

Middle East conflict - Lebanon. Security Council documents: Middle East con...

HS L 179:100



Dag Hammarskjöld's saml.

Middle East conflict 1958 - July 15

Secco documents

Verbatim record of the 828-th meeting

L 179: 100

UNITED NATIONS
SECURITY
COUNCIL



GENERAL
S/PV.828
15 July 1958
ENGLISH

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHT HUNDRED AND TWENTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 15 July 1958, at 3 p.m.

| | | |
|-------------------|---|-------------------|
| <u>President:</u> | Mr. ARAUJO | Colombia |
| <u>Members:</u> | Canada | Mr. HOLMES |
| | China | Mr. KIANG |
| | France | Mr. de VAUCELLÉS |
| | Iraq | Mr. ABBASS |
| | Japan | Mr. MATSUDAIRA |
| | Panama | Mr. ILLUECA |
| | Sweden | Mr. JARRING |
| | Union of Soviet Socialist Republics | Mr. SOBOLEV |
| | United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland | Sir Pierson DIXON |
| | United States of America | Mr. LODGE |

This record contains original speeches and interpretations. The final text, containing translations, will be distributed as soon as possible.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent in duplicate, within two working days, to the Chief, Meetings Service, Department of Conference Services, Room 1104, and also incorporated in mimeographed copies of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED AT 0930 HOURS ON 16 JULY 1958,
THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 0930 HOURS ON 18 JULY 1958.

Publication of the final printed records being subject to a rigid schedule, the co-operation of delegations in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

LETTER DATED 22 MAY 1958 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF LEBANON ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL CONCERNING:

"COMPLAINT BY LEBANON IN RESPECT OF A SITUATION ARISING FROM THE INTERVENTION OF THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF LEBANON; THE CONTINUANCE OF WHICH IS LIKELY TO ENDANGER THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY" (S/4007)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Azkoul, representative of Lebanon, and Mr. Loutfi, representative of the United Arab Republic, took places at the Security Council table.

The consecutive interpretations into English and French of the statement made by Mr. Sobolev (USSR) at the 827th meeting of the Security Council were given.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I respectfully draw the attention of the members of the Council to the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union in document S/4047.

Mr. de VAUCELLES (France) (interpretation from French): For two months Lebanon, an independent and sovereign country and a Member of the United Nations which has always very carefully observed the obligations laid down in the Charter, has been struggling against a revolt which would have been brought to an end had it not been supported from abroad.

The Lebanese Government felt it absolutely necessary to bring this problem before the Security Council, and the Council dealt with it at several meetings. During the debate, the French delegation has already had occasion to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the size and inadmissible nature of the interference in Lebanese affairs.

(Mr. de Vaucelles, France)

The Security Council could not tolerate a state of affairs which was contrary to the principles of international law as well as to the obligations of Members of the United Nations. In a resolution dated 11 June 1958 (S/4023), it decided to send observers to Lebanon so that no illegal infiltration of personnel and no illegal shipments of arms or other materiel should cross the Lebanese borders. By virtue of this resolution, the Secretary-General immediately took the necessary steps to send to Lebanon more than 100 observers from eleven different countries who promptly undertook their task. I am happy on this occasion to express to them as well as to the Secretary-General our appreciation for the fine work which they have done.

(Mr. de Vaucelles, France)

However, from the report submitted by the Mission, we see that the Mission could not completely do its job because of the difficulties it met with, especially because of the fact that it could not control or check on more than one-tenth of the frontier between Lebanon and Syria. In view of the fact that the situation has been aggravated because of obstacles placed in the path of the observers and because of the bloody events which have just occurred in Iraq, the Lebanese Government yesterday appealed to other Members of the United Nations for support. As we were told this morning by the representative of the United States, the Government of that country decided to reply immediately to this appeal.

The Government of the French Republic notes this decision which in our eyes is justified under the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter. With regard to this matter, my delegation noted with the greatest interest the information supplied by the representative of the United States concerning the spirit and the conditions under which the United States intended to conduct its activity.

My Government firmly hopes that the announcement of the decision taken by the United States will suffice to create conditions necessary for a lessening of the tension there and will suffice to restore public order and constitutional legality.

As far as the French Government is concerned, we will continue to examine with the greatest care the request which was presented to us by the Lebanese Government. In the past, we have been closely connected with Lebanon, and this situation continues in the present, and this explains the very grave concern which is caused by the present situation.

