

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



SIXTH COMMITTEE, 345th

MEETING

Tuesday, 9 December 1952, at 3 p.m.

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

Page

Question of defining aggression: report by the Secretary-General (A/2162, A/2162/Add.1, A/2211, A/C.6/L.265/Rev.1, A/C.6/L.267, A/C.6/L.268 and Corr.1, A/C.6/L.269/Rev.1 and Corr.1, A/C.6/L.270, A/C.6/L.272, A/C.6/L.273, A/C.6/L.274, A/C.6/L.275/Rev.1) (<i>continued</i>)	225
Election of a new Rapporteur	230

Chairman: Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand).

Question of defining aggression: report by the Secretary-General (A/2162, A/2162/Add.1, A/2211, A/C.6/L.265/Rev.1, A/C.6/L.267, A/C.6/L.268 and Corr.1, A/C.6/L.269/Rev.1 and Corr.1, A/C.6/L.270, A/C.6/L.272, A/C.6/L.273, A/C.6/L.274, A/C.6/L.275/Rev.1) (*continued*)

[Item 54]*

1. Mr. PETRZELKA (Czechoslovakia) said that the sole purpose of his delegation's original amendment (A/C.6/L.275) had been to list, in the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.265/Rev.1), the States to be appointed to the special committee. In order to meet the point raised by certain representatives, and to provide even greater assurance of balanced composition, his delegation was now submitting a revised text of its amendment (A/C.6/L.275/Rev.1) increasing the special committee's membership by the following three States: India, Pakistan and the Netherlands. In his delegation's view there was nothing to prevent such an increase.

2. Mr. HSU (China) objected to the Czechoslovak amendment for a number of reasons. First, it was a reflection on the competence of the Chairman of the Sixth Committee and the President of the General Assembly, who were usually entrusted with the appointment of members of subsidiary bodies. Secondly, it did not include China. By virtue of China's status as a permanent member of the Security Council—which eventually might be called upon to apply the definition—and its experience as a victim of aggression, it was particularly concerned in that question. Although the agreement of the five permanent members of the Security Council was not absolutely necessary for the adoption of the definition, China's participation in the special committee would ensure a greater measure

of agreement in the Security Council later on. He therefore appealed to the Committee, in the interests of United Nations principles and of fairness, to reject the Czechoslovak amendment.

3. Mr. COCK (Colombia) said that to draw up a definition was difficult in the best of circumstances, but was particularly difficult in the case of aggression, which constantly assumed new forms. There were as many different notions of aggression as there were countries in the world, and a notion adopted by the countries of one region of the world on the basis of their common background and experience might not be acceptable to those of another. Thus, the definition contained in the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance of 1947¹ was suited to the needs of the countries of Latin America but might be unsuitable for other areas.

4. A definition of aggression, in order to be universally applicable and acceptable, must be general, and he therefore could not support the USSR draft resolution (A/C.6/L.264), which gave a restrictive enumeration of acts of aggression, and the Polish amendments (A/C.6/L.272 and A/C.6/L.273), which had the same effect.

5. His delegation, desirous of co-operating in any United Nations undertaking which would contribute to the maintenance of peace and security, had, together with three other delegations, submitted amendments (A/C.6/L.269/Rev.1 and Corr.1) to the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.265/Rev.1) calling for further study of the question. It was his delegation's understanding that such study would be only preliminary, and that on the basis of it the General Assembly would decide at its following session whether a definition of aggression should be adopted. He would vote for the French (A/C.6/L.268 and Corr.1), Indonesian (A/C.6/L.270), Turkish (A/C.6/L.

* Indicates the item number on the agenda of the General Assembly.

¹ See *United Nations Treaty Series*, volume 21, p. 93.

L.267) and Yugoslav (A/C.6/L.274) amendments. He could not however, accept the Czechoslovak amendment, in either its original (A/C.6/L.275) or its revised (A/C.6/L.275/Rev.1) form; first, because it was not proper to list the members of the special committee in the draft resolution, and, secondly, because the list excluded China, a permanent member of the Security Council.

6. Mr. TOUS (Ecuador) recalled that his delegation had always felt that a definition of aggression was necessary in the present world situation, and that it was incumbent upon the United Nations to draw up a proper definition. For various reasons stated earlier (341st meeting), his delegation, as was the case with many others, favoured a mixed definition. He would vote for point II of the revised joint amendments (A/C.6/L.269/Rev.1 and Corr.1) to the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.265/Rev.1), because that point called for such a mixed definition, and against the USSR draft resolution (A/C.6/L.264), because it contained a restrictive enumeration.

