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Agenda item 90:
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Chairman: Mr. Karel KURKA (Czechoslovakia).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Santiso Gálvez (Guatemala), Rapporteur, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 90

1. Mr. AMADEO (Argentina) said that owing to the lateness of the hour at which the preceding meeting had risen, the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.276) had not had time to consider the amendments submitted by the representatives of Nigeria and the Sudan towards the end of that meeting. He would therefore request the suspension of the meeting for one hour to permit the sponsors to discuss them.

The meeting was suspended at 11.15 a.m. and resumed at 12.15 p.m.

2. Mr. WACHUKU (Nigeria) said that since it seemed that his delegation's amendments (A/C.1/L.279) would give rise to a protracted debate—and he did not wish to hold up the work of the Committee—he would withdraw them.

3. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) recalled that at the preceding meeting he had submitted orally the text of a new operative paragraph which he felt might be inserted in the seven-Power draft resolution; he did not wish to submit that amendment formally until he knew the reaction in the Committee to the Sudanese amendments, with which he was in agreement.

4. The CHAIRMAN observed that the only amendments formally before the Committee were those submitted by the Sudan (A/C.1/L.278).

5. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) said that the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution were prepared to accept the first and third Sudanese amendments (A/C.1/L.278, paras. 1 and 3). The second amendment, however, was entirely unacceptable. The sponsors rejected that group of suggestions as defamatory of the Organization of American States (OAS), an organization to which the Latin American countries attached very great importance and which they believed could indeed serve as an example to other organizations. In any case, operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution already contained an appeal to all States Members of the United Nations; it was only natural and right that the other operative paragraph should make a special appeal to members of the OAS, for the problem affected the American continent and it was natural that American States should be more concerned in its solution than States in other parts of the world.

6. Mr. ROA (Cuba) said that the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.276) had never been submitted to his delegation for consideration although it was directly concerned with Cuba. It had clearly been concocted at the instigation of the United States, which had originally been opposed to the adoption of any draft resolution but had changed its mind on realizing that all the small countries supported Cuba and that even the great Powers had not contested its rights.

7. Cuba could not accept any draft resolution which made reference to the Security Council resolution of 19 July 19601 one of the most blatant manoeuvres ever brought off in the United Nations. It had stated in effect that no action could be taken on the Cuban complaint because the matter was under consideration by the OAS, which was entirely untrue. Furthermore, the Secretary General of the OAS, in communicating to the Secretary-General of the United Nations the agreements adopted at the Seventh Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American States, held at San José, Costa Rica, in August 1960, had implied that they constituted the report requested by the Security Council in its resolution of 19 July 1960. But the Cuban Government had not signed the Final Act of the Meeting, which it believed to have been organized with the design of violating Cuba's rights. The Foreign Ministers of Peru and Venezuela had also refused to sign the Act and the Foreign Minister of Mexico had made a formal reservation thereto. Thus Cuba could not accept any reference to the OAS, not only because it had chosen to bring the matter before the United Nations, but also because the regional organization was being used, in disregard of the principles on which it was based, to suppress the rights of a State which belonged to both organizations.

8. The OAS was in fact a serious danger to the small countries that belonged to it. At the time of the organisa-

---

tion of the Pan-American Union, José Martí had pointed out that the United States was trying to drive the European countries from the American continent so that it could gain control of the Latin countries' raw materials, trade, and markets. The representative of Argentina himself at an earlier date had expressed the view that Pan-Americanism was an illusion since it was based on a messianic conception of the American continent as an incorruptible entity and disregarded the profound differences between the Latin and Anglo-Saxon peoples. He had also recognized that the United States used the false assumption of a common American ideology to direct the policies of most American States to its own advantage. It was surprising, therefore, that Argentina was a sponsor of the seven-Power draft resolution.

9. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) said that his delegation wished, under rule 123 of the rules of procedure, to reintroduce the amendment to operative paragraph 1 of the seven-Power draft resolution that had been submitted by Nigeria (A/C.1/L.279, para. 1) and subsequently withdrawn.

