

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

Official Records



PLENARY MEETING 565th

Sunday, 4 November 1956,
at 9.45 p.m.

FIRST EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

New York

CONTENTS

Agenda item 5:

Question considered by the Security Council at its 749th and 750th meetings held on 30 October 1956 (continued) 79

Page

President: Mr. Rudecindo ORTEGA (Chile).

AGENDA ITEM 5

Question considered by the Security Council at its 749th and 750th meetings held on 30 October 1956 (continued)*

1. Mr. GARIN (Portugal): At the 563rd meeting, after the vote on the Canadian draft resolution, [A/3276], I stated that my delegation had abstained because it had had no time to refer the matter to the Portuguese Government. I added, however, that my delegation had every reason to believe that the Portuguese Government would favour the principle embodied in the second paragraph of the draft resolution. I have since been in contact with my Government and am now in a position to state that the Portuguese Government agrees with the fundamental idea of the resolution for an emergency international force to be set up for the purpose mentioned therein. I would be thankful if this statement of mine appeared in the record.

2. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Chair will take note of the statement by the Portuguese representative. I call upon the Secretary-General.

3. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I have put before the Assembly three reports concerning the question under consideration at the first emergency special session.

4. One report [A/3284] is the second report concerning the day-to-day developments relevant to the decisions covered by the resolution of the Assembly on 2 November 1956, [997 (ES-I)]. I do not believe that the Members of the Assembly will find anything in this report which requires immediate consideration.

5. A second report [A/3287] deals with the cease-fire on which the Assembly urged the parties to agree. The report presents the state of affairs as at four o'clock this afternoon, 4 November, and indicates that communications received later will be circulated as documents. So far, no such communications have been received by me. However, at an earlier stage, I was approached by the Governments of France and the United Kingdom. One of the four Governments approached, the Government of Israel, has thus far in no way reacted to the *démarche* undertaken by me under the resolution of the General Assembly. We are now less than two hours from the time set for an agreed

cease-fire. Without commitments from the three Governments, which so far have not indicated their acceptance, the time left is scarcely sufficient for the further contacts necessary if we are to meet the target. The Assembly may wish to consider this situation.

6. The third report [A/3289] is my first report in reply to the request of the Assembly that, within forty-eight hours, the Secretary-General present a plan for the establishment of a United Nations force to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities. In this report, I put before the Assembly certain preliminary proposals which I recommend for its serious consideration. I believe that the report is self-explanatory and therefore I do not wish to take up the time of the Assembly with any special comments.

7. Mr. SAPOZHNIKOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (*translated from Russian*)): I have asked for the floor to read an important document received by my delegation. It is an appeal from two Egyptian associations, the Association of Egyptian Civil Servants and the Association of Political Sciences and of Rectors and Teachers of Egyptian Universities. A similar appeal has also been received by the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, which has asked me to speak on its behalf. I will read out the document, which, in my view, is very important:

"The Egyptian people is undergoing prolonged attack and the continuous bombardment of its cities, homes and public buildings, including churches, schools and hospitals. If these indiscriminate bombings and criminal acts are not immediately ended, thousands of innocent civilians will be killed and public and private property will be destroyed. Can world public opinion allow such crimes to continue, and are the countries of the world going to stand by and look on while a completely innocent and peace-loving people is being destroyed, while the freedom it won with such toil is being violated and while its means of subsistence are being turned into ruins? We ask you to refer to the statements made by eye-witnesses, who are telling the truth about the terror reigning among innocent, peaceful people in cities and villages, and to expose the malicious Franco-British fabrications to the effect that military objectives alone are being bombed. The areas which are being subjected to indiscriminate bombardment contain water pumping stations, electric power stations, private undertakings, telephone exchanges and radio stations; all these are situated in densely populated areas, and the bombing must inevitably cause heavy losses among innocent women and children. The Egyptian people asks your Government to do everything possible to ensure the adoption of speedy and effective measures to put an immediate end to the criminal and senseless acts which are being committed by aggressive politicians, acts which are leading the world to a major war which will destroy all civilization.

* Resumed from 563rd meeting.

"(Signed) Association of Egyptian Civil Servants, Association of Political Sciences and of Rectors and Teachers of Egyptian Universities."

8. I am not going to comment on this appeal; it needs no comment. I have merely read it in order to give the General Assembly, which has been convened to consider the question of the aggressive action undertaken in the Middle East, some picture of the real situation obtaining in the area.

9. Mr. LOUTFI (Egypt), (*translated from French*): I have asked to speak today for the sole purpose of giving the Assembly some information. I consider it completely pointless to repeat what I have already told the Assembly and to answer once again the arguments which have been used in an attempt to justify this aggression. The delegations which have supported Egypt in condemning it have so well answered the aggressors' arguments that there is surely no need to go over the same ground again.

10. In the first resolution [997 (ES-I)] adopted in the night of 1 to 2 November the Assembly urged that "all parties now involved in hostilities in the area should agree to an immediate cease-fire and as part thereof, halt the movement of military forces and arms into the area;" and urged "the parties to the armistice agreements promptly to withdraw all forces behind the armistice lines, to desist from raids across the armistice lines into neighbouring territory and to observe scrupulously the provisions of the armistice agreements".

11. In the resolution adopted in the night of 3 to 4 November, the Assembly repeated the resolution of 2 November [999 (ES-I)] and again appealed to the parties to abide by its provisions. These two resolutions have not been acted upon by the French and United Kingdom Governments even though my Government agreed to abide by them, as is clear from the communication of the Egyptian Foreign Minister addressed to the Secretary-General, which I now propose to read to you:

"With reference to your communication dated 4 November 1956 and, in light of your explanations therein, I wish to inform you that the Government of Egypt:

"1. Accepts the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its meeting of 4 November 1956 as mentioned in your communication.

"2. Is ready to bring to a halt all hostile military actions in the area by 2000 GMT.

"3. Takes note of paragraph 5 of your communication in connexion with operative paragraph 2 of the resolution of the General Assembly of 2 November 1956 and operative paragraph 3 of its resolution of 4 November 1956 relating to the withdrawal of all Israeli forces behind the armistice lines."¹

12. Today the forces of the aggressors have continued to bomb Egyptian towns. Suez, Port Said and Alexandria, in particular, have undergone very heavy bombardment. Egyptian airfields, radio stations, railways, factories, hospitals and places of worship did not escape this barbarous onslaught, which has caused considerable damage and taken a heavy toll of victims. The troops of the aggressors attempted to land in Egypt today and were engaged.

13. We had hoped that the General Assembly's two resolutions would be implemented. It must not be forgotten that they were adopted by an overwhelming

majority. The first obtained the approval of sixty-four delegations, a rare event in the United Nations; the second received fifty-nine votes. We hoped that the voice of world opinion would be heard and that peace would be restored.

