

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

FOURTEENTH SESSION  
Official Records



**SIXTH COMMITTEE, 638th  
MEETING**

Friday, 20 November 1959,  
at 3.25 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	Page
<i>Agenda item 56:</i>	
<i>Diplomatic intercourse and immunities (con- tinued) . . . . .</i>	203
<i>Tribute to the memory of Mr. Alfonso López, former President of Colombia. . . . .</i>	208

**Chairman:** Mr. Alberto HERRARTE (Guatemala),

**AGENDA ITEM 56**

Diplomatic intercourse and immunities (A/3859 and Corr.1, A/4164 and Add.1 to 7, A/C.6/L.455 and Add.1 to 3, A/C.6/L.456 and Add.1/Corr.1, A/C.6/L.457/Rev.1 and Add.1, A/C.6/L.458, A/C.6/L.459 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.6/L.460) (continued)

1. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) said that his delegation would have been prepared to accept the joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.455 and Add.1 to 3) but now found that the amendments proposed in document A/C.6/L.459 and Add.1 and 2 introduced new factors which should be considered before the General Assembly decided to call a conference of plenipotentiaries. The joint draft resolution referred to the convening of a conference to deal only with the topic of diplomatic intercourse and immunities. As the International Law Commission was studying the question of consular intercourse and immunities and would later be considering ad hoc diplomacy, the sponsors of the amendments had deemed it advisable that the General Assembly should have reports on those subjects before the conference convened so that it could consider all three subjects at once. If such an approach were adopted the results of the conference would be broader and more useful. His delegation was therefore inclined to accept the amendments concerned.

2. As to the two proposals made in documents A/C.6/L.456 and Add.1/Corr.1 and A/C.6/L.457/Rev.1 and Add.1 respectively, his delegation would support the former, as it was in accordance with previous United Nations practice and also avoided raising controversial political questions.

3. Mr. ROSENNE (Israel), exercising his right of reply in connexion with remarks attributed to him by speakers at the previous meeting, explained that in commenting on the proposals for operative paragraph 3 of the joint draft resolution he had simply wished to reserve his delegation's position on the question whether the two proposals to which he had referred (A/C.6/L.456 and Add.1/Corr.1 and A/C.6/L.457/Rev.1 and Add.1) were technically amendments to the joint draft resolution within the meaning of rule 131 of the rules of procedure. He wished it to be clearly understood that his delegation saw nothing improper in the actions of the sponsors of either of those documents.

4. He wished also to correct the impression he had apparently given that his delegation considered that the Sixth Committee could deal with topics such as consular intercourse and immunities and ad hoc diplomacy. In his statement at the 636th meeting, he had made no reference to ad hoc diplomacy as he had no views whatever on the problem in the absence of even a preliminary report from the Special Rapporteur of the International Law Commission on the subject. As for the question of consular intercourse and immunities, his delegation was anxious only that any decision that was taken by the Committee should not prevent the diplomatic conference from drafting, if necessary, a convention on consular intercourse and immunities at the same time as the convention on diplomatic intercourse and immunities, so that the holding of two diplomatic conferences would not become inevitable. If, however, the final draft on consular intercourse and immunities had not been received from the International Law Commission by 1961, he would agree that the conference should take place at any time thereafter to complete the convention on diplomatic intercourse and immunities. But his delegation had a completely open mind on the ultimate treatment of the problem of consular intercourse and immunities, pending the receipt of recommendations from the International Law Commission.

5. Mr. AMADO (Brazil) welcomed the Austrian Government's invitation to hold the proposed conference on diplomatic intercourse and immunities at Vienna. He would support any proposal to that effect.

6. Despite what the representatives of Ecuador and Colombia had said, he could not agree that the conference on diplomatic intercourse and immunities should be postponed until drafts on the other related subjects had been prepared. The General Assembly in adopting resolution 1288 (XIII) had already agreed that diplomatic intercourse and immunities should be the subject of a separate convention. His delegation's only doubt had been whether the Sixth Committee or a conference of plenipotentiaries would be the most suitable body to do the work.

7. Clearly the subject of diplomatic intercourse and immunities was ready for codification and it was the duty of States to codify international law. The subject was one where many customary rules already existed and that fact should make codification easy. The ease with which such a convention could be concluded was an argument in its favour, not against it as the Ecuadorian representative had maintained.

