

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWELFTH SESSION

Official Records

Tuesday, 12 November 1957,  
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Agenda items 30 and 31:  |      |
| Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (continued)                                    |      |
| Review of the arrangements for the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (continued) |      |
| Consideration of draft resolutions (continued) . . .   | 231  |

**Chairman:** Mrs. Aase LIONAES (Norway).

## AGENDA ITEMS 30 AND 31

**Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (A/3585/Rev.1 and Add.1, A/3613, chap. VI, sect. IV, A/C.3/L.639/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.643) (continued)**

**Review of the arrangements for the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (continued)**

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.3/L.639/REV.1, A/C.3/L.643) (continued)**

1. Mr. DELHAYE (Belgium) referred to his country's interest in humanitarian problems, particularly those concerning refugees. Belgium was giving material support to many different international benevolent activities.

2. With regard to the Chinese refugees in Hong Kong, his delegation would give evidence of its compassion for them by voting in favour of the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.643) concerning them. Referring to the statements of the representatives of the United States and France (807th meeting), among others, he stressed, however, that his vote could not in any way be interpreted as a financial commitment on behalf of the Belgian Government. Moreover, the Parliament was alone competent to take decisions in regard to public finances.

3. Mrs. QUART (Canada) said that her Government gave sympathetic consideration to the situation of the Chinese refugees and the efforts of the local authorities but its support of the draft resolution implied no financial commitment at the current stage. It hoped, however, that the appeal would not fall on deaf ears.

4. Mrs. TOLBERT (Liberia) said that her delegation appreciated the High Commissioner's work in behalf of refugees and would support any resolution that tended to alleviate their plight. She supported the Saudi Arabian representative's oral amendment (807th meeting) to the draft resolution and endorsed the United States representative's explanation that no financial commitments were involved in voting in favour of the three-

Power draft; nevertheless, every effort should be made to improve the lot of the refugees.

5. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) said that his delegation's position was based on paragraph 11 of of the High Commissioner's report (A/3585/Rev.1) and paragraphs 110, 111 and 113 of the report of the United Nations Refugee Fund (UNREF) Executive Committee on its fourth session (A/3585/Rev.1, annex). The question was a humanitarian and non-political matter and praise was due to the Hong Kong authorities for their action in facing a situation which had grown beyond the resources available. The draft resolution (A/C.3/L.643) was intended to enlist world-wide support. His delegation was glad that the Saudi Arabian oral amendment had been accepted by the sponsors (807th meeting) and would vote for the draft resolution, on the understanding that it implied no financial commitments.

6. Mr. PYMAN (Australia) said he hoped that the Committee would adopt the draft resolution by an overwhelming majority, in order to express the United Nations concern about the plight of the Hong Kong refugees. His delegation had had doubts, for practical reasons, about including any reference to the High Commissioner in the draft resolution. Those doubts arose from the High Commissioner's existing commitments and the belief that the United Kingdom and Hong Kong authorities could deal with the situation, given the necessary support. His delegation hoped that the draft resolution would receive strong support on the understanding that, as had been said by a number of representatives, Governments supporting the draft resolution were not necessarily being involved in a commitment to provide financial or other assistance. Constitutional provisions, such as the requirement of parliamentary approval, prevented many Governments from undertaking such commitments in advance.

7. Mr. HANCKE (Norway) said that his delegation would be able to vote in favour of the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.643), on the understanding that no government commitments for material support were entailed.

8. Mr. KRAJEWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation regarded the so-called problem of the Hong Kong refugees as a phenomenon of economically-prompted migration and rapid urbanization, similar to many cases observed all over the world, in which the High Commissioner's intervention had not been sought. He could see no possibility of solving the problem without the participation of the People's Republic of China, which was the State most directly concerned. He would vote against the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.643).

9. Mr. EFFENDI NUR (Indonesia) said that, although his delegation was in sympathy with the underlying

purposes of the draft resolution, it considered that the effect of the adoption of the draft would be to discriminate in favour of the Chinese refugees in Hong Kong, and against refugees in other parts of the world. It would be better not to single out that category, but to refer to them in the thirteen-Power draft resolution. His Government, moreover, was unable to make any material contribution, and would therefore abstain from voting on the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.643).