7. Generally, his position on the various proposals before the Committee was as follows.

8. He would vote for the first and second paragraphs of the preamble to the revised joint draft resolution, since they provided a useful introduction; against point I of the revised joint amendments; and against the French amendment (A/C.6/L.268 and Corr.1) to sub-paragraph (b) of the second paragraph of the preamble to the revised joint draft resolution. He, however, supported the French amendment (A/C.6/L.268) calling for the insertion of a new sub-paragraph after sub-paragraph (b), because he considered that amendment reasonable and well founded. The Indonesian amendment (A/C.6/L.270) to insert a third paragraph in the preamble, though acceptable at first sight, might give rise to controversy over the meaning of the words "generally acceptable", and he would therefore vote against it.

9. Paragraph 1 of the operative part of the revised joint draft resolution should be maintained in its original form. The Czechoslovak amendment (A/C.6/L.275/Rev.1) to that paragraph was improper—particularly since it did not include China—and contrary to established procedure. He was also unable to support the Turkish amendment (A/C.6/L.267) to paragraph 1. With regard to paragraph 2 of the operative part, he preferred the original text of the joint amendment (A/C.6/L.269), for the reasons stated earlier.

10. Mr. MAJID ABBAS (Iraq) said that, while his delegation was opposed to the drafting of a definition at the present juncture, it had no objection to the appointment of a special committee to study the matter further. The method of appointment was a matter of indifference to him, and he would vote for whichever proposal on the question seemed preferable to the Committee.

11. There were, however, two points on which his delegation had strong views. First, the special committee must meet at Headquarters, for reasons of economy. Secondly, it should submit its report to the ninth session of the General Assembly, because past experience had shown one year to be insufficient for studies of that nature, because the political climate

in two years' time might be more favourable for the adoption of a definition, and because it was better to defer the matter, which might involve an amendment to the Charter, until the session immediately preceding the tenth session of the General Assembly, at which the question of a review of the Charter would be considered. He therefore would oppose any amendment to the revised joint draft resolution which advanced the time-limit for the presentation of the report from the ninth to the eighth session of the General Assembly. If an amendment to that effect was nevertheless adopted, he would be compelled to vote against the revised joint draft resolution as a whole.

12. The CHAIRMAN said there were two draft resolutions before the Committee—the USSR draft resolution (A/C.6/L.264) and the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.265/Rev.1). The latter, proposing that the question should be given further study, was in effect a proposal for postponement of the question. Earlier (328th meeting), in a similar case, the Committee had voted first upon the draft resolution proposing postponement. Unless there was any objection, he would follow the same procedure and would put the revised joint draft resolution to the vote first.

13. Mr. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) could not accept the Chairman's interpretation of the two draft resolutions. It was a question not of one draft resolution which proposed postponing the adoption of the recommendation contained in the other, but of two entirely separate draft resolutions which contained quite different conceptions of the definition of aggression. That being so, he would request the Chairman to follow the rules of procedure and to put to the vote first the draft resolution which had been presented first, namely, that of the USSR.

14. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) referred to his statement at the preceding meeting that, while the USSR delegation was convinced that a definition of aggression could be adopted at the current session, it was prepared to meet half-way the view of the majority that a special committee should be established for further study of the question, having in mind that the Soviet Union draft of a definition of aggression would be considered in that special committee.

15. Accordingly, the USSR delegation would not press for a vote on its own draft resolution (A/C.6/L.264), but would submit it to the special committee, if established.

16. Mr. GREEN (United States of America) asked whether the foregoing statement meant that the USSR representative had withdrawn his draft resolution.

17. The CHAIRMAN declared that, in his opinion, the USSR representative's statement was tantamount to a withdrawal of the USSR draft resolution and, in conformity with established procedure, he would so treat the statement.

18. He would therefore ask the Committee to proceed to the vote on the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.265/Rev.1) and the relevant amendments, on the basis of the working paper prepared by the Secretariat (A/C.6/L.271/Rev.2). The amendments to the preamble would be put to the vote in the order listed.

19. In dealing with the operative part of the revised joint draft resolution, a vote would first be taken on the first point of the revised Czechoslovak amendment (A/C.6/L.275/Rev.1) to paragraph 1 increasing the membership of the proposed special committee from fifteen to eighteen. Thereafter, the Turkish amendment (A/C.6/L.267) to paragraph 1 would be put to the vote, and if it were adopted no vote would be necessary on the second point of the Czechoslovak amendment. If both the Turkish and the Czechoslovak amendments to paragraph 1 were rejected, a vote would then be taken on the corresponding paragraph of the revised joint draft resolution.