8. There were several objections to the inclusion of the topic of consular intercourse and immunities with that of diplomatic intercourse and immunities. One was that consular intercourse had been regulated largely by bilateral agreements and hence was not a subject of customary law. While in theory the two subjects might well be studied together, in practice they were essentially different and should be dealt with separately.

9. As to ad hoc diplomacy, there were reasons for believing that the subject was not suitable for codification. In any case, it was too early for a decision to be taken, as the subject was new and many States had not yet had time to interpret its meaning. He would therefore be unable to support the draft amendments (A/C.6/L.459 and Add.1 and 2).

10. The situation was clear. The Committee could take action on the draft it had before it, namely the draft articles on diplomatic intercourse and immunities (A/3859 and Corr.1, para. 53), and could take no action when it had no draft before it as was the case with the "other related matters". His delegation would therefore support the joint draft resolution.

11. As to participation in the conference, his delegation would support the proposal in document A/C.6/L.456 and Add.1/Corr.1 and reject that in document A/C.6/L.457/Rev.1 and Add.1, as the latter introduced factors which would give rise to numerous technical and political difficulties.

12. Mr. Maxwell COHEN (Canada) said that although his delegation had originally been prepared to support the text of the joint draft resolution, it had now decided to co-sponsor the draft amendments (A/C.6/L.459 and Add.1 and 2) for various practical and doctrinal reasons. There were five problems with which the Committee had to deal at the present time. The first was whether the convention should be drafted by a conference of plenipotentiaries or by the Sixth Committee convened as a conference. His delegation was now inclined to support the former view as regards a conference on diplomatic intercourse and immunities, leaving open the question of what body should examine the International Law Commission's future contributions that might require codification. If the Committee was to engage in conference work, and it was to be hoped that it would, some new organizational methods would have to be adopted as, for instance, the establishment of a standing drafting sub-committee of the Sixth Committee not solely for the purpose of dealing with possible conventions, but also to act as a clearing-house for resolutions transmitted to it by other Committees.

13. The second problem was whether diplomatic intercourse and immunities should be considered alone or in conjunction with the other related topics. In that connexion, the Polish representative had referred at the previous meeting to paragraph 37 of the International Law Commission's report on the work of its eleventh session (A/4169) but had not referred to paragraph 39 of that report which drew attention to the essential doctrinal unity between diplomatic intercourse and immunities and consular intercourse and immunities. Although it was true that there had been a tendency to regulate consular intercourse and immunities by means of bilateral agreements, there was none the less a high degree of uniformity between all such agreements, so that it should be possible to draft a convention on consular intercourse and immunities that would be of universal application. Furthermore, many States had ceased to make any distinction between their diplomatic and consular staffs, and receiving States had now frequently permitted sending States to list consular staff on the diplomatic list of the sending country.

14. The third problem was connected with the fact that a draft on diplomatic intercourse and immunities had already been prepared while no drafts on the other related subjects were ready. He failed to under-

stand why the question of diplomatic intercourse and immunities should be so urgent. Indeed, there was no need to exaggerate the importance of codification generally, particularly in a field where existing arrangements already worked perfectly well. Accordingly, the early completion of a draft on diplomatic intercourse and immunities was not so urgent as to outweigh the advantages to be gained from considering that subject in conjunction with consular intercourse and immunities and possibly with ad hoc diplomacy as well.

15. The fourth problem concerned the costs of holding either one or more conferences. It seemed, despite the statement made by the representative of the Secretary-General at the 633rd meeting, that the cost of a single conference to deal with all the related matters would be far below the cost of two conferences held at an interval of two or three years, particularly for the Governments taking part in the conferences. The extra cost involved in servicing a larger conference would still be less than the cost of servicing two smaller conferences. As to the time factor, it was unlikely that the General Assembly would have to wait as much as seven years, as the representative of the Secretary-General had suggested, for the completion of the draft on consular intercourse and immunities.

16. He wished to express his Government's appreciation of the Austrian Government's very generous offer regarding financial arrangements for the conference. He wondered, however, whether the Austrian offer covered the full eight-week period envisaged for the conference or only a shorter period.