14. Demonstrations supporting Egypt and condemning the invaders' brutal aggression have taken place in many countries. There have been such demonstrations even in the United Kingdom. You will certainly have heard this news from the Press and the radio. In particular, you have heard of the resignation of the United Kingdom Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Nutting, and of the reasons he gave for resigning.

15. Unfortunately, France and the United Kingdom have continued to use brutal colonialist methods which we had hoped were completely outdated since the United Nations Charter. How can premeditated armed attack be justified when the United Nations Charter exists?

16. I also wish to draw the Assembly's attention to the Secretary-General's report of 4 November in which there is a report concerning the attitude of Israel towards General Burns and the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization. Paragraph 3 reads in part:

"The Secretary-General was informed by General E. L. M. Burns, Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, that the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Israel, in a communication of 4 November said 'Israel representative stated in the Assembly last night the Government's position that the General Armistice Agreement had become a fiction and no longer had validity. The Government did not intend to return to the General Armistice Agreement with Egypt. United Nations Truce Supervision Organization personnel had no function to perform in Gaza or Beersheba and I was asked to give orders for their withdrawal'. In his reply dated 4 November, General Burns referred to the instructions of the Secretary-General (see paragraph 7 of A/3267), and stated that in view of his instructions he was unable to accede to the demand for withdrawal. General Burns added that if the Government of Israel disagreed with his decision, their representative might be instructed to take up the matter with the Secretary-General." [A/3284.]

17. This Israel statement requires no comment. It is only too cynical. It once again demonstrates the aggressive and expansionist intentions of Israel, which respects neither the armistice agreements nor the decisions of the United Nations, which is responsible for its existence. But we are no longer astonished at anything coming out of Israel.

18. Today, in a communication addressed to the President of the General Assembly and to the Secretary-General, and shortly to be distributed to the Assembly, the Egyptian Government has stated:

"Egypt is resisting aggression and will continue to uphold the rule of law and to defend its independence and sovereignty. We are confident in the outcome of the struggle because we feel strong by our determination to fight for the restoration of peace. We are confident that our case will continue to be the case of all peace-loving peoples and nations." [A/3288.]

The solution of the problem is in your hands. The eyes of the world are upon you. Yours is a great responsibility. The fate of our Organization is at stake. It is for you to uphold its prestige and to ensure that the principles and purposes of the United Nations prevail.

¹ Text reproduced in document A/3287, annex 6.

I have just received the draft resolution [A/3290] which has been circulated. Unfortunately I am not at the moment in a position to give my views on this text.

19. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I call upon the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

20. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): As the Secretary-General has recalled, the Assembly early this morning adopted a draft resolution [A/3275] which had been submitted by nineteen delegations and which authorized Mr. Hammarskjöld immediately to arrange with the parties concerned for the implementation of the cease fire called for under the Assembly's earlier resolution [997 (E.S.-I)] dated 2 November 1956. Mr. Hammarskjöld has also mentioned that, in accordance with this authority, he addressed messages to the Governments of the United Kingdom, France, Israel and Egypt on the subject. These messages have now been circulated to us [A/3287, annex 1 to 4].

21. I thought that I should inform the Assembly that I am still awaiting the reply of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to the Secretary-General's message. Her Majesty's Government has throughout the day been giving most careful consideration to that message. I have, in fact, in the course of the day sent an interim reply to Mr. Hammarskjöld from the United Kingdom Government [A/3282]. There has, of course, been close consultation with the Government of France. When the Secretary-General's message was received, the Foreign Minister of France decided to fly to London for consultations with members of the United Kingdom Government. There are, however, considerable differences of time and geography involved, and, owing to those differences, it has not been possible for me to receive the reply of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom in time for the opening of this evening's meeting. I hope—in fact, I expect—to be in a position in the course of tonight to inform the Assembly of the nature of the reply.

22. Mr. MIR KHAN (Pakistan): On 1 November, the Assembly met in emergency special session under a dark cloud, the effects of which on the international political climate were beyond calculation. We adopted a resolution calling upon the combatants on Egyptian soil to cease fire and retire from Egyptian territory. That resolution was adopted with unprecedented speed and support. It has so far not been heeded, as may be seen from the reports which we have just heard. This is also true of the resolution adopted by the Assembly less than twenty-four hours ago. It therefore seems to me that the cloud which cast its shadow on this Assembly on Thursday still hangs over us tonight. Pakistan is against colonialism and imperialism of all kinds and condemns aggression wherever it takes place. That must be evident from the vote we cast in the Assembly earlier this evening.

23. The sequence of events which commenced with the invasion of Egyptian territory has caused profound shock and grief to the people of Pakistan. The reaction in my country cannot be described better than in the words of my Prime Minister, whom I shall quote:

"Not only have these events incited and helped Israel in her aggressive designs on Egyptian territory, but the violation by these two Powers of Egyptian sovereignty and territory by the use of force in disregard of the appeals of other Members of the United Nations has shocked world opinion and placed the very concept of that world Organization in jeopardy. So far as Pakistan is concerned, the fact

that the Moslem country towards which Pakistan has always entertained fraternal feelings should be the victim of such aggression has further exercised public opinion. What is happening in Egypt today constitutes a threat to the entire Moslem world. The Government of Pakistan unreservedly condemn this aggressive action. They will continue to endeavour by every means within their power to bring about an early peaceful settlement of the conflict.

"With that in view, I personally have been in almost constant touch with the principal Powers concerned. At our insistence, a meeting of the Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers of Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Pakistan will shortly take place in Teheran, where this question will further be considered with a view to appropriate action to bring about a peaceful solution to the dispute."

The Prime Minister further said:

"... if the efforts we are making should unfortunately fail, we shall certainly proceed to consider whatever further measures may be possible to bring about a settlement which would ensure that Egyptian sovereignty and territorial integrity are fully respected".

24. My Prime Minister has also arranged a meeting with the Prime Ministers of the other Colombo Powers to discuss the situation existing in the Middle East and any possible action that these Powers can take to assist in bringing about a speedy solution.

25. As I stand on this rostrum, I do so more in sorrow than in indignation because the time for indignation has passed. There was indignation when Israel marched its troops into Egyptian territory. It was a blow not only against the Egyptian people and Egyptian sovereignty, but it was also a blow against peace in the Middle East and possibly in the whole world. That what the United Nations created by mandate as a small state should so far forget itself as to strike a blow at the very basic purposes and foundations of that Organization was an occasion for indignation, but unfortunately the people of the world were not allowed much time to remain indignant. There came to the assistance of Israel two of the world's big Powers, and they starting a pounding of Egypt from the air for which Egypt's defences were no match.