10. If the Cuban problem was to be solved there must be some mediation between the two sides of a kind which would respect both the sovereignty of the Cuban State and the human rights of the Cuban people. It was in keeping with the spirit of the United Nations that the problem should be examined on a regional basis, but the United Nations must maintain some control over whatever action was taken, in order to safeguard the rights of the parties involved and its own prestige.

11. Mr. AMADEO (Argentina) said that the seven-Power draft resolution was the work of its sponsors alone; they had had no outside guidance. It was unfortunate that the Cuban representative should have cast aspersions on his (Mr. Amadeo's) character since political consistency did not appear to be one of that representative's own virtues.

12. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) said that in preparing the seven-Power draft resolution the sponsors had deliberately taken the views of Cuba into account. They had referred only to the last two paragraphs of the Security Council resolution of 19 July 1960, since they knew that paragraph 1 was unacceptable to Cuba. Similarly, they knew that Cuba would not agree to a general reference to the decisions of the Seventh Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American States and had therefore mentioned only resolution II of that Meeting, which had merely set up an Ad Hoc Good Offices Committee consisting of Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico and Venezuela, all friends of Cuba. The Cuban representative's objections, therefore, did not seem to be justified.

13. Mr. ADEEL (Sudan) thanked the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution for accepting the first and third of his amendments (A/C.1/L.278). He regretted that he could not withdraw the second amendment, which had proved unacceptable to them. Although he respected the OAS and did not wish to belittle it, he believed that the Cuban question should not be referred to that body. The OAS was free to take action on it independently of the United Nations if it so desired, but Cuba had appealed to the United Nations to act on its complaint and it was therefore the responsibility of the Assembly to respond to that appeal.

14. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) proposed an amendment to operative paragraph 2 of the seven-Power draft resolution, as revised following the acceptance by the sponsors of the third Sudanese amendment. His proposal was that the word "peaceful" should be inserted before the word "action".

15. Mr. SCHWEITZER (Chile) assured the representative of Cuba that Chile's intention, in co-sponsoring the seven-Power draft resolution, had not been to damage or prejudice Cuba's interests. On the contrary, Chile had agreed with most of the arguments presented by Mexico and Ecuador in defence of the Cuban Government's position, and it was supporting the seven-Power draft resolution in the belief that it would prove effective in achieving a peaceful settlement of the situation. Moreover, Chile regarded the Mexican draft resolution (A/C.1/L.275) as complementing that of the seven Powers and was inclined to vote for it because it reaffirmed principles to which Chile was wholly committed. On the other hand, its failure to make a specific reference to the inter-American system constituted a serious drawback. In that connexion, he pointed out, as the Venezuelan representative had done before him, that the references to the inter-American machinery in the third preambular paragraph of the seven-Power text carefully excluded those concepts and actions to which Cuba had taken exception.

16. In his opinion, the Saudi Arabian suggestion that the word "peaceful" should be inserted before "action" in the new operative paragraph 2 need not be seriously entertained, because the references throughout the text to a settlement by peaceful means were so clear as to render the addition of the word superfluous.

17. Mr. UMANA RFRNAT (Colombia) said that he categorically rejected the Cuban representative's assertions regarding the OAS.

18. He had no objection to the addition of the word "peaceful" as proposed by the representative of Saudi Arabia, but believed that that should be decided by the representative of the Sudan, since it was directed to a text that had been proposed by him and subsequently accepted by the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution.

19. Mr. BRUCAN (Romania) requested the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution to clarify the third preambular paragraph by explaining what were the peaceful means of settlement established at the Seventh Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics, how many Foreign Ministers had signed that instrument and on what grounds some had refused to sign it. He questioned the effect of a vote in the United Nations on an inter-American settlement which had not been accepted by Cuba and certain other Latin American countries.

20. Mr. PAZHWA (Afghanistan) asked for a specific clarification by the Chair, particularly in the light of the withdrawal of the Nigerian amendments to the seven-Power draft resolution, with regard to the voting on the Mexican draft resolution.

21. The CHAIRMAN said that he proposed the following order of voting on the proposals before the Committee: (1) the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.276) with its amendments; (2) the Mexican draft resolution (A/C.1/L.275); (3) the Romanian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.274); and (4) the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/L.277).

The meeting rose at 1:20 p.m.