20. The Committee would then proceed to paragraph 2 of the operative part of the revised joint draft resolution, voting first on the French amendment (A/C.6/L.268) and then on the various amendments to the revised joint amendments submitted by Colombia, Egypt, Mexico and Syria (A/C.6/L.269/Rev.1 and Corr.1). If the revised joint amendments were rejected, the Committee would then vote on the Polish amendments (A/C.6/L.272) to paragraph 2 of the operative part of the revised joint draft resolution. Finally, it would vote on paragraph 3 of the operative part and on the revised joint draft resolution as a whole.

It was so agreed.

21. The CHAIRMAN said that no amendments had been submitted to the first paragraph of the preamble to the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.265/Rev.1).

22. He put to the vote the revised joint amendment (A/C.6/L.269/Rev.1) calling for the deletion of the second paragraph of the preamble to the revised joint draft resolution.

The amendment was rejected by 30 votes to 16, with 8 abstentions.

23. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the French amendment (A/C.6/L.268 and Corr.1) to sub-paragraph (b) of the second paragraph of the preamble to the revised joint draft resolution.

The amendment was adopted by 20 votes to 15, with 19 abstentions.

24. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the French amendment (A/C.6/L.268) proposing the insertion of a new sub-paragraph after sub-paragraph (b) of the second paragraph of the preamble to the revised joint draft resolution.

The amendment was adopted by 23 votes to 16, with 15 abstentions.

25. The CHAIRMAN noted that, in consequence of the adoption of the French amendment inserting a new sub-paragraph (b), it would be necessary to re-letter sub-paragraphs (c) and (d) of the second paragraph of the preamble (d) and (e), respectively.

26. In accordance with the request of the representative of Czechoslovakia, the Chairman called for a separate vote on the word "generally" in the Indonesian amendment (A/C.6/L.270) proposing the addition of a third paragraph to the preamble to the revised joint draft resolution.

The word "generally" was adopted by 24 votes to 16, with 14 abstentions.

27. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Indonesian amendment (A/C.6/L.270).

The amendment was adopted by 22 votes to 15, with 18 abstentions.

28. The CHAIRMAN said that in dealing with the operative part of the revised joint draft resolution the Committee would first vote on the first point of the revised Czechoslovak amendment (A/C.6/L.275/Rev.1) increasing the membership of the special committee from fifteen to eighteen.

The first point of the amendment was rejected by 29 votes to 19, with 7 abstentions.

29. The CHAIRMAN noted that the rejection of the first point of the Czechoslovak amendment implied the rejection of the second.

30. He called for a separate vote on the following words in the Turkish amendment (A/C.6/L.267) to paragraph 1 of the operative part of the revised joint draft resolution: "by the President of the General Assembly in consultation with".

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Chile, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Denmark, El Salvador, France, Greece, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Australia, Belgium, Canada.

Against: Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Bolivia, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Abstaining: China, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Burma.

The words "by the President of the General Assembly in consultation with" were rejected by 21 votes to 19, with 16 abstentions.

31. Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) said that in view of the rejection of the principle of his amendment he would not press for any further action on that amendment.

32. The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to vote on the French amendment (A/C.6/L.268) to paragraph 2 of the operative part of the revised joint draft resolution.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Dominican Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: France, Greece, Honduras, Liberia, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark.

Against: Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran, Lebanon, Mexico, Peru, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Bolivia, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia.

Abstaining: India, Iraq, Israel, Netherlands, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Burma, China, Colombia.

The amendment was rejected by 24 votes to 23, with 9 abstentions.

33. The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to vote next on the amendments to point II of the revised joint amendments (A/C.6/L.269/Rev.1 and Corr.1) to paragraph 2 of the operative part of the revised joint draft resolution.

34. He put to the vote first the Polish amendment (A/C.6/L.273) to point II, sub-paragraph (a) of the revised joint amendments.

The amendment was rejected by 35 votes to 5, with 11 abstentions.

35. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the Polish amendment (A/C.6/L.273) calling for the deletion of point II, sub-paragraph (a) (i) from the revised joint amendments.

The amendment was rejected by 35 votes to 6, with 13 abstentions.

36. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the Yugoslav amendment (A/C.6/L.274) to point II, sub-paragraph (a) (ii) of the revised joint amendments.

The amendment was adopted by 33 votes to 11, with 9 abstentions.

37. The CHAIRMAN said that the adoption of the Yugoslav amendment to point II, sub-paragraph (a) (ii) implied the rejection of the Polish amendment (A/C.6/L.273) to that sub-paragraph.