26. Today, as I stand before this Assembly, I feel in my heart black, profound and engulfing sorrow. Sorrow for the Egyptian people, their dream of progress and their dream of a better future. Sorrow for the nations which, by their action, have given a setback to humanity's efforts to evolve a peaceful method and machinery for solving disputes and disagreements. Above all, I feel sorrow for the world Organization. If the disregard for its edicts, of which we have seen evidence during the last three days, continues, I am afraid I cannot beguile myself about what the future of this Organization is going to be.

27. The only silver lining which I see in the cloud of which I spoke at the outset is that the position is not yet irretrievable. Even now there is time to undo the wrong that has been done if the invaders desist from their plan. Let there be an immediate cease-fire, and let there be a complete withdrawal of foreign forces from the soil of Egypt. This, alas, will not bring back the Egyptian dead, but the parties responsible for the despoliation of Egypt should make amends by fitting together the fragments of the dreams of the people of Egypt. The least they can do, and the least this

Assembly can do, is to see that Egypt, apart from the repair and restoration of damage, receives all necessary assistance in its long-term dream and plan for building a better future for its people.

28. Mr. ENGEN (Norway): I wish to address myself to two documents which have been distributed to the representatives in this Assembly. I refer to the report [A/3289] submitted by the Secretary-General on the Canadian-sponsored resolution 998 (ES-I) which the General Assembly adopted this morning. I wish to speak also on the draft resolution [A/3290], sponsored by the delegations of Canada, Colombia and Norway, which is now before the General Assembly.

29. On 2 November, this Assembly adopted a resolution [997 (ES-I)] calling upon the parties to cease hostilities. This morning, 4 November, the General Assembly, having seen no result from this appeal, adopted another resolution [998 (ES-I)] calling upon the Secretary-General to report within forty-eight hours on a plan for an emergency international United Nations force to be established for the purpose of securing and supervising the cessation of hostilities in accordance with the terms of the resolution which the General Assembly adopted on 2 November. The purpose, furthermore, of that resolution was to facilitate the compliance by the parties with the resolution of 2 November.

30. As I have said, we have before us the first report of the Secretary-General. I am sure that I express the feeling of those who voted for the resolution when I thank the Secretary-General for the speed with which he has taken action in response to the request of this Assembly. I am not going to say many words about this report, since the representatives will know what is in it.

31. It will be noted that the Secretary-General suggests certain steps to be taken immediately to facilitate the cessation of hostilities through the establishment of the emergency international force which I mentioned a moment ago. For this purpose, as a first step the Secretary-General suggests the establishment of a United Nations Command. This, to my mind, is the obvious first step in the establishment of such a force. Secondly, he proposes the appointment of Major General Burns, the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, as chief of this United Nations Command. Furthermore, in paragraph 4 of the Secretary-General's report will be found his suggestions for the directives for this chief of the Command.

32. My delegation, together with the delegations of Canada and Colombia, has thought it appropriate to draft a resolution (A/3290) embodying the suggestions which the Secretary-General has made in his report. This draft resolution is before the Assembly. It aims at laying down clear directives for the establishment of such a force which the Assembly decided this morning should be established. I do not think I need say much more. Both the draft resolution and the situation speak for themselves. I commend the draft resolution to the Assembly for its earnest and prompt consideration.

33. Mr. LAUL (India): The Secretary-General has given us a large number of documents today. But this is not just a proliferation; they all record steps of some importance which he has taken and is trying to take in the interests of the resolutions adopted by this Assembly so that fighting may cease in Egypt and the foreign troops in that country may be withdrawn to their own frontiers. Therefore we are extremely grateful to the Secretary-General for these documents.

34. I wish first to draw the attention of the Assembly to the Secretary-General's report [A/3287]. This document is in effect a report on the nineteen-Power resolution which was adopted by fifty-nine positive votes [999 (ES-I)]. What is immediately apparent from this, is the fact recorded in paragraph 5 and annex 6, to the effect that Egypt has accepted the resolution which we adopted. Egypt has shown again that it pays attention to the decisions of this body.

35. It is a matter of regret that the Secretary-General has not been able to tell us that he has received equal acceptance, in fact any acceptance at all, by the other three Powers concerned. We hope that compliance will soon be forthcoming.

36. In this connexion, may I now turn to the interim reply received from the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom [3282]. The delegation of India was very glad to learn from our colleague of the United Kingdom that his Government is giving the closest study to the resolutions of the General Assembly regarding the cease fire, the withdrawal of troops and indeed the complete solution of the situation which has been created for Egypt by the aggression perpetrated against it. We were glad to learn of this close study, and we were moderately heartened by the words used by the Foreign Secretary. We feel we can entertain a modest hope now that the final reply will hearten us even further.

37. It is with considerable regret that I refer now to the second report of the Secretary-General concerning the day-to-day developments [A/3284]. I must say that I entirely agree with the comments of my colleague of Egypt. I regret very much to see this most unfortunate and unacceptable attitude of the Government of Israel toward the resolution of the General Assembly, and I trust that this state of affairs will soon be changed.

38. Then I should like to refer to the most important document, the first report [A/3289] of the Secretary-General on the plan for an emergency international United Nations force. May I join the representative of Norway in congratulating and thanking the Secretary-General for his remarkable expedition in producing a report in less than twenty-four hours of the adoption of our resolution 999 (ES-I) which takes us as far as this document does. As the result of this report, we are able now to take some steps to set up a machinery which will make available forces in Egypt to supplant the aggressors who have entered the country, and which will restore peace and the *status quo ante*, the least that can be done for Egypt as an immediate measure. At this stage we have some slight reservations regarding paragraph 6. The Secretary-General has helped us considerably, however, by changing the word "directly" in the second line of this paragraph to "immediately". Nevertheless we feel that we cannot express our views on this paragraph until we see the final report which the Secretary-General has promised to us.

39. I come now to the draft resolution [A/3290] sponsored by the delegations of Canada, Colombia and Norway, and which follows from the Secretary-General's report. Here again we are grateful for the inclusion of the word "all" in paragraph 1 of the operative part, so that it now reads, "in accordance with all the terms of the resolution of the General Assembly of 2 November 1956". It is a very significant word, which really introduces the thought that what we are dealing with now are all the provisions of the resolution 997 (ES-I) of 2 November 1956—that the words "cessation of hostilities" are not a cease fire. I need not say anything more about this because this was

the interpretation which the representative of Canada gave to his own draft resolution [A/3276] when he introduced it. He told us that he was putting in this word "all" so that it should be clear beyond doubt that what it referred to was in fact the full implementation of the resolution of 2 November 1956. It is on that basis that we can accept this paragraph of the draft resolution before us now. Indeed, it is on this basis that the delegation of India will be able to support this draft resolution. We trust that it will be passed very early tonight so that we can complete the first step of our endeavour, which we set in motion two and one-half days ago—one is losing count of the time—so as to turn back the black tide which has swept over Egypt in the last week or so.