My Government, on the other hand, has a duty of protecting the material and moral interests of France in a country which has been our traditional friend. We have also a duty to ensure the security of our numerous nationals there, and it is in this spirit that we reserve our right to take within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations any measure which will seem indispensable to us so as to safeguard our interests.

Mr. HOLMES (Canada): I need not say that the Canadian Government shares in the concern expressed by other members of the Security Council over the situation which has developed in the Middle East. This is not the time to enter into an examination of all the many factors which have contributed to the present dangerous tensions. Rather, we must address ourselves to the urgent task of seeking how best the United Nations can assist the people of the area in finding solutions for their difficulties.

Since the Lebanese question was first brought to the attention of the Security Council, my Government has given firm support to United Nations action in that area. We have contributed men to the observer group in Lebanon as we have previously contributed men to the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization and to the United Nations Emergency Force. We continue to believe in the purposes of the United Nations activities in the area. We are proud of what has been accomplished, and we continue to hope that in this and other ways the United Nations can maintain its good influence in that part of the world.

We trust that whatever further measures may have to be taken will build on the good work already done as a foundation. We trust also that due concern will be paid to the well-being of the many agents of the United Nations who are now serving in this area.

In this present grave situation, the Government of Lebanon has called on direct assistance from those in a position to give that assistance. As the representative of Lebanon has explained, this call was made in accordance with the provisions of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Holmes, Canada)

In our view, there is no reason why the action reported to the Council by the representative of the United States should not be considered as complementary to the mission which the United Nations has already inaugurated. Our confidence that this can be so is based primarily on our confidence that the United States is not pursuing selfish interests in the Middle East but is seeking to assist the people of the Middle East towards a more peaceful and a more prosperous life. It is also based on the specific terms on which the United States representative has interpreted the intentions of his Government to the Council.

Clear proof that the United States is not seeking ends incompatible with the purposes of our Charter is to be found in Mr. Lodge's firm statement that the United States is not only willing but anxious to withdraw its forces when its mission can be taken over by the United Nations.

We must face the facts of the situation. The principles of international law, to which the Soviet representative somewhat inconsistently appeals, must be applied to actual situations, not appeal to an abstraction.

It is clear to all that the rights of States and the rights of persons are threatened by the violent disturbances which are shaking the area. We do not presume to judge the causes of this violence, but we cannot allow violence to spread dangerously.

If the intervention of the United States at the request of the duly established Government of Lebanon can hold the ring, check the violent disorders and enable us to help the Lebanese people to find political rather than military solutions to their troubles, I believe that it will serve our purposes. This is not a time, therefore, for this Council to relax its efforts. It is up to us to meet this new challenge and this new opportunity. That is the kind of job for which the Security Council was created by the founders of the United Nations.

Mr. KIANG (China): In the absence of our permanent representative I shall make a very brief statement.

It is shocking to my delegation that Mr. Fadhil Jamali, who is so well known and much respected in the United Nations was reported to have been murdered. It was only a few weeks ago that we in this Council heard the remarkable speech that Mr. Jamali delivered on 10 June. That speech is now his last voice in the

(Mr. Kiang, China)

United Nations. I remember our permanent representative saying in this Council that Mr. Jamali's speech deserved not only the attention of this Council but also the attention of all people interested in the cause of peace and freedom.

When the resolution of 11 June was discussed in this Council, my delegation regarded that resolution as the minimum which the Security Council could do in the discharge of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security in the world. Since the adoption of the resolution, my delegation has hoped, and is still confident, that the United Nations Observation Group will exert its vigorous efforts in the most effective way so as to reduce interference from across the border.

Today the representative of the United States advised this Council that his Government has responded positively to the request of the President of Lebanon for the help that is needed to preserve Lebanon's integrity and independence.

(Mr. Kiang, China)

The response is indeed a good and selfless deed. My delegation believes that the action which the United States has now taken is in full accord with the principles and purposes of the United Nations and will certainly promote the cause of peace and freedom. Therefore, my delegation wholeheartedly supports the action that the United States has taken, with vision and courage, at this most critical turning point in history.