10. Mr. COX (Peru) said he would vote for the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.643), as an expression of sympathy to human beings who had been forced to leave their country. Owing to its own economic commitments, Peru could not undertake any financial obligations, but would support the draft resolution in order to show that all refugees deserved the Committee's attention.

11. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) said she would vote for the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.643), on the understanding that the Chinese refugees in Hong Kong would not be placed under the High Commissioner's mandate. She regretted that the secondary question of the heavy burden placed upon the Government of Hong Kong had been mentioned in the draft; the main point was that hundreds of thousands of human beings should receive the assistance they needed. Unfortunately, her Government was unable to pledge any material support.

12. Mr. AGOLLI (Albania) considered that the overwhelming majority of the Chinese in Hong Kong could not be regarded as refugees, and could not therefore be placed under the High Commissioner's mandate. The question had been raised for political reasons and had nothing to do with humanitarian refugee problems. He would vote against the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.643).

13. The CHAIRMAN put the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.643) to the vote.

The draft resolution was adopted by 43 votes to 10, with 14 abstentions.

14. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the revised thirteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.639/Rev.1) and the amendments to it.

15. Mrs. ROSSEL (Sweden), observed that the Greek representative's statement at the previous meeting that paragraph 5 combined both the advisory and the executive functions of the proposed new Executive Committee was purely formal and appealed to him not to press that argument.

16. With regard to his assertion that the terms of reference of the UNREF Executive Committee were not taken up in the joint draft resolution, she pointed out that the UNREF Executive Committee had been set up to deal with a previously defined programme, whereas the new committee would take action on programmes still to be planned. Nevertheless, the contingencies covered by Economic and Social Council resolution 565 (XIX) were largely reproduced in the thirteen-Power draft. Thus, the provisions of paragraph 1 A (a) of resolution 565 (XIX) were covered by paragraph 5 (c), paragraph 1 A (b) by paragraphs 5 (c) and (f) and paragraph 8, and paragraph 1 A (c) by paragraphs 5 (c) and (d); paragraphs 1 A (d) and (h) contained general provisions, which had not been restated; paragraphs A (e), (f), (g) and (i) were covered by paragraphs 8 and 10 of the new draft, and paragraph 1 B by paragraph 5 (b).

17. In the debate, some delegations had expressed the opinion that not enough attention had been paid to voluntary repatriation. The sponsors of the draft resolution had merely broadened the scope of material assistance to the High Commissioner's Office, but had not in any way revised his Statute (General Assembly resolution 428 (V), annex). They had assumed that a reference to repatriation in the preamble would constitute adequate recognition of that aspect. The introduction of the six-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.641), however, had shown that concern was still shown on the subject and, in a spirit of conciliation, the sponsors had inserted a new operative paragraph 2, restating paragraph 1 of the High Commissioner's Statute, in the hope that the six Powers would withdraw their amendment. The High Commissioner was bound, under his Statute, not to "encourage" various solutions, but to "facilitate" them. "Encouragement" would involve the High Commissioner in political decisions, whereas his activities must depend on the measures taken by the countries of asylum and of immigration and, above all, on the freely expressed will of the refugees themselves. The High Commissioner could not encourage any one of the three solutions at the expense of the others.

18. The Syrian representative had suggested (807th meeting) that the word "promotion" could be used instead of "facilitation", but the sponsors considered that that word implied even more compulsion than "encouragement". They appreciated the spirit of compromise that had prompted that suggestion, but considered it most important that the High Commissioner should not be forced to make any political decisions.

19. Furthermore, the six-Power amendment, through its reference to paragraph 1 of the thirteen-Power draft, applied only to the existing UNREF programme, and thus entailed the incorrect principle of relating voluntary repatriation only to the unsettled European refugees. Secondly, contributions to UNREF had already been made for a specific programme already planned by the High Commissioner, and it would be unwarranted for the General Assembly to modify that programme on an *ex post facto* basis.