40. Mr. EBAN (Israel): The General Assembly has before it new documents, two of which I should like to refer to by way of preliminary observation. I have in mind the first report of the Secretary-General [A/3289] concerning the proposal for the establishment of an international force and the draft resolution [A/3290] submitted by the delegations of Canada, Colombia and Norway. The subject of this report and of this draft resolution closely affects the interests of Middle Eastern States, including Israel.

41. My Government and delegation have not so far been amongst those consulted in the preparation of the report or in the drafting of the resolution. We are convinced that this is because of the shortness of time that has elapsed and that there will be opportunities for the detailed observations of the Israel Government to be taken into account prior to any definitive action.

42. In the light of this observation, what I shall now say should be regarded as a preliminary comment on some of the problems raised by the report and the draft resolution. The first and crucial legal problem which arises is that of the sovereignty of States in the context of the consent required for the implementation of this project. The consent required is not merely or primarily the consent of the States invited to participate in the force, but chiefly the consent of those States upon the territory of which it is proposed to station these forces. It would seem to my delegation to be axiomatic under the law of the Charter that the stationing of any force in a territory under Israel's jurisdiction or control is not possible in law without the Israel Government's sovereign consent and that this principle would of course apply to the territory of any other State under whose jurisdictional control it was proposed to station these forces. Although this matter might be regarded as axiomatic, it would, I think, be helpful if the authors of the draft resolution would clarify this most important point of law. If this question of sovereign consent were not clarified, then a precedent would be created whereby a majority of the General Assembly could decide to station forces in the territory of any State irrespective of its prior consent. While convinced that this is not the intention of the report or of the draft resolution, it is, I think, one of the matters which does require clarification.

43. A second matter refers to the duties which it is proposed to bestow upon the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization and officers now under his jurisdiction. It must be pointed out that the functions of the Chairman of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization and of his officers are those defined in the General Armistice Agreements concluded bilaterally between Israel and each of its four contiguous neighbours. Thus a change

in their capacity would affect the existing capacity under which they now work in Israel and in the surrounding States. Thus, the proposed allocation of new functions to these officers would have legal and other effects not only in respect of the Israel-Egyptian General Armistice Agreement, but also of other agreements. This again is a complex juridical problem which arises in the context of this proposal. My delegation would similarly like to reserve its position pending further consideration on the powers which paragraph 3 of the joint draft resolution would seek to bestow upon one of the permanent principal organs of the United Nations.

44. The question of whether the capacity of military recruitment is within the spirit of the Charter, one of the functions of that principal organ, deserves further clarification and consideration. This does not exhaust everything that there is to be said on the very complex issues which arise in this context and which certainly demand mature consideration at governmental level.

45. The delegation of Israel will consult with its Government and reserve the opportunity of addressing the General Assembly in detail again on all the problems here involved. In the meantime, of course, it must reserve its position both on the draft resolution itself and on the question of its implementation.

46. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Spanish*): The Secretary-General has asked to speak on a point of order and I call upon him.

47. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I should like to take this opportunity to give two clarifications which may be useful for the Members of the Assembly. As a matter of course, the report issued as document A/3289 is based on the legal fact created by the vote taken this very morning by the Assembly. As to the question of the conflict of the functions of the Chief of Staff, it is a matter of course that if the Assembly were to give this new assignment to the Chief of Staff he would leave his present post. He would change his functions, and other arrangements would be made with the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization. Secondly, the recruitment of officers for the proposed group corresponds to the functions which the Chief of Staff already possesses in relation to the Observer Corps of the Truce Supervision Organization.

48. Mr. DE GUIRINGAUD (France) (*translated from French*): The French delegation is in the same position as the United Kingdom delegation with regard to the point raised by Sir Pierson Dixon a moment ago. At about 11.30 this morning, New York time, the French Government received the Secretary-General's telegram [A/3287, annex 2] informing it of the resolutions adopted by the Assembly yesterday. When it is 11.30 a.m. in New York, it is 5.30 p.m. in Paris. The Secretary-General's note must of course be studied at the highest levels of the French Government and in consultation with the Government of the United Kingdom. Moreover, Mr. Pineau, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, was in London and may still be there at this moment. I hope nevertheless that we shall be able to inform the Secretary-General of the French Government's reply with the minimum of delay.

49. Mr. RIFA'I (Jordan): My delegation has just read the reports issued by the Secretary-General this evening and the other documents circulated to the members. Aware of the short time Mr. Hammarskjöld had available to fulfil his mandate under the nineteen-Power resolution [999 (ES-I)] of 9 November, we feel very grateful that he executed his task in a very

prompt manner, which deserves our commendation. With the little time available to us to study the various reports, we can only bring to the attention of the delegations a few observations.

50. According to one report [A/3287] Israel for the second time did not respond positively to the terms of the resolution adopted by this Assembly on 4 November, 999 (ES-I), reaffirming the Assembly's previous resolution 997 (ES-I). Egypt, in contrast, accepted the appeal of the overwhelming majority of this Assembly for an immediate cease fire, as stated in Annex 6 of the Secretary-General's report.

51. Israel, according to another report of the Secretary-General [A/3284], has committed two defiances: one to the Secretary-General's mandate to obtain compliance for the withdrawal of the Israel forces behind the armistice lines, and the second to the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization by preventing his personnel from performing their duties in Gaza and Beersheba. More serious still among the Israel defiances is the fact that Israel has denounced the General Armistice Agreement with Egypt as a fiction and stated that it was no longer valid.

52. In view of this drastic development on the part of Israel, my delegation's clear understanding will be that the new draft resolution submitted today [A/3290] should give particular importance to the prompt withdrawal of all the Israel forces behind the armistice lines. My delegation is concerned about this particular point and would appreciate hearing from the sponsors of the draft resolution their explanation of operative paragraph 1.

53. Mr. SERRANO (Philippines): Before proceeding to express my remarks on the various documents now before the Assembly, may I be permitted to extend the appreciation of my delegation for the magnificent work performed by the Secretary-General under the mandates of the two resolutions adopted on 2 and 4 November and under the Canadian resolution, providing for the establishment of an international police force.

54. An examination of these documents reveals the following facts. As regards the cease-fire resolution which was adopted on 2 November and reaffirmed in another resolution of 4 November, it appeared from the communications first received by the Secretary-General from the Governments of France [A/3268] and the United Kingdom [A/3269] that they in effect rejected the cease-fire. If I correctly recall those communications, they maintained that their action undertaken in Egypt was a police action and, notwithstanding the resolution of the General Assembly, they felt obliged in the circumstances to continue it. They stated that they would agree—I suppose the effect of the communication was that it would be sometime in the future—to the withdrawal of their forces when the United Nations would be in a position to establish a force of its own to maintain stability in the area. Therefore, as regards the immediate problem of the cease-fire as provided in the two resolutions of the General Assembly from the standpoint of the Governments of the United Kingdom and France, the proposal was rejected.