17. Lastly there was the question of participation in the conference, and in that connexion his delegation would support the proposal made in document A/C.6/L.456 and Add.1/Corr.1, as it avoided raising embarrassing political considerations which should be avoided, particularly in connexion with the convening of a diplomatic conference of the kind envisaged.

18. The essential difference between the joint draft resolution and the draft amendments was the importance attached to doctrinal unity and the approach to economic factors and factors of administrative convenience and timing. As the only problems among those which require further discussion were the factors of administrative convenience and timing, he suggested that the conference should be convened at any event in January 1962, only eight months later than the time proposed in the joint draft resolution, and that the conference should study diplomatic intercourse and immunities and any other draft that might be ready at that time. Such a solution might, he hoped, bring the advocates of the various proposals closer together and with that end in view, he formally proposed that the meeting should be suspended briefly in an endeavour to reach agreement in private.

*The Canadian motion for suspension was rejected by 28 votes to 19, with 24 abstentions.*

19. Sir Gerald FITZMAURICE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had never dreamt of attributing sinister motives to the sponsors of the draft amendments (A/C.6/L.459 and Add.1 and 2), as it well understood both their concern with economy and their belief that the subjects of diplomatic intercourse and immunities and consular intercourse and immunities were closely related. So far as economy was con-

cerned, however, the generous offer of the Austrian Government had made it virtually impossible to follow the course suggested in those draft amendments. That offer, to bear the whole difference between the cost of a conference in New York and the cost of holding one at Vienna, had been specifically based on the figures set forth in the Secretary-General's note on financial implications (A/C.6/L.458). It assumed that the conference would deal solely with diplomatic intercourse and immunities. Any decision to expand the scope of the conference would inevitably increase the cost beyond the estimate set forth in the Secretary-General's note.

20. The United Kingdom delegation had always considered that the two subjects were closely related. A glance at the International Law Commission's draft on diplomatic intercourse and immunities (A/3859 and Corr.1, para. 53) and at the Special Rapporteur's proposals on consular law<sup>1</sup> immediately revealed several areas where the two subjects impinged upon each other. As the Polish representative had stated (637th meeting), however, they were distinct in their origin. Diplomatic intercourse had always been governed by customary international law, merely supplemented by certain conventions, and some international rules thereon had existed since the very dawn of international relations. Consular intercourse, on the other hand, had always been governed by national laws and bilateral arrangements and thus far had never been regulated on a truly international basis. In seeking to draft some general rules on the subject, the Special Rapporteur had had to extract common features from those laws and arrangements and thus to determine certain standards which might receive general acceptance.

21. For those reasons, the United Kingdom delegation had felt from the outset that it would be preferable to deal with the parent topic of diplomatic intercourse separately and to take up consular law at a later stage. Nor would it depart from that opinion so long as the only choice was between the joint draft resolution and the draft amendments. The Canadian representative's suggestion, however, deserved consideration. The United Kingdom delegation, for one, had agreed to sponsor the joint draft resolution mainly in the hope that a conference on diplomatic intercourse would be held at a reasonably early date; but it held no strong views as to the precise moment at which that conference should begin, since a few months seemed of relatively slight importance. The Canadian representative had suggested that the Committee should adhere to the decision that a conference on diplomatic intercourse must be held, but that it should change the date to early 1962 and leave the General Assembly free to decide, for example in 1961, that the preparatory work on consular intercourse was sufficiently advanced to warrant the final codification of the relevant rules at the same conference. The Canadian suggestion might perhaps involve certain mechanical difficulties, such as the automatic prolongation of the conference, with a resulting increase in cost, and it might also place the General Assembly in a somewhat awkward situation *vis à vis* the Austrian Government. On the other hand, the principle of that suggestion seemed almost wholly

unexceptionable. It would tend to reconcile differing views and thus avoid the possibility that a very early conference was imposed on some States which did not desire it. The Canadian representative's main concern was apparently not to preclude in advance the possibility that the conference would also consider consular intercourse, as it was still possible that the draft thereon might be ready before the conference met. In those circumstances, the Canadian suggestion perhaps revealed the possibility of a compromise.