38. He put to the vote the Polish amendment (A/C.6/L.273) to point II, sub-paragraph (a) (iii) of the revised joint amendments.

The amendment was rejected by 32 votes to 6, with 15 abstentions.

39. The CHAIRMAN said that as a result of changes proposed by the representatives of Mexico (344th meeting) and Syria (342nd meeting), the text of point II, sub-paragraph (a) (iii) read: "an enumeration of the circumstances which in particular may not be invoked as justification for an act of aggression".

40. Mr. ROLING (Netherlands) asked whether the introduction of the phrase "an act of aggression" was intended as a reference to the Judgment of the Nürnberg Tribunal, in which a definite distinction had been drawn between "aggression" and "acts of aggression".

41. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) replied that it was too late to ask for explanations once the voting had started.

42. Mr. SALAMANCA FIGUEROA (Bolivia) wished to take up in his own name a suggestion made by the Yugoslav representative (343rd meeting) to amend point II, sub-paragraph (a) (iii) of the re-

vised joint amendments. He thought that it would be impossible for the special committee to enumerate the circumstances which could not be invoked as justification for an act of aggression, and he therefore proposed that point II, sub-paragraph (a) (iii) should be amended to read: "a statement to the effect that no circumstances may be invoked as justification for aggression, even if regularly invoked hitherto".

43. Mr. VALLAT (United Kingdom) and Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) protested that the Bolivian suggestion was out of order and could not be accepted in the middle of the voting procedure.

44. At the request of the CHAIRMAN and in view of the objections raised, Mr. SALAMANCA FIGUEROA (Bolivia) withdrew his proposal.

45. Mr. VALLAT (United Kingdom), referring to point II of the revised joint amendment, requested separate votes on sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) and on the word "eighth" in sub-paragraph (a), the words "in the light of the definitions it has drafted" in sub-paragraph (b) and the words "on the assumption that a definition of aggression is adopted by a resolution of the General Assembly" in sub-paragraph (c).

46. Mr. HERRERA BAEZ (Dominican Republic) requested a separate vote on point II, sub-paragraph (a) (iii).

47. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) requested a separate vote on point II, sub-paragraph (a) as far as the words "... its constituent elements".

48. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the word "eighth" in point II, sub-paragraph (a) of the revised joint amendments (A/C.6/L.269/Rev.1 and Corr.1).

The word "eighth" was rejected by 30 votes to 16, with 5 abstentions.

49. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote point II, sub-paragraph (a) of the revised joint amendments (A/C.6/L.269/Rev.1 and Corr.1), as far as the words "... its constituent elements".

Point II, sub-paragraph (a), as far as the words "... its constituent elements", was adopted by 26 votes to 21, with 7 abstentions.

50. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on point II, sub-paragraph (a) (i).

51. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote point II, sub-paragraph (a) (i) of the revised joint amendments (A/C.6/L.269/Rev.1 and Corr.1).

Point II, sub-paragraph (a) (i), was rejected by 25 votes to 20, with 8 abstentions.

52. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote point II, sub-paragraph (a) (iii) of the revised joint amendments (A/C.6/L.269/Rev.1 and Corr.1), as that sub-paragraph had been amended by the sponsors.

Point II, sub-paragraph (a) (iii), as amended, was rejected by 30 votes to 15, with 10 abstentions.

53. The CHAIRMAN said that a further vote on point II, sub-paragraph (a) (ii) would be redundant, since the Yugoslav amendment (A/C.6/L.274) had already been adopted.

54. Mr. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) said that he would be prepared to have a further vote on point II, sub-paragraph (a) (ii), since the whole purpose of his amendment had been defeated by the rejection of sub-paragraph (a) (i).

55. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) and Mr. CASTANEDA (Mexico) endorsed that statement.

56. Mr. VALLAT (United Kingdom) pointed out that the only words of point II, sub-paragraph (a) on which no vote had as yet been taken were "one of which shall include". He thought it would be improper to have a second vote on parts of a text which had already been adopted or rejected.

57. The CHAIRMAN agreed with the United Kingdom representative and called for a vote on the whole of point II, sub-paragraph (a), as amended, of the revised joint amendments (A/C.6/L.269/Rev.1 and Corr.1).

The whole of point II, sub-paragraph (a), as amended, was rejected by 26 votes to 23, with 5 abstentions.

58. Mr. SALAMANCA FIGUEROA (Bolivia) proposed that the vote should be taken again by roll-call, and Mr. EL-TANAMLI (Egypt) said that he had in fact asked for a roll-call vote before the voting had started.

