for further developments.

106. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): As I made clear to you earlier today, I have absolutely no objection to the report of the Committee on sanctions being included in the agenda. Indeed I would accept the agenda proposed by the representative of Somalia.

107. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I think that we are having official consultations.

108. Mr. SAVAGE (Sierra Leone): My delegation was of the opinion that the point of order raised by the United Kingdom representative was adequately dealt with in your statement, Mr. President, to the effect that the usual consultations were going on. The delegation of Sierra Leone would have absolutely no problem in listening to what the British representative would have to tell us. But I agree with you, Mr. President, that the usual consultations need to be held and my delegation relies on you in this matter.

109. Mr. ORITZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It seems to me that the Council, in its wisdom has spared the President the task of holding consultations, because the majority of its members have already pronounced themselves. From what has been said it seems clear that there is no objection to hearing the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom, a statement which promises to be extremely interesting.

110. With regard to what appears to be a slight problem of form, that is, the wording of the agenda, rule 7 of our rules

of procedure states that: "The provisional agenda for each meeting of the Security Council is drawn up by the Secretary-General and approved by the President of the Security Council." So that the question is in the hands of the Secretary-General, who will draw up the agenda, which you must then approve, Mr. President. If you agree, the consultations have taken place and the only thing remaining is to decide when the meeting is to be convened, which, in principle it had been thought would be 11:30 a.m. That is acceptable to my delegation. The question of the agenda being left to the discretion of the President, depending on what the Secretary-General proposes, and perhaps even taking into account the suggestion of our friend Mr. Farah, the problem could be settled and we would all go home satisfied after a good day's work.

111. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): As I understand it, we all agree on the need to convene the Security Council to discuss the situation in Southern Rhodesia, at which time statements will be heard and information provided in accordance with established practice. And I think that all members of the Council would certainly be surprised if, shall we say, the Soviet delegation proposed or requested that a meeting of the Security Council should be held merely in order to inform the Security Council of the results, let us say, of talks between Mr. Brezhnev and Mr. Pompidou. I think that that would be very interesting but it would hardly be a reason for convening a meeting of the Security Council.

112. The attitude of the Soviet Union is that the meeting is being convened not in order to listen to information, but in order to continue the discussion of a question which is on the agenda and that a statement will be made in that connexion by one of the members of the Security Council. I really see no reason for argument, since in Sir Colin's letter it says in fact that this is "a matter of which the Security Council is seized concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia" [S/10396]. A completely clear question. As for how it should be formulated, I think that will also present no difficulty. We have an item: "Question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia". We are going to discuss it and naturally we are also going to discuss the report of the Committee on sanctions which is available to us and express any opinions we wish.

113. I also support the proposal made by the Somali Ambassador and think that the rest of the business can be settled in the course of the consultations which you are already conducting, Mr. President, on the matter today.

114. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (*interpretation from French*): Although many of the points discussed by President Pompidou and Mr. Brezhnev would be of great interest to the Council, most fortunately relations between France and the USSR are not of the same kind as the relations between the United Kingdom and Southern Rhodesia.

115. With regard to the position of my delegation I would simply say that we are open to any debate on the entire problem. But now there is a gesture of courtesy, which is furthermore unusual, for which we are grateful to the

representative of the United Kingdom, which consists in making a communication on a subject which interests us. Let us hear it. Later, if anyone wishes it we can have a debate. We, who are probably slower than others, will take time out to think and endeavour to examine the document but obviously afterwards every delegation can speak freely to any point with regard to the problem as a whole. I really think that, as my colleague from Argentina has said, there is no difficulty at all. We trust you, Mr. President, to convene a meeting as appropriate to hear our colleague from the United Kingdom.

116. Mr. TERENCE (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, you could perhaps bring this discussion to a conclusion. My delegation repeats that it has no objection to the substance, as presented by the representative of the United Kingdom. Hence, it is for the President to inform us of the evolution of the question and to convene a meeting on a suitable date and hour in accordance with the request of the representative of the United Kingdom and possibilities of the President.

117. Since we have been given additional clarification by the representative of the United Kingdom, who, as I understand it, does in no way seek to disassociate his statement from the discussion of the problem of Rhodesia as a whole, my delegation has no difficulties in regard to either the substance or the procedure.

118. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall be very brief. Even though it appears that we are all in agreement, you are still being requested, Mr. President, to consult us as to the date and hour. For my part, frankly, I would wish to be informed of the report of the representative of the United Kingdom by him and not by *The New York Times*. That is why it would be interesting to hear him tomorrow at the same time as the Minister for Foreign Affairs will be reporting to Parliament that is to say, tomorrow morning at 11.30. Otherwise, I shall have to read one of the local newspapers to find out only in part what the statement is.

119. For my part I formally ask whether there is any objection by members of the Council to our meeting at 11.30 tomorrow morning, with the agenda that you will decide upon in accordance with rule 7 of the provisional rules of procedure.

120. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Since there are no more names on the list of speakers, perhaps I might try to summarize this discussion and the official consultations we have had instead of the informal consultations we have as a rule. I think that on the basis of the discussion we have had today, there is one thing on which the members of the Council agree, that is, to take up consideration of the situation in Southern Rhodesia and hear the representative of the United Kingdom.

121. As our colleagues from Argentina and Burundi correctly suggested, the question of the date and hour of the meeting can be the subject of consultations to be held immediately after the adjournment of this meeting; we will, of course, bear in mind the proposal of the representative of the United Kingdom that we meet.