22. Mr. ESCOBAR (Colombia) said that the Cambodian representative's novel approach to the discussion had left the Colombian delegation somewhat perplexed; the statements themselves appeared both innocent and non-committal, but they could at least be construed as a reproach to those who did not share that representative's views. The Colombian delegation, for its part, believed that the best weapons in a United Nations debate were directness and clarity, coupled with a genuine desire to promote the welfare of the international community.

23. Much had already been said regarding the relationship between diplomatic intercourse and consular intercourse. The existence of that relationship was fully confirmed in the International Law Commission's report, and the United Kingdom representative had himself conceded that it was beyond dispute. Even the Polish representative's brilliant statement at the preceding meeting, thought designed to prove precisely the opposite, had shown that diplomatic relations, consular relations and *ad hoc* diplomacy all fell within a common pattern. The Polish representative had also argued, not without force, that diplomatic relations had always been governed by multilateral instruments while consular intercourse had always been regulated by bilateral agreements. That historical fact, however, was no compelling reason for perpetuating the situation and for refusing to have both subjects duly covered in a single convention.

24. The assertion that the draft amendments were incompatible with General Assembly resolution 1288 (XIII) seemed unjustified, for in reality those amendments merely sought to develop the resolution. There was certainly no intention to go back on the General Assembly's decision that a convention on diplomatic intercourse and immunities should be concluded at an early date. The sponsors of the draft amendments merely believed that 1963 was early enough, and that the conference to which the elaboration of the convention would be entrusted should be given the opportunity to draw up additional provisions on related topics. Clearly, therefore, the draft amendments had not been presented with any ulterior motive in view, and the good will of its sponsors could not be seriously questioned. The essential differences between the draft resolution and the draft amendments were the date of the conference and the fact that under the draft amendments the conference would deal with more than one restricted subject. The sponsors of the draft amendments had never lost sight of the fact that the draft on diplomatic intercourse was already available, whereas the one on consular intercourse was in course of preparation; they had suggested 1963 as the proper time for the conference precisely in order to give the International Law Commission and Governments a proper opportunity to complete the preliminary study on consular law.

<sup>1</sup>/Yearbook of the International Law Commission, 1957, Vol. II (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 1957.V.5, Vol.II), document A/CN.4/108.



25. The Polish representative had also implied that it might be imprudent to call a conference on partly unascertained subjects. According to that argument, the rules on consular intercourse fell within the province of the progressive development of international law and, consequently, a duly concluded convention on diplomatic relations would facilitate that development process. That argument was substantially true, but the lessons to be drawn from the drafting of the diplomatic articles would be fully taken into account by the International Law Commission before its completion of the consular draft. Most of the work of co-ordination would thus be done in advance of the conference.

26. Nor was it true to say that the adoption of the draft amendments would make the holding of the conference conditional. The general purport of those amendments was simply that the conference should deal with diplomatic intercourse and immunities, on which a draft already existed, and with consular intercourse and immunities, on which the Commission's early report could be expected with virtual certainty. The reference to other subjects on which the Commission's studies might be ready in time had been inserted only in order to give the conference some latitude to examine such relevant material.

27. The Colombian delegation had stressed from the beginning that there was no urgent need for a conference in 1961. Diplomatic intercourse was in no way a source of controversy, States being willing to accept the established customary rules, the Vienna Regulation of 1815 and the Havana Convention of 1928. The desperate haste advocated by the sponsors of the joint draft resolution thus seemed difficult to explain. Another reason for a short postponement was the need to avoid several successive conferences. Such a procedure, if followed, would set an unfortunate precedent, for the Sixth Committee might in future be tempted to refer everything to conferences without ever going into the substance of an issue itself. If the calling of special conferences became too common a practice, the prestige of the United Nations would inevitably suffer.

28. The suggestion that the draft amendments had not been intended as a compromise was refuted by the text itself. The preamble of the joint draft resolution was maintained in full, with two additional preambular paragraphs merely affirming the stated opinion of the International Law Commission. Operative paragraph 1 would similarly be retained, but would merely call on the conference to consider a wider subject. The remainder of the draft resolution, with only a change of date in operative paragraph 2 and a small consequential amendment in operative paragraph 7, would remain intact.

29. So far as the site of the conference was concerned, the Colombian delegation had had no special preference. In view of the Austrian Government's generous offer, however, he could only rejoice that the problem had been happily solved.