20. With regard to paragraph 5 of the new text, she said that the sponsors wanted the new Committee to have a broad international basis and to expand the scope of refugee assistance within the framework of the United Nations. That was why they proposed that the Committee should consist of many kinds of States, not only countries in different parts of the world, but the countries most directly interested in the High Commissioner's work, such as countries of first asylum, countries of immigration and countries which, for humanitarian or religious reasons, wished to give their support or material aid. It was to be hoped that wide representation could be achieved since, if twenty-five countries were to be represented, nearly one-third of the Member States would be included. The stipulation that a certain interest should be shown in the work was necessary, for the alternative was to include countries which were not interested in helping the High Commissioner to find solutions.

21. With regard to points 2 and 3 of the Saudi Arabian amendments (A/C.3/L.642), she pointed out that they drew no clear line of responsibility for the liquidation of UNREF between the proposed new Executive Com-

mittee and the High Commissioner's Office. There was every reason to believe that the existing close co-operation between the High Commissioner and the Executive Committee would continue, but it was essential to make it quite clear with whom the final decision would rest in the event of disagreement; the sponsors of the joint draft believed that it should be for the proposed new Executive Committee to take that decision, because its collective judgement reflected the opinion of the United Nations to a large extent and because the High Commissioner should not be called upon to bear the onus of possibly contentious decisions. If the Saudi Arabian amendments were adopted, the High Commissioner might be made a scapegoat for decisions which should properly only be taken by representatives of Governments.

22. Mr. SAMY (Egypt) said that his Government had had to spend vast sums on Arab refugees in the Gaza Strip and had been unable to help European refugees. It was, none the less, sincerely concerned with the fate of all the refugees everywhere, both those who were within the High Commissioner's mandate and those who were not.

23. The High Commissioner and his staff had shown themselves capable of dealing efficiently with the refugee question, with the able assistance of the UNREF Executive Committee. The High Commissioner should be able to count on such assistance in the future, since it would not be suitable for him to accept great responsibility without the advice of the countries which furnished aid to the refugees and since such countries were entitled to control of the use of the moneys they had themselves contributed. He therefore supported the draft resolution.

24. Mrs. HAIKAL (Jordan) commended the High Commissioner for having approached the matter of the Hungarian refugees in a wholly humanitarian and objective manner.

25. Now that the reference to selection of members of the proposed Executive Committee "on the widest possible geographical basis" had been included in paragraph 5 of the thirteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.639/Rev.1), an equally objective approach to future refugee situations seemed to be guaranteed and she would therefore support the draft resolution.

26. With reference to the joint amendment (A/C.3/L.641), she said that it was important to incorporate in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution a reaffirmation of the basic principle of the Statute of the High Commissioner's Office regarding permanent solutions. She fully agreed with the High Commissioner that one of his functions was to ensure the widest possible freedom of choice on the part of the refugees. However, she also agreed that the principle of voluntary repatriation should not be applied to children whose parents had remained in their country of origin. The children were too young to make a choice for themselves, and the High Commissioner should take steps to reunite them with their families.

27. She took exception, from a purely humanitarian point of view, to the Israel representative's recent statement (804th meeting) that the Israel Government's main contribution had been to accept some European refugees for resettlement. The High Commissioner should in future object on moral grounds to any contribution towards the welfare of some refugees which

made it impossible for other refugees ever to return to the land of their ancestors.

28. Mrs. SHOHAM-SHARON (Israel) remarked that, in spite of repeated protestations to the contrary, representatives of the Arab States had on several occasions seen fit to bring up the question of the Palestine refugees.

29. She wished to correct a misquotation of her recent statement; she had said that unfortunately her Government could not increase its contribution to UNREF because of the heavy burden it had assumed in looking after thousands of refugees who had previously been under the High Commissioner's mandate. The immigration policy of her country was wholly an internal matter. Furthermore, Israel was in no way responsible for the creation of the Palestine refugee problem. She pointed out that nearly 500,000 persons from Arab countries had come to Israel in the past few years.