Mr. LOUTFI (United Arab Republic)(interpretation from French): I must admit that it was with some surprise that my delegation heard that the Security Council had been called into emergency session today. I listened with close attention to the statement of the representative of the United States who requested the convening of this session of the Council on behalf of his Government. Without being a member of this Council, I have the honour to belong to a country which is part of this area of the world and, because of that, I see myself obliged to make certain remarks regarding this fait accompli with which we are faced today and the charges that have been thrown against us.

It appears to me that there seemed to be no reason for such an emergency session of the Council, and especially for the landing of American troops. The situation in the Lebanon has greatly improved and the disturbances which took place there have greatly calmed down. Both the Government forces and the rebels have virtually ceased hostilities and a political solution between the Lebanese themselves was being explored.

All the official documents which we have before us, such as the report of the Observers and the statements of most of the world press, have clearly shown that the question of Lebanon was an internal problem, which was in fact of concern only to the Lebanese, and it was up to the Lebanese to find a solution to it. The armed intervention of the Government of the United States, at the request of President Chamoun, unfortunately can merely aggravate the situation and make it more critical in that part of the world.

(Mr. Loutfi, United Arab Republic)

I do not wish to quote here, and I think that this is not the time to do so, the comments of the international press and also of responsible politicians in this country, such as Mr. Lippman, Senator Humphrey and Senator Green, who have proven that the consequences of this intervention can hardly contribute to peace and stability in this part of the world. I thought that the resolution of the Security Council of 11 June last was apt to improve the situation in Lebanon and to enable the Lebanese to settle their differences themselves. It is in this spirit that my delegation did not object to the resolution of the Council. It was therefore with considerable regret that we take note of this new attitude of the Government of the United States.

It follows from all this that nothing seemed to militate in favour of the unilateral decisions of the Government of the United States to intervene. It seems to us that Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations does not even allow for such intervention. Indeed, it demands armed aggression as a condition. Furthermore, there is a decision of the Council which should be carried out and which is being carried out by the Observation Group.

From the very first day it became clear that this resolution of the Security Council of 11 June last did not satisfy the present Government of Lebanon. We noted therefore that the Observation Group and the observers themselves were the target of much criticism on the part of the President of the Lebanese Republic, who stated in an interview with the Daily Mail, that they were not carrying out their task, and he said:

(continued in English)

"It is difficult for me to comment on the activities of observers because they appear to be doing nothing. As far as I can see, they spend their time at the Aero Club in Beirut and on beaches and up at the mountain resort."

Then, further on, it says:

"The observers contented themselves with quick picnics in certain Lebanese areas and at banquets given in their honour here and there."

(continued in French)

The reasons which prompted the President of the Republic and the members of the Government to take their stand are obvious. They were not satisfied with the fact that these observers of the United Nations, and in particular

(Mr. Loutfi, United Arab Republic)

Ambassador Plaza, the head of the Observation Group, stated that they were faced with a Lebanese civil war. What is more important, however, is that the Security Council was seized of this issue and adopted a resolution which the Secretary-General is now carrying out.

In his statement this morning, Mr. Hammarskjold stressed the efforts which were being made by the Observation Group in order to carry out the Security Council's resolution. He told us that in the Tripoli area free access was granted by the opposition forces, and also in the Bekaa area. An agreement with the opposition which controls this territory has been reached. Nevertheless, while this resolution was being implemented, a member of the Council who voted in favour of that very same resolution has suddenly decided now to intervene unilaterally.

On that occasion charges were renewed against us, the justification of which has never been proven. I have already shown this in my earlier statement before the Council during the two sessions which were devoted to the Lebanese question. I also showed that in that particular case we had there a difference between the Lebanese. The events in the Lebanon again concern only the Lebanese. It is up to them alone to put an end to it. I would not even like to revert to this problem. The evidence which I gave that this was an internal Lebanese problem can be found in the records of our meetings.

Mr. Azkoul, in his statement today, unfortunately, renewed the same charges. I will not reply to his academic efforts with which he sought to comment on the report of the observers. We did so at the time of his statement to the press, of which you are aware. But I would add that whatever the logic he uses, it cannot be valid so long as it is contradicted by the facts, and you will find the facts in the report of the observers.

The Observation Group itself declared the following, in an interview with the press, which I find here before me and which I will also quote:

(Mr. Loutfi, United Arab Republic)

(continued in English)

"The Observation Group believes that the progressive implementation of that mandate will contribute greatly to the creation of conditions within Lebanon which will make possible the solution by the Lebanese people themselves of the internal problem which faces the country at the present time."