55. We now have in our possession the communication addressed to the Secretary-General by Mr. Selwyn Lloyd [A/3282], which refers not only to the Canadian proposal for the establishment of an international police force but also to the nineteen-Power resolution, which affirmed the first resolution. To the extent

that the communication of Mr. Selwyn Lloyd speaks of these two resolutions as being under study—I do not know whether my interpretation is correct—there is the hope that the rejection by the United Kingdom of the cease-fire may yet be modified. On the other hand, the Government of Egypt accepted the cease-fire resolution subject, of course, to the condition that the Governments of the United Kingdom, France and Israel should desist from further military action.

56. That appears to be the position as disclosed by the report of the Secretary-General in the documents now before this Assembly. But there is more than meets the eye in the present difficulties confronting us. I should like to call the attention of the Assembly to the communication [A/3283] of the Director-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, dated 4 November 1956. Although this is not clearly within the purview of our present work, it is, however, inextricably intertwined with the difficulties involved in our task. It is a problem of great urgency because it is of a humanitarian character. The Secretary-General has also reported on the difficulties of implementing the two resolutions in view of the time limit that has been set.

57. In the light of the conclusions which we have gathered from the reports of the Secretary-General, I consider the following matters deserving of immediate action by this body. First, it would seem to be advisable and necessary that in view of the twelve-hour time limit in the nineteen-Power resolution which will expire at midnight tonight, we should consider a modification of the resolution by authorizing the Secretary-General to extend the hour of the cease-fire, subject to his discretion, but in no case beyond thirty-six hours after the approval of the amendatory resolution which this body may approve along that line. This is designed to enable the Secretary-General to extend the period without seeking prior authority from this body and to allow us to meet the realities of the situation.

58. I therefore recommend that a resolution, be adopted by this Assembly authorizing the Secretary-General to extend the period of the cease-fire, which he had fixed in his communication [A/3287, annex 5] to the four Governments concerned, to a time which he may deem proper in the circumstances but, in no case, beyond thirty-six hours after the approval of such new resolution.

59. Secondly, it appears from the *aide-mémoire* [A/3279] of the Israel representative of 3 November that his Government agrees to an immediate cease-fire and "feels that the only answer to the situation is the establishment of peace between Israel and Egypt by direct negotiations between the parties". It accordingly notifies the Assembly that it would welcome the immediate opening of negotiations towards that end.

60. It appears, therefore, that as of 3 November, the Government of Israel would be agreeable to a cease-fire. This, however, should be taken in the context of the communication which was sent to the Secretary-General by General Burns, to the effect that according to Israel the "Armistice Agreement had become a fiction and no longer had validity". As it will no longer observe the Armistice Agreement, it has made an announcement that, with respect to the Gaza area, the observers of the United Nations would not be permitted to make an entry there. In the light of this situation, this Assembly would perhaps feel obliged to the representative of Israel if he could give some clarification of his Government's position. This clarification would enable

the Secretary-General to be guided more clearly in the implementation of the two resolutions which I have mentioned—the resolution of 2 November and the resolution of 4 November affirming the previous one.

61. Finally, I would refer to the cable received from the Director-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, from which I quote:

“In calling the attention of the General Assembly to the fact that the continuation of unrest and hostilities in the area will inevitably affect adversely the carrying out of the Agency's mandate as given by the General Assembly, I wish to stress urgently that the majority of the refugees have no means of subsistence other than those provided for them by the United Nations.” [A/3283.]

62. In view of this report, it becomes absolutely necessary to find some way by which an appeal may be addressed to the Governments concerned to the effect that, notwithstanding the continuance of the hostilities, and pending their cessation, they should offer no obstruction whatsoever to the work of the Agency, wherever it may be performing its functions in the interests of humanity. This is absolutely essential in order that the humanitarian work of that body may be carried out, even during the progress of the hostilities and in the areas covered by such hostilities. Whether this Assembly should pass a resolution to this effect, or whether the Secretary-General may simply be asked to take the necessary steps in the premises is a matter upon which I am not now prepared to express my view.

63. These are my recommendations in the light of the Secretary-General's reports. With respect to the three-Power draft resolution now before us [A/3290] seeking the establishment of a United Nations Command for an emergency international force, my delegation will find no difficulty in supporting it after we have had some clarification from the representative of Israel on the points I have raised.

64. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Despite the resolution [997 (ES-I)] adopted at the first emergency special session of the General Assembly, the situation in the Middle East remains threatening. The Governments of the United Kingdom and France, which are engaged in aggression against the Egyptian State, are still delaying their reply to the General Assembly's recommendation of 2 November for a cease-fire. [*Resolution 997 (ES-I)*.] They are even disregarding the General Assembly resolution of 4 November [999 (ES-I)] in which the overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations again asked them to halt military action.

65. In defiance of the wishes of all the peoples of the world, the Governments of the United Kingdom and France are continuing their military operations. Anglo-French air forces are systematically raiding cities and populated points, sowing death and destruction. Reports reaching us from Egypt indicate the barbarous nature of the Anglo-French air action. Heavy bombers have been used against Egypt's civilian population.

66. On 3 November a report from the Secretary-General of the United Nations Organization was circulated [A/3267], quoting a communication from representatives of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, which draws attention to the danger that this action may cause terrific loss of life among

the civilian population. The Soviet delegation has received telegrams from social, scientific and cultural organizations in Egypt, indicating the extent of the casualties and destruction caused by the barbarous raids carried out by the Anglo-French air forces.

67. Let me cite just a few facts. The Association of Egyptian Civil Servants and the Association of Professors and Teachers of Egyptian Universities report that homes, public buildings, churches, schools and hospitals are being subjected to continuous heavy bombardment. The telegram says:

“The areas which are being subjected to indiscriminate bombardment contain water pumping stations, electric power stations, private undertakings, telephone exchanges and radio stations; all these are situated in densely populated areas, and the bombing must inevitably cause heavy losses among innocent women and children.”

A telegram dated 4 November from the Egyptian Society of International Law states: “This morning alone Cairo has been raided six times by the Anglo-French air forces.” Similar facts are reported in a telegram from the Egyptian Federation of Trade Unions.

68. These facts demonstrate that the United Kingdom and France are engaged in the relentless destruction of Egypt's civilian population. The General Assembly cannot hold aloof in the face of such action by the Anglo-French air forces. It must take immediate steps to end such criminal activities. In view of the refusal by the United Kingdom, France and Israel to comply with the General Assembly's recommendation for an immediate cessation of aggressive action against Egypt, the United Nations must make a new effort and call upon the Governments of the United Kingdom and France, as a first step, to comply with the General Assembly resolutions of 2 and 4 November, to halt immediately the bombardment of Egyptian territory and other military operations.