30. With reference to the question of participation, he had already expressed certain doubts regarding the nature of the proposals made in documents A/C.6/L.456 and Add.1/Corr.1 and A/C.6/L.457/Rev.1 and Add.1. He could not agree with the representative of Ceylon that those proposals were genuine amendments, within the meaning of rule 131 of the rules of procedure. An amendment could be presented only

to an existing text, while operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution had been left blank.

31. Mr. DOUC RASY (Cambodia) said that he had hesitated to speak again at the present stage of the debate, but the Colombian representative's accusations were too serious to leave unanswered. It had been implied that the Cambodian delegation had shown itself intolerant of opposing views. Since the beginning of the discussion, his delegation at all times had been extremely careful in its approach to the principles on which the Committee was divided. On many occasions, in analyzing the problems before the Committee, he had eliminated everything which might make it difficult and awkward to discuss them. He had, on many occasions, raised problems which he had deliberately left open, because the responsibility for settling them rested with the Committee. He would say no more, since he felt that the Committee itself would be the best judge.

32. Mr. CALICE (Austria), replying to a question raised by the Canadian representative, said that his Government's offer had been based on the conditions set forth in paragraph 6 of the Secretary-General's note (A/C.6/L.458), which provided for a conference to be held in March and April 1961. If the Committee should decide on different conditions, his Government would have to give further consideration to the matter in the light of the new circumstances.

33. Mr. ZEPOS (Greece) said that the arguments hitherto advanced in the discussion had not persuaded him to abandon his support of the joint draft resolution and the proposal submitted in document A/C.6/L.456 and Add.1/Corr.1, of which his delegation was a co-sponsor.

34. Mr. LACHS (Poland) said, in reply to the Canadian representative, that he had not distorted the International Law Commission's report (A/4169), but had merely tried to indicate that in paragraph 37 the Commission had not committed itself as to the form which the codification of consular intercourse and immunities would take. In his reference to paragraph 39, he had merely meant to say that although it was desirable that the draft articles on diplomatic intercourse and immunities and consular intercourse and immunities should be brought into concordance as regards both substance and structure, that did not imply that they would have to be drafted simultaneously.

35. Mr. SMALL (New Zealand) said that his delegation had originally desired that the convention on diplomatic intercourse and immunities should be drafted by the Sixth Committee itself, but had since been impressed by the cogent arguments advanced by the delegations which favoured the convocation of a conference. It had been particularly interested in the question of the relative advantages and disadvantages of holding a large combined conference which would deal both with the present articles on diplomatic intercourse and immunities and the draft articles on consular intercourse and immunities. Earlier in the current session, however, the very valid point had been made that the Sixth Committee was in duty bound to exercise extreme care when deciding whether to adopt a particular course of action which might affect the work of the International Law Commission. His delegation, therefore, had been convinced that the Commission should proceed with the codification of one subject at a time and had therefore supported

General Assembly resolution 1288 (XIII), which had been confined to the one subject of diplomatic intercourse and immunities.

36. Some delegations had laid emphasis on the doctrinal unity of the two subjects of diplomatic intercourse and immunities and consular intercourse and immunities, but his delegation had been more impressed by the argument advanced at the 637th meeting by the representative of Poland, who had effectively demonstrated that there was a difference between the customary and multilateral development of the law of diplomatic intercourse on the one hand and what could be called the predominantly bilateral creation of consular institutions on the other. His delegation, therefore, had the gravest misgivings about the advisability of treating the two subjects together.

37. The factor of costs was also something which could not be disregarded. It had become fairly clear that if a combined conference were held, it would be necessary for two committees to sit simultaneously and that the conference would extend longer than the eight weeks' period which had been originally envisaged for the conference on diplomatic intercourse and immunities alone. On balance, therefore, it could not be presumed that any saving would be made either for the United Nations or for any Member State, as the result of holding a combined conference. His delegation could not support the draft amendments (A/C.6/L.459 and Add.1 and 2), but would vote in favour of the joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.455 and Add.1 to 3).

38. Mr. Benjamin COHEN (Chile) explained that his delegation did not favour the convocation of a conference of plenipotentiaries but preferred, in the interests of continuity, that the Sixth Committee should itself undertake the necessary work of codification. He was therefore submitting a text (A/C.6/L.460) to replace the operative paragraphs of the joint draft resolution.