(continued in French)

It could not be more clear and I do not know what I have to add to this. It has never been established that the United Arab Republic had intervened in the internal affairs of the Lebanon, but, unfortunately, that is what is now happening today. We consider that this is an intervention in the domestic affairs of the Lebanon on the part of the United States.

(Mr. Loutfi, United Arab Republic)

I cannot help regretting that Messrs. Chamoun and Malik should have asked themselves for an intervention of foreign forces in their countries. They shall assume before history the responsibility for these acts which may be fraught with very grave consequences and repercussions in this part of the world. There is no doubt that the major Power that has taken this decision -- which is far from being justified -- and that has more than any other State the responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, has thereby created a very dangerous precedent indeed.

No one can turn back the wheel of history. The peoples of the Middle East, like the peoples of Asia and Africa, are now assuming their own responsibilities. They know that they have rights, the right to independence and the right to freedom without pressure from the great Powers or intervention on their behalf. If you ignore these factors in the international relations between the major Powers and the countries of this part of the world, it will be difficult to enforce peace and stability there.

Gentlemen, it is obvious, and it follows also from the statement of the representative of the United States himself, that the Iraqi revolution prompted the United States to adopt this grave decision. Yet that, too, is an Iraqi question, a domestic question of Iraq, and I think that nobody can deny that. This revolution can in no case be invoked as an excuse for intervention which might be an infringement of peace and stability in that part of the world.

I was amazed to hear the charges of the representative of the United States in our direction. They are not founded, they were never established, and they are obviously rebutted by the Press, by the report of the Observers, and by their statements. It is regrettable that this statement comes from a country with which we desire to have good relations. If one wishes to intervene in Lebanon for reasons which I shall ignore and which are certainly not justified, whether for reasons of prestige or for private interests, there is no need to do that to accuse another State without proof. The Government of the United States has taken this serious decision; it is for the Government of the United States to assume full responsibility for its action.

(Mr. Loutfi, United Arab Republic)

For our part, as I have already said on many other occasions, we hope that Lebanon will remain independent and prosperous.

I reserve my right to speak at another point, if necessary, if I may.

Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, with your permission and with that of the members of the Council, I should like to take a few minutes of the Council's time in order to elucidate some points in reply to some of the comments that were made about my country. First of all, I should like to start by elucidating the statements of Mr. Chamoun, the President of the Republic, in his interview in the Daily Mail. I would inform the Council that the Lebanese Minister, who was the liaison officer with the Observation Group, stated to the Press that the statements which were attributed to the President had been distorted.

As regards the statement that has been attributed to the Head of the Observation Group, Ambassador Galo Plaza, according to which he allegedly said that he did not believe there was any infiltration of armed men or shipments of war material to Lebanon, I should like to ask the Secretariat, if possible, to read out the exact text of that statement. We do not recall having read in any publication any such statement on behalf of Ambassador Galo Plaza. The utmost he may have said was that his group during the short time he was in Lebanon and in the preparatory stage had not been able to note the existence of such infiltration. But he could certainly not say at that point that such infiltration did not exist. In any case, either today or at another meeting, I should like to ask if it would be possible for the Secretariat to elucidate this statement.

As regards the statement in the first communique which the Group published in Beirut, it is true that the last paragraph of that communique says that the progressive implementation of the mandate of the Group would allow for the establishment of conditions which would enable the Lebanese people to settle their own domestic problems. However, the representative of the United Arab Republic interpreted this text in a way which was hardly in conformity with the facts. This text confirms our thesis -- namely, that if the mandate of the

(Mr. Azkoul, Lebanon)

Observers is carried out and if the Observers can put an end to infiltration, then conditions will be established for the settlement of the Lebanese differences by the Lebanese themselves. That is what we maintain: that if this infiltration ceases, we shall be able to settle our own problems. This paragraph, in our belief, is a very clear proof of the existence of such infiltration, and only the end of this infiltration will enable the people of Lebanon to settle their domestic affairs themselves.

I should like to conclude my statement by associating myself with my friend, Ambassador Loutfi, when he speaks of the right of self-determination and of the need to have this right respected by the major Powers. I am speaking as the representative of a very small country and I am addressing myself to the representative of the United Arab Republic which, as compared to Lebanon, is a major Power, and I quite agree with him that if the principle of the right of self-determination, especially for the small countries, is respected by their neighbours and by those who, as compared to them, are major Powers, then indeed we would not have anything to worry about.