69. The Soviet delegation makes that proposal. The implementation of such a decision would not require any supervision machinery or any United Nations command. The whole world will be able to see at once whether or not the decision is being complied with.

70. Mr. SUDJARWO (Indonesia): My delegation wants to express its appreciation to the Secretary-General for the speedy manner in which he has complied with the request made of him by this emergency session of the General Assembly to enforce the implementation of its resolution.

71. It is a matter of deep concern and regret, however, that this action by the Secretary-General, as requested by the General Assembly resolution, was not readily heeded by the parties, excepting Egypt, as may be seen from one report of the Secretary-General [A/3287]. The other report of the Secretary-General [A/3284] is even more ominous where it reports that the Government of Israel now views the General Armistice Agreement as only a fiction and no longer valid. The further explanation of the representative of Israel this evening was only a further violation of the United Nations Armistice Agreement. This absurd position can certainly not be accepted and should be dealt with determinedly by the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization and later by the emergency United Nations force to carry out the task envisaged in the resolution of this morning, 4 November.

72. It seems now more than clear that the attacking parties are determined to achieve their objectives by

brutal force in contempt of all the efforts made by this special session to stop the aggression and to end the war speedily. This will go down in history and will not be forgotten. The condemnation that was expressed overwhelmingly against their actions in this special session will equally stand in history, from which they will not escape.

73. The immediate need at this moment is still, of course, to try to save the situation. We still believe that this aggression should not only be stopped but also that such aggression should not be allowed to achieve any gains. Whatever the outcome of this war, we should see to it that the suffering it has caused to the Egyptian people will not have been in vain. The United Nations forces which will be despatched to the area should be given a task within the framework of our endeavours, which should not only be to create favourable conditions for ending the war and the withdrawal of forces according to the resolution of 2 November, but also to restore the integrity and the security of Egypt as a Member State of the United Nations.

74. I am grateful to the Secretary-General for his report [A/3289] on the question of the formation of this international United Nations force, the ideas in which find further expression in the draft resolution [A/3290] submitted by Canada, Colombia and Norway. In general, the outlines to be found there seem to my delegation helpful to facilitate and speed up the formation of the United Nations supervision force.

75. It is the earnest hope of my delegation, in this still grave hour, that the parties concerned, in the light of this present endeavour, will see the senselessness of their actions and will stop further military actions speedily in accordance with the call of the Assembly's resolutions. Should the war be stopped soon, the problem lying behind this conflict should then allow itself to be solved by peaceful negotiations, in which the United Nations as such will still have a great responsibility. If we seek the solution of the present situation in this frame of mind, then my delegation believes that the achievement of a constructive and peaceful settlement does not belong in the realm of the impossible as regards our future endeavours. Those who have now violated the United Nations Charter and spirit will, I hope, realize that only through the United Nations can they achieve a lasting peace and a settlement of all the problems involved.

76. Mr. RIZV (Lebanon): This evening, two reports of the utmost importance were made public by the Secretary-General. Both are addressed to the first emergency special session of the General Assembly.

77. In the one, the Secretary-General makes the following statement: "The Secretary-General was informed by General E. L. M. Burns, Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, that the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Israel, in a communication of 4 November said 'Israel representative stated in the Assembly last night the Government's position that the General Armistice Agreement had become a fiction and no longer had validity. The Government did not intend to return to the General Armistice Agreement with Egypt. United Nations Truce Supervision Organization personnel had no function to perform in Gaza or Beersheba and I was asked to give orders for their withdrawal.'" [A/3284, para. 3.]

78. In another report the Secretary-General informs us that he has addressed communications directly to the four Governments concerned—the United King-

dom, France, Israel and Egypt—pursuant to the resolution [999 (ES-I)] which this Assembly adopted in the early hours of this morning and by which it authorized the Secretary-General "immediately to arrange with the parties concerned for the implementation of the cease-fire and the halting of the movement of military forces and arms into the area", as requested in its resolution of 2 November [997 (ES-I)]. The Secretary-General further reports that, of the four Governments contacted, only Egypt had replied [A/3287, para. 6]. These two reports by the Secretary-General are of the utmost significance and reveal the extent of the lawlessness of which the aggressor States of France, Israel and the United Kingdom are guilty. They reveal clearly the magnitude of their defiance—nay, their open rebellion—against international law, against this world Organization which was set up to end war for all time, against the will and wish of the civilized world.

79. The reluctance of the Governments of France and the United Kingdom—and we hope that it is only reluctance, and not outright refusal—to comply with the request addressed to them by the overwhelming majority of mankind to put an end to bloodshed and destruction is indicative of how far these two States are bent on aggression and how little consideration and respect they have for world public opinion, for the advice of their own allies and friendly governments, and for the overwhelming majority of the human race, which wants to live in peace.

80. It is indeed an encouraging sign that there are large numbers of peace-loving people in Britain itself who deplore and condemn the colonial war launched by their Government, an unprovoked war which their Government is waging against the people of Egypt, bringing death and destruction to that hapless land. Press despatches from London today carry reports about the riots which have been raging in London against the British Government, calling for its resignation. It is heartening to witness a people which has suffered so much in two world wars standing up against a policy which, if pursued further, risks plunging the world into a holocaust of unprecedented magnitude and unforeseen consequences to humanity as a whole.

81. As to the report [A/3284] from which the representative of Egypt has just read excerpts, this report unfolds the sad story of the crumbling of the forces of law and order and of the utter disregard which Israel has for the United Nations, to which it owes its very existence, and for the combined efforts of mankind to restore the rule of law which the brutal aggression of France, Israel and the United Kingdom has banished from international relations.

82. This defiant attitude which Israel adopts toward the United Nations and the world has been made possible only by the blessings and complicity of the United Kingdom and France in Israel's invasion of Egypt. For how else could one explain Israel's impudent rebuff to this Organization's representative, General Burns? Unilaterally and against the advice of General Burns, Israel decrees that the General Armistice Agreement with Egypt has become a fiction. This General Armistice Agreement has not become and should not be allowed to become a fiction. Israel's impudent assertion that the Agreement has become a fiction can have but one explanation, namely, that Israel considers that her armed invasion and conquest of the Gaza Strip and parts of the Sinai Peninsula give her a title to those territories, and that the General Armistice Agreement,

which was to maintain peace and security on the armistice lines, is no longer a reality and must therefore be scrapped. This is as patent an example as I have ever seen of the manner in which Israel, by her aggression against neighbouring territories, has confronted the world with the *fait accompli*—and, alas, got away with it. Finally, Israel's unilateral repudiation of the General Armistice Agreement brings yet another proof, if that be needed, of Israel's determined policy to torpedo the Armistice Agreements by her armed attacks against her neighbours and to force peace on them at the point of the gun.