122. There remains the question of deciding on the agenda, and I am ready to consult those delegations that have suggestions to make on the subject immediately after this meeting is adjourned.

123. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Perhaps my formal proposal was not clear—I proposed that you, Mr. President, consult us here and now; in other words, that you ask the members of the Council whether they object to meeting tomorrow at 11.30 a.m. to consider the question of Southern Rhodesia—that is, to hear the United Kingdom representative.

124. As regards the agenda, I reiterate that there seems to be no problem, since the agenda will be the one which, in accordance with rule 7 of the rules of procedure, the Secretariat will draft with your approval. You, Mr. President, will pass on the agenda.

125. Furthermore, we gather from the exchange of ideas we have had that there appears to be no difficulty with regard to the agenda. This has been settled. What I wish to know is whether we will meet tomorrow at 11.30, and that was why I made my formal proposal that you ask the members of the Council that question.

126. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I had not, in fact, understood the substance of the proposal that the representative of Argentina, has just repeated.

127. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I am sorry but it seems to me that that sounds like some sort of an ultimatum to settle immediately the question of the time at which the Security Council meeting should start. I find this quite incomprehensible. It must be pointed out that you suggested holding consultations after the end of this meeting, in order to settle any unresolved questions. We all agreed in principle that we should meet and discuss the item which is on the agenda. The item on the agenda is called the question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia. We, the Soviet delegation, are perfectly ready to meet, tomorrow perhaps, either at 10.30 or 11.30, or perhaps we shall make a concession to the other delegations and meet at 9 o'clock in the morning. I do not understand this lack of confidence in you, Mr. President. Why cannot consultations be held after the end of this meeting and a time fixed for tomorrow's meeting then? I should like to say to the Argentine Ambassador that the request to hold a meeting of the Security Council at 11.30 is, you must agree, in itself somewhat unusual. Meetings of the Security Council, like those of other organs of the United Nations, usually begin either at 10.30 or at the latest at 11. Obviously therefore, it is somewhat confusing as to why it should be 11.30 and not 11.45 or 11.48. The time indicated is an unusual one; that is why the suggestion has been made that consultations should be held under the guidance of the President of the Security Council. I think that we can perfectly well do this after the end of the meeting; we can talk and settle at what time tomorrow's Security Council meeting should begin. But to request that the question of when tomorrow's meeting should begin should be settled immediately, without leaving this table, is simply unusual and the request seems somewhat strange to me.

128. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): I doubt whether the Security Council has ever met on time since it was established, and if we set the meeting for 10.30 a.m. we can be pretty sure that we shall not begin until 11.30 a.m. So for that reason I would suggest that we maintain our traditions of the past 25 years, schedule the meeting for 10.30, and begin at 11.30.

129. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Somalia has put me in a rather difficult situation as President. If I agreed with his proposal, it would be tantamount to agreeing that the Security Council always meets one hour late. However, after this last statement, I wonder whether the representative of Argentina wishes to insist that we adopt a decision here and now or whether he would not agree that immediately after this meeting rises we should contact all the interested delegations and decide on the time of the meeting, which, I believe everyone agrees, should be held tomorrow. We could also decide on the terms of the agenda, if anyone has any suggestions to make. It is, of course, for the Secretary-General to draw up the agenda and for the President of the Security Council to approve it and submit it to the Council. If that procedure is acceptable to all the members of the Security Council, I am ready immediately after declaring this meeting adjourned to hold consultations with any representative.

130. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS, (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should certainly be the last to think that I could present an ultimatum to the Soviet Union, or to the Security Council. Were I to do so, I would then be entering the undesirable club of the super-Powers.

131. As long as we do hold a meeting tomorrow morning, so as not to be obliged to get from the afternoon newspapers a report on what the Minister for Foreign Affairs will say in Parliament, the hour is indifferent to me, and it remains at the discretion of the President to decide, based on the consultations. But, in principle I think that it is desirable, as the President has quite rightly pointed out, to agree that we shall meet tomorrow morning. The only matter remaining for consultations would be the hour, since in regard to the agenda the President has said that he agrees with the proposal I made to the effect we apply rule 7 of the provisional rules of procedure.

132. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I did not say that an ultimatum was presented to the Soviet delegation. It seemed to me that the situation was much worse and that the representative of Argentina had presented an ultimatum to the President of the Security Council. But since he has so graciously retracted the ultimatum, I can only welcome the fact and support his request to continue consultations after the end of the meeting.

133. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I think that all the "ultimatums" have disappeared and that we are ready to accept the suggestion that has emerged following the last statement of the representative of the Soviet Union. If that is the case, members will permit me to conclude with the item which is on the Council's agenda for today. Since no representative has asked to speak on the

question which is on today's agenda, I consider that the consideration of this matter has been concluded. The Council, however, remains seized of the question, in conformity with the provisions of the resolution we have just adopted.

134. I should like to repeat that I am at the disposal of my colleagues of the Security Council for any consultations that they would like to have with me after this meeting.

135. Mr. MIGLIUOLO (Italy) (*interpretation from French*): I should simply like to ask for clarification. Mr. President, you referred to the last proposal of the

representative of the Soviet Union. I thought that the last proposal was made by the representative of Argentina who had spoken of a meeting tomorrow morning. I would ask you to be kind enough to enlighten me on this point.

136. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In order that we have absolute clarity on this question, I understood that the proposal of our Argentine colleague concerning a meeting tomorrow morning had been accepted by the representative of the Soviet Union and that all that remained was to set the hour for that meeting tomorrow.

The meeting rose at 6.5 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. Подайте справки об изданиях в нашем 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.