The SECRETARY-GENERAL: The representative of Lebanon referred to a statement by the representative of the United Arab Republic which, in turn, referred to a statement made in a Press Conference by Mr. Galo Plaza. It will be a pleasure for us to check what was really said by Mr. Galo Plaza and put it at the disposal of the two gentlemen who have talked about the statement. I myself do not recall exactly his wording, but I think that this matter can be cancelled out by giving the exact text to the two gentlemen.

Since I have the floor, I might perhaps add one word about something which it has been said that I have said myself. The representative of the Soviet Union referred to a statement according to which I would have said that the problem in Lebanon was "a domestic concern of the people of Lebanon". I have never made a public statement to that effect. I think that the Soviet representative has been misled by somewhat imaginative and free interpretations in the Press of what was a statement with an entirely different overtone and undertone.

Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): In my remarks, I quoted the statement of Mr. Galo Plaza. The representative of Lebanon said that he was not aware of such a statement, and he requested confirmation of it. I should like to quote once again what I read in Russian from United Nations Press Release LEB/15 dated 7 July 1958. At a certain point in this Press Release, the following is stated, which I shall read in English:

(continued in English)

"Mr. Plaza was asked whether the Lebanese Government had provided information which the Group had not yet been able to investigate but which, if substantiated, would justify its charges. He" -- meaning Mr. Plaza -- "answered, -- and here is a direct quotation of his answer -- 'We have not had anything from the Lebanese Government which would lead us to say there is massive infiltration.'"

That is exactly what I quoted, nothing more.

Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon)(interpretation from French): I would like to thank very sincerely and wholeheartedly the representative of the Soviet Union for having produced a text which enables us to elucidate the situation. When I spoke a few moments ago, I said that my purpose in so doing was to elucidate the situation.

The statement of President Galo Plaza is completely acceptable as far as the Government of Lebanon is concerned for the very simple reason that the Government of Lebanon never claimed and never used the words "mass infiltration". No responsible spokesman of Lebanon ever used these words. What we said until now was "mass intervention in the domestic affairs of Lebanon" and we persist in saying that this mass intervention exists. I listed the six forms of intervention which makes us say that it is mass intervention. There are the shipment of weapons, the training of personnel, propaganda by radio, propaganda by the Press and various types of intervention. The sum of these elements builds up into a mass intervention. The infiltration of armed men is only one of the forms of intervention. In connexion with this infiltration, we said that there was continuous infiltration. We never said that there was mass

(Mr. Azkoul, Lebanon)

infiltration, because the words "mass infiltration" are in our belief quite contradictory. Infiltration means a sort of trip by trip -- persons either individually or in little groups slip clandestinely from one country into another. If there is mass infiltration it is no longer infiltration but invasion. We never said that there was an invasion of Lebanon. This proves that Mr. Gala Plaza is quite in accord with this statement of the Lebanese, namely, that there is not mass infiltration but mass intervention. If he says that there is no mass infiltration it means that he admits that there is infiltration, and that is what we have claimed all along.

I am grateful to the representative of the Soviet Union for having allowed me to clarify this point.

Mr. LOUTFI (United Arab Republic)(interpretation from French): I do not wish to embark upon a controversy with my friend from Lebanon, regarding the interpretation to be given to various words. I would merely like to take note of the fact that he is in agreement with the statement of President Galo Plaza.

Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): In the report of the Observation Group dated 3 July (S/4040) there were several very important conclusions regarding the subject of the observations with which Mr. Azkoul will not find it as easy to agree as he did now with the statement of Mr. Plaza.

In this regard, I should like to quote from a document dated 8 July which was signed by Mr. Azkoul (S/4043).

(Mr. Sobolev, USSR)

Mr. Azkoul quotes three theses that have been advanced by the Observation Group. I will read out these theses in English. Ambassador Azkoul says that these are the basic conclusions, the fundamental conclusions. These are the conclusions of the Observation Group:

(continued in English)

"1. It has not been possible to establish from where these arms [namely, the arms seen by the Observation Group] were acquired...

"2. Nor, was it possible to establish if any of the armed men observed had infiltrated from outside."

"Any" -- not "massive", but "any". I understand it may be even single, "if any".

And, lastly, which is much more important to me and I think for everybody:

"3. There is little doubt, however," concluded the Observation Group, "that the vast majority was in any case composed of Lebanese."