83. Another fact which struck my delegation on reading this report was that Israel, far from complying with the request of this Assembly immediately to cease fire and withdraw its forces to the armistice lines—this Israel which has been branded an aggressor—is today ordering the withdrawal of the United Nations Truce Supervisors—yes, of the United Nations Truce Supervisors—whose mandate she considers terminated by her invasion of the territory in which these supervisors operated. This defiance, this impudent rebuff of the United Nations authority, on the part of a small State can be explained only by the conviction which that State must have acquired that law and order in international relations have broken down and that the opportunity is unique for invasion, conquest and rapine.

84. In contrast to this open rebellion on the part of Israel against the United Nations, in contrast to United Kingdom and French reluctance to accept the immediate cease-fire requested of them by this Assembly, the world stands in admiration before Egypt, the victim of aggression, and her prompt response to the plea of humanity to put an end to hostilities.

85. With regard to the report of the Secretary-General on the plan for an emergency international United Nations force [A/3289], the delegation of Lebanon wishes to join those other delegations which have commended the Secretary-General for the rapidity with which he has set out to implement the Assembly's resolution.

86. Finally, with regard to the draft resolution submitted by Canada, Colombia and Norway [A/3290], my delegation has not yet had time to study it carefully. However, our initial reaction to it is not unfavourable and we may not be opposed to it after we have had some time in which to clarify certain points with its sponsors.

87. Mr. URRUTIA (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): I should merely like to make a few observations because I believe that we must make no mistake as to what powers the Assembly has at this time and what intentions we can entertain. The Charter of the United Nations is very clear. It establishes two distinct procedures. One is the pacific settlement of disputes, the conciliation procedure provided for under Chapter VI, and the other is collective action, which is dealt with in Chapter VII, and is a function of the Security Council. If such action should fail because of a veto in the Security Council, then, under the resolution 377 (V), "Uniting for Peace", the matter passes to the General Assembly but is there subject to the conciliation procedure provided for in Chapter VI. Thus in such case we may authorize the use of force but only, as we stated at a previous meeting, in cases of individual or collective self-defence. Apart from those cases in which we can as a mere authorization permit a State to defend itself, we cannot take any decision or order any collective measure because under

Chapter VII of the Charter to do so is a function of the Security Council.

88. Having given this clarification with regard to the powers of the General Assembly, I wish to make an observation concerning the decision that we can take at this time if we wish to settle the conflict within the procedure provided for in Chapter VI of the Charter, that is, the procedure of conciliation.

89. In the first place, we have been asked for a clarification concerning paragraph 1 of the operative part of our draft resolution [A/3290]. It is quite obvious that reference is made to all the terms of the resolution 997 (ES-I), to the part where we urged the parties to agree to an immediate cease-fire and as part thereof halt the movement of military forces and arms into the area and to the part where we also urged that all forces should promptly be withdrawn behind the Armistice lines. In short, we refer to the entire resolution. It is quite clear that where the draft resolution under discussion states "in accordance with all the terms", the reference is to all the terms of the resolution without exception as will be obvious from a reading of that resolution.

90. I should now like to make an observation in connexion with what has been said here by the representative of Israel. He told us that in his opinion our draft resolution required clarification because under the Charter the consent of a State is necessary for the presence of United Nations troops in territory under its jurisdiction. On this point we are in complete agreement, but we shall no longer be in agreement when it comes to deciding what constitutes territory under jurisdiction. In our opinion, territory under jurisdiction is territory under lawful jurisdiction. We cannot admit that force creates rights, and all the Latin American States, for example, expressly condemn the acquisition of territory by force. Thus, if we really want to settle this conflict and bring about a conciliation, we must understand that we are prepared to attempt a conciliation, but we must also appeal to the State of Israel to take account of the General Assembly's view, which is perfectly clear. We have been among the first to realize that this, as we stated at the 563rd meeting, is a broad problem and that we must face this problem.

91. We believe that in order to re-examine this problem, to find a new approach to it and to arrive at a comprehensive solution, the first requirement is the restoration of peace; there can be no kind of conciliation and no kind of settlement while there is war. As means of restoring peace we have suggested two basic principles. The first is that we offer Israel a guarantee, the guarantee of an international force which will be able to forestall real or illusory dangers and at all events the dangers which according to Israel existed along its borders. Secondly, in return for this guarantee, we ask Israel that when the United Nations forces arrive it should withdraw its forces to the territory where it has lawful jurisdiction or, in other words, from territories which are outside Israel's jurisdiction and have, for one reason or another, been occupied by Israel's forces.

92. In giving this clarification I wish to point out that I am not, of course, in any way speaking on behalf of the other sponsors of this draft resolution. This is merely the personal view of my delegation, but I thought that it was urgent at least to make clear exactly what we had in mind in proposing the draft resolution.

93. Mr. PEARSON (Canada): I shall be very brief. We are considering the first report [A/3289] of the

Secretary-General on the plan for an emergency international United Nations force, and a draft resolution [A/3290] the sponsorship of which my delegation has the honour to share with the delegations of Colombia and Norway—a draft resolution which is designed to implement the first stage of this task of ours to bring about a cessation of hostilities. That, of course, is of primary and immediate importance, but as we consider it I think we should remind ourselves, as I ventured to say the other night, that we have an even greater collective responsibility than the responsibility to bring about a cease-fire. That is the responsibility to bring about a peace settlement, and we have failed up to the present in that—all of us at the United Nations—over the years. To find a way out of our present tragic dilemma—that is our immediate responsibility and our immediate task; but to seek a lasting settlement is our next and greater task.

94. So, as the Secretary-General has shown us how to proceed with energy and dispatch by producing a report within twenty-four hours of the passing of the resolution 998 (ES-I), I hope that we shall be able to proceed with equal energy and dispatch in our consideration of the draft resolutions that deal with the larger question and which have been submitted by the United States delegation.

95. In conclusion, may I just say that the Prime Minister of my country announced a few hours ago in Canada that the Canadian Government was ready to recommend Canadian participation in such a United Nations force as is visualized in this draft resolution if that force is to be established and if it is thought that Canada could play a useful role in it.

96. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): In the very early hours of 2 November 1956 the General Assembly issued a clear call to the States engaged in hostilities in the Near East to agree on an immediate cease-fire and to withdraw their forces forthwith behind the armistice lines. That resolution of the Assembly was adopted by the vote of an overwhelming majority of Members of the United Nations. I regret to say that the General Assembly had to take note last night of the fact that there had not yet been compliance with the terms of its resolution. Some of the parties to the hostilities addressed communications to the Secretary-General concerning their attitude towards a cease-fire and stating conditions upon which they were willing to heed the General Assembly's call, but the parties had not taken any effective steps to carry out the General Assembly recommendations.