39. At the request of Mr. MAURTUA (Peru), the CHAIRMAN put to the vote the question whether the Chilean amendment (A/C.6/L.460) should be voted on at the meeting.

*The Committee decided to vote upon the Chilean amendment by a vote of 50 in favour, 11 against, with 13 abstentions.*

*At the request of the United States representative, a vote was taken by roll-call on paragraph 2 of the Chilean amendment.*

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

In favour: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti,

Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand.

Abstaining: Turkey, Union of South Africa, Burma, Cambodia, Colombia, Cuba, Ethiopia, Jordan, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Tunisia.

*Paragraph 2 of the Chilean amendment was rejected by 41 votes to 24, with 12 abstentions.*

*The remainder of the Chilean amendment was rejected by 54 votes to 6, with 18 abstentions.*

40. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft amendments (A/C.6/L.459 and Add.1 and 2).

*At the request of the representative of India, a vote was taken by roll-call on paragraph 2 of the draft amendments.*

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

In favour: Finland, France, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Liberia, Nicaragua, Norway, Philippines, Sweden, Turkey, Uruguay, Australia, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador.

Against: Greece, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Federation of Malaya.

Abstaining: Guinea, Honduras, Iran, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Panama, Peru, Thailand, Union of South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia.

*Paragraph 2 of the draft amendments was rejected by 39 votes to 25, with 14 abstentions.*

41. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that paragraph 2 of the draft amendments had been the key paragraph of the amendments; since that paragraph had been rejected, it hardly seemed necessary to vote on the remaining ones.

42. Mr. PERERA (Ceylon) supported the Soviet representative.

43. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to decide whether the remaining paragraphs of the draft amendments (A/C.6/L.459 and Add.1 and 2) should be voted on.

*The Committee decided not to vote on the remaining paragraphs by 49 votes to 1, with 22 abstentions.*

44. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal contained in document A/C.6/L.456 and Add.1/Corr.1.

*At the request of the United States representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.*

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

In favour: Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania.

Abstaining: Colombia, Cuba, Ethiopia, Jordan, Libya, Peru, Portugal.

*The proposal contained in document A/C.6/L.456 and Add.1/Corr.1 was adopted by 51 votes to 21, with 7 abstentions.*

45. The CHAIRMAN said that as a result of the preceding vote, it would not be necessary to vote on the proposal contained in document A/C.6/L.457/Rev.1 and Add.1.

46. He put to the vote the joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.455 and Add.1 to 3), with the exception of the place where the conference was to be held.

*At the request of the Libyan representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.*

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

In favour: Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand.

Against: Peru.

Abstaining: United States of America, Australia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Haiti, Israel.

*The joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.455 and Add.1 to 3) was adopted by 67 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.*

47. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the place where the conference would be held.

48. Mrr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested that a vote should first be taken on Vienna as a site for the conference.

*Vienna was adopted as the site of the conference by 70 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.*

49. Mr. MAURTUA (Peru) said in explanation of his vote on the joint draft resolution, that he had been unable to vote for that resolution because it ignored the fundamental unity which existed between the subjects of diplomatic intercourse and immunities and consular intercourse and immunities, an idea which had been well expressed in operative paragraph 1 of the draft amendments.

50. Mr. ROSENNE (Israel) said that he had voted in favour of holding the conference at Vienna as an acknowledgement of the Austrian Government's generous gesture in offering to defray part of the conference's expenses if its capital were selected as the site. In explanation of his abstention from voting on the joint draft resolution, he wished to place on record his regret that it had not been possible to reach agreement on a compromise date for the conference in view of the fact that the draft amendments had been supported by no less than twenty-five delegations.

51. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Pakistan) said that he too had voted in favour of Vienna as the site for the conference out of gratitude for the generous gesture of the Austrian Government.

#### Tribute to the memory of Mr. Alfonso López, former President of Colombia

52. Mr. Benjamín COHEN (Chile) announced the death of Mr. Alfonso López, former President of Colombia and representative of his country in the United Nations.

*On the proposal of the Chairman, the members of the Committee observed a minute of silence in tribute to the memory of Mr. Alfonso López.*

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.