With those three conclusions the representative of Lebanon was not in agreement and in this document which I mentioned now he took great pain to argue with these conclusions of the Observation Group. To my mind, these arguments were unsuccessful.

Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) (interpretation from French): I apologize for having to talk again, but since certain questions were addressed to me, I see myself duty bound to reply.

The representative of the Soviet Union has offered me a further occasion to prove our theses. We criticized the first and the second conclusions arrived at by the Observation Group that we called positive conclusions reached in its first report. We criticized them as judgements that were not conclusions, or, at least, were premature.

What did the first conclusion say? "It has not been possible to establish from where these arms [namely, the arms seen by the Observation Group] were acquired..." Now, we showed in the document to which the representative of the Soviet Union referred that this vision from afar of weapons being brought in from afar by the rebels, without studying the manufacturer of the gun and without taking the gun in one's hand, this sort of long-range vision cannot enable the

(Mr. Azkoul, Lebanon)

observers to ascertain what is the origin of these weapons.

We can say, therefore, that the Observation Group with the limited means at its disposal and the impossibility of entering rebel territory found it impossible to ascertain where these weapons came from.

This applies also to the second conclusion which says: "Nor, was it possible to establish if any of the armed men observed had infiltrated from outside." You have only to read the document which we submitted in order to see that it was truly impossible to arrive at any conclusion since the observers saw the rebels only from afar, they saw groups of one hundred persons or so, or else they were talking to the leaders, and in that case, of course, it was not the infiltrators who would accompany them to the leaders but mainly the Lebanese. Therefore, to make such judgements could have serious consequences in the sense that they could be interpreted as final judgements, while it seems to me that in the minds of the observers they did not have that implication.

But the third conclusion to which the representative of the Soviet Union attached the greatest importance, I accept. It confirms what we have always claimed. It says: "There is little doubt, however, that the vast majority was in any case composed of Lebanese." We accept that interpretation because it proves, in the first place, that if the great majority were Lebanese, there was a minority that was not Lebanese. Here is a definitive conclusion on the part of the Observation Group.

Secondly, we must also note that the rebels seen by the observers were, I repeat, the rebels that they saw because these rebels accompanied them to a given area, mainly to see their leaders. These certainly must have been chosen to show the observers that these rebels were Lebanese. The Syrians or Egyptians or Palestinians who were in the group would not have shown themselves to the observers because the task of these observers is to see if there are any foreign elements there.

Therefore, this third conclusion confirms rather than negates the Lebanese thesis to the effect that among the masses of the rebels there is a large number of foreigners. We have even said that there is a proportion of 25 to 30 per cent of foreigners and that the majority were Lebanese. Therefore that is exactly what we also said.

The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I have now been able to check the quotations to which reference has been made in the course of the debate, and I think that a good way to end this debate may be to put on record what was said by President Plaza.

I wish, in the first instance, to refer to note to correspondents No. 1831 of 26 June 1958. I read the following sentence:

"The Chairman of the Group recalled that its task was only to determine whether there was any infiltration; if this could be done it would be easier for the Lebanese themselves to solve their internal trouble."

The other quotation is from Press Release LEB/15 of 7 July 1958:

"Mr. Plaza was asked whether the Lebanese Government had provided information which the Group had not yet been able to investigate but which, if substantiated, would justify its charges. He answered, 'We have not had anything from the Lebanese Government which would lead us to say there is massive infiltration.'"

It seems to me obvious that this last mentioned statement is not a statement on the question of substance but just a registration of the fact that there was not sufficient evidence for a positive judgement.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): At the beginning of this afternoon's meeting, the President drew the attention of the members of the Security Council to the fact that they had before them a draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union contained in document S/4047. In accordance with our rules of procedure, if no member of the Council wishes to make further statements and since no other draft resolution has been submitted, it would now be in order for the Security Council to vote on the Soviet draft resolution. However, in view of the complexity of the question before the Security Council and also in view of the exceptional gravity of the problem before us, I would suggest that this meeting should be continued tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. If there are no objections, I shall take it that my suggestion is adopted and that that is the procedure which the Security Council will follow.

It was so decided.

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): I simply wish to say, Mr. President, that I am glad to accept your suggestion that we recess until tomorrow particularly because, as I said in my statement this morning, the United States intends to introduce a draft resolution of its own on this subject for consideration at that time.

The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.