59. Mr. MITCHELL (Liberia) objected to the proposal that a new vote should be taken.

60. After a brief discussion, the CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal to take a new vote by roll-call on point II, sub-paragraph (a), as amended, of the revised joint amendments (A/C.6/L.269/Rev.1 and Corr.1).

The proposal was rejected by 26 votes to 22, with 6 abstentions.

61. Mr. MOLINO (Panama) pointed out that the remaining two sub-paragraphs of point II of the revised joint amendments were meaningless without sub-paragraph (a), and he therefore proposed that the Committee should take no further votes on them but should revert to the original text of the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.265/Rev.1).

62. The CHAIRMAN put that proposal to the vote.

The proposal was adopted by 30 votes to 10, with 10 abstentions.

63. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Polish amendment (A/C.6/L.272) to replace the word "ninth" by the word "eighth" in paragraph 2 (a) of the revised joint draft resolution.

The amendment was rejected by 31 votes to 13, with 7 abstentions.

64. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Polish amendment (A/C.6/L.272) to replace the words "draft definition" in paragraph 2 (a) of the revised joint draft resolution.

The amendment was rejected by 32 votes to 7, with 12 abstentions.

65. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Polish amendment (A/C.6/L.272) to delete the words "or

draft statements of the notion of aggression" from paragraph 2 (a) of the revised joint draft resolution.

The amendment was rejected by 23 votes to 13, with 14 abstentions.

66. The CHAIRMAN said that there was no need to vote on the amendments (A/C.6/L.269/Rev.1 and A/C.6/L.272) to paragraph 3 of the revised joint draft resolution since the question had already been decided in the vote on the first Polish amendment (A/C.6/L.272) to paragraph 2 (a). He therefore called for a vote on the revised joint draft resolution as a whole.

67. Mr. VALLAT (United Kingdom) requested a separate vote on the words "on the assumption of a definition being adopted by a resolution of the General Assembly" at the end of paragraph 2 (b).

68. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on the second paragraph of the preamble and on paragraphs 2 (b) and 3 of the operative part.

69. Mr. TOUS (Ecuador) requested a roll-call vote on the second paragraph of the preamble.

70. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second paragraph, as amended, of the preamble to the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.265/Rev.1).

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Israel, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran.

Against: Luxembourg, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Belgium, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia.

Abstaining: New Zealand, Saudi Arabia, Syria, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Egypt, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Iraq.

The second paragraph of the preamble, as amended, was adopted by 35 votes to 8, with 12 abstentions.

71. Mr. TOUS (Ecuador) requested a roll-call vote on the words "on the assumption of a definition being adopted by a resolution of the General Assembly" at the end of paragraph 2 (b) of the revised joint draft resolution.

72. The CHAIRMAN put those words to the vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Peru, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Peru, Syria, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Burma, Chile, China, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Mexico, Netherlands.

Against: Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Denmark, Israel, Liberia, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Panama.

Abstaining: Poland, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, India, Nicaragua.

The words "on the assumption of a definition being adopted by a resolution of the General Assembly" were adopted by 20 votes to 15, with 19 abstentions.

73. Mr. TOUS (Ecuador) requested a roll-call vote on paragraph 2 (b).

74. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 2 (b) of the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.265/Rev.1).

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Chile, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Burma.

Against: Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Belgium, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Abstaining: Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Haiti, Honduras, India, Israel, Liberia, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada.

Paragraph 2 (b) was adopted by 26 votes to 6, with 22 abstentions.

75. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 3 of the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.265/Rev.1).

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 40 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

76. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the revised joint draft resolution as a whole (A/C.6/L.265/Rev.1), as amended.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Haiti, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Haiti, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala.

Against: Luxembourg, New Zealand, Sweden, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Brazil.

Abstaining: Honduras, India, Turkey, Venezuela, Argentina, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, France.

The revised joint draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 36 votes to 9, with 9 abstentions.

Election of a new Rapporteur

77. Mr. WIKBORG (Norway), Rapporteur, regretted that he would be obliged to leave for Norway on the following day and proposed that Mr. Rechen-dorff (Denmark) should be elected Rapporteur in his stead for the remainder of the session.

Mr. Rechen-dorff (Denmark) was elected Rapporteur by acclamation.

78. The CHAIRMAN welcomed the new Rapporteur and expressed the Committee's appreciation of the excellent work done by Mr. Wikborg.

79. Mr. RECHENDORFF (Denmark) thanked the Committee for the confidence it had shown in electing him Rapporteur and said that he would fulfil his duties to the best of his ability.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.