97. Knowing full well the urgency of the situation in the face of human suffering and casualties, and realizing the need for international assistance to the parties in arranging for a cease-fire, the General Assembly resolved by its resolution 999 (ES-I) adopted on the proposal of nineteen Powers, that the Secretary-General should try to bring about the carrying out of the cease-fire by the parties, and the halting of the movement of military forces and arms into that part of the world. The Assembly asked the Secretary-General to report to it within twelve hours on the compliance achieved.

98. At the same time, the General Assembly adopted a resolution [998 (ES-I)] which had been submitted by the delegation of Canada and which requested the Secretary-General to try to arrange for the withdrawal of forces behind the armistice lines and to submit to the General Assembly within forty-eight hours a plan

for the setting up of an emergency international United Nations force to supervise the cessation of hostilities.

99. We have now heard the report requested of the Secretary-General on compliance by the parties with the United Nations call for a cease-fire. It is most discouraging that the parties have not yet agreed upon a cessation of hostilities, and that they have not yet given orders to their armed forces accordingly. The Secretary-General is to be greatly commended for his selfless and unflagging efforts, and we earnestly hope that within a short time he will be able to report compliance.

100. The Assembly's call for a cease-fire was unconditional. The States concerned—and, above all, those engaged in attack—must stop their military operations. There must be an immediate and unconditional cessation of the fighting. This was true when the Assembly first met in emergency special session: it is true now. Silencing of the guns is the necessary prelude to the solution of any—I repeat: any—of the problems which beset the Middle East. We appeal to the States engaged in hostilities—and particularly to Israel, France and the United Kingdom—to honour their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations, and as loyal Members of the Organization, to heed the General Assembly's call to stop the fighting.

101. The Secretary-General has been asked to present to us by early Tuesday his full plan for setting up an emergency international force, as called for in the draft resolution which was submitted by Canada. We should do well to suspend our debate on this matter for the present and to adopt the draft resolution [A/3290] introduced by Canada, Colombia and Norway, which would establish a United Nations command, in accordance with resolution 998 (ES-I) adopted by the Assembly. We should take this step immediately to permit the Secretary-General and the Government with which he is consulting to proceed at full speed in making plans for the emergency international force.

102. The United States earnestly hopes that the Government of Israel will agree without delay to the prompt withdrawal of its armed forces behind the armistice lines and will co-operate fully in carrying out the plan now being negotiated by the Secretary-General. We hope that France and the United Kingdom will accept the plan envisaged in the Canadian proposal. We trust that the Government of Egypt, for its part, will be prepared to accept the temporary stationing within its territory of elements of the United Nations emergency international force in order to preserve peace in that part of the world. It is most important that this plan should be speedily carried out. To facilitate the success of its operation, the United States is prepared to help—and help in an important way—as regards airlifts, shipping, transport and supplies.

103. We very much fear that time is getting short. We therefore move that the debate should be closed, in order that we may proceed to an immediate vote on the draft resolution submitted by Canada, Colombia and Norway.

104. The PRESIDENT: I call on the United Kingdom representative on a point of order.

105. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): I think that I should recall what I said a short time ago—namely, that the reply of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to the Secretary-General's letter is awaited. This reply, as might be imagined, is likely to have a considerable bearing on this conception of an international force. Spokesmen

for Her Majesty's Government, both in London and here in the United Nations, have shown their interest in this conception. The draft resolution [A/3290] now before us, which has been submitted by Canada, Colombia and Norway and on which it is now proposed to proceed to an immediate vote, deals with one aspect of this idea: the setting up of Command arrangements. I have taken steps to bring this new draft resolution immediately to the notice of my Government, which is considering it. It was only submitted in what in Europe is the middle of the night. I, myself, have no instructions on it, and I dare say a number of other representatives may be in the same position. I am bound to say, frankly, that it would seem to me to be incorrect to decide to put the draft resolution to the vote immediately.

106. Mr. DE GUIRINGAUD (France) (*translated from French*): I said just now that I had not yet received the French Government's instructions on the question put to it this morning. I said that the French Government had not received the Secretary-General's telegram until about 5.30 p.m. I would add that the joint resolution sponsored by the Canadian, Colombian and Norwegian delegation [A/3290] was placed on our desk at 9.30 p.m. I believe, in fact, that it was distributed at 10 p.m. Neither this draft resolution nor the Secretary-General's report [A/3289] has yet reached the French Government.

107. While acknowledging the importance of the serious questions under discussion this evening, I am astounded at the desire to force so hasty a vote, in such an unaccustomed manner on proposals which have only just been submitted. These proposals raise important constitutional problems. I am wondering why, in this Assembly tonight, such a hasty vote is being urged. I take due note of the fact. I therefore cannot approve the draft resolution proposed by the delegations of Canada, Colombia and Norway, but more particularly I consider it improper to press for a vote at this stage.

108. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): As there is a motion for closure of the debate and two speakers have already participated in the discussion, the motion should be immediately put to the vote, in accordance with rule 77 of the rules of procedure. I therefore put to the vote the United States proposal that the debate should be closed forthwith.

The proposal was adopted by 50 votes to 6, with 16 abstentions.

109. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on the draft resolution proposed by the delegations of Canada, Colombia and Norway [A/3290].

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Luxembourg, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Luxembourg, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argen-

tina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya.

Against: None.

Abstaining: New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Albania, Australia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, Hungary, Israel, Laos.

The draft resolution was adopted by 57 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.

110. Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand): I wish to explain to the Assembly why on behalf of my Government I abstained on the draft resolution which has just been carried. I abstained with regret because, as the members of the Assembly know, my Government has already offered to contribute to the international force which has been proposed and, subject to satisfactory conditions, it is still prepared to do so. But I must say that I am concerned that in a matter of such moment as this, the debate should be concluded so quickly. I realize the urgency of the matter, but obviously there is need for delegations representing Governments at a great distance, as mine is, to get instructions. At least, that is what I would have thought. My Government is a responsible government. There are important matters in this resolution which require some time to examine and which it would be entirely proper for the Government of New Zealand to discuss with other Governments.

111. Under those circumstances, while thoroughly approving in principle the proposal for an international force, and having shown in practice that my Government is ready to contribute to that force, I found to my regret that it was necessary for me to abstain in the vote.

112. Mr. DE LA COLINA (Mexico) (*translated from Spanish*): In voting in favour of the draft resolution proposed by the delegations of Canada, Colombia and Norway, my delegation acted without specific instructions from its Government, since it was impossible to receive instructions in the very short time available. Since in effect it merely provides the basis upon which we can begin to put the plan approved on 2 November into effect, my delegation reserves its right to express the views of its Government on the detailed programme which is to be drawn up.

113. Before concluding I should like to express my delegation's gratitude to our esteemed Secretary-General for the prompt attention he gave to the difficult mandate which the General Assembly entrusted to him less than forty-eight hours ago.

The meeting rose on Monday, 5 November 1956, at 12.25 a.m.