30. Mr. EL-FARRA (Syria) pointed out that the phrase "promotion of permanent solutions" was to be found in two earlier General Assembly resolutions on refugees (resolutions 727 (VIII) and 832 (IX)), and that, moreover, the word "promote" was used repeatedly in paragraph 8 of the Statute, which set forth the specific functions of the High Commissioner. He therefore pressed his proposal that the High Commissioner should be asked to "promote", rather than merely "facilitate", permanent solutions for refugees.

31. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) said that the great success achieved by the High Commissioner's Office in providing permanent solutions for the Hungarian refugees made her all the more conscious of the fact that similar swift action had not been forthcoming in the case of the earlier refugees. She was glad the draft resolution emphasized the UNREF programme on behalf of those unfortunate persons. She also supported the provision for dealing with future refugee situations as they arose.

32. She had certain reservations about the arrangement whereby the High Commissioner should be assisted by an Executive Committee. The Statute provided for a purely advisory committee, and she had never understood why the Economic and Social Council had seen fit to endow it also with some functions of control. Moreover, she would prefer that the General Assembly itself, rather than the Council, with its restricted and therefore not fully representative composition, should establish the number of members of the proposed Executive Committee, and she would prefer that number to be twenty-five. Accordingly, she asked that a separate vote should be taken on the words "from twenty to" in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution:

33. Since there might be new groups of refugees anywhere at any time, the proposed Executive Committee should be truly representative; she was pleased that paragraph 5 now contained a reference to the election of its members on the widest possible geographical basis. One disadvantage of the criteria for membership set forth in that paragraph was that the countries from which the refugees came might find themselves not represented on the Committee; yet, since voluntary repatriation was one of the permanent solutions envisaged, their participation would be highly desirable.

34. Under the Statute, in order to qualify as a refugee a person had to have left his country for political reasons; consequently, unaccompanied children could not properly be regarded as refugees, and they should be sent to their parents rather than resettled in foreign countries. Their right to grow up on their own soil under the care of their own families must be safeguarded by the High Commissioner. She pointed out that resettlement was hardly ever voluntary; in practice, it was not the refugee who chose the country of resettlement; the country chose him. Those who stressed that the repatriation, even of young children, must be voluntary, should bear that consideration in mind.

35. Mrs. QUART (Canada), speaking as co-sponsor of the thirteen-Power draft resolution, said that the sponsors had welcomed the Dominican amendment (805th meeting) to paragraph 1 (b), whereby the High Commissioner would appeal to States, rather than renew appeals already made, and also the Venezuelan amendment (A/C.3/L.640) adding a paragraph on financial rules.

36. With regard to the six-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.641), the sponsors of the draft resolution had included a new paragraph restating the terms of the High Commissioner's Statute which should be acceptable to the six Powers. It was hoped that the latter would withdraw their amendment.

37. The sponsors had thought that point 1 of the Saudi Arabian amendments (A/C.3/L.642) had been met by the inclusion of the phrase "on the widest possible geographical basis" in paragraph 5, making it clear that geographical distribution would be taken into account, although it was imperative that the members of the Executive Committee should represent interested countries. The range of those States was not necessarily static, since new refugee problems might arise and any State might decide at any time to take more interest in refugee problems than it had done previously. Accordingly, the membership of the Committee had been deliberately made flexible.

38. The thirteen Powers had, however, been unable to accept the Saudi Arabian amendment replacing the words "give directives to" by the words "discuss with". The Canadian delegation considered it important for some body to be authorized by the General Assembly to give the High Commissioner directives with regard to the disposal of funds; it was logical for the new Executive Committee to take those functions over from the UNREF Executive Committee, whose arrangements had worked satisfactorily.

39. In conclusion, she said that her Government, which had been unable to make a specific pledge to UNREF when the opportunity had been given to delegations some time previously, was now in a position to announce that, subject to parliamentary approval, it would contribute \$200,000 to UNREF in 1958.

40. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia) proposed that, for the reasons given by the Syrian representative (807th meeting), the word "facilitate" in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution should be replaced by "promote". In actual practice, much more had been done to resettle refugees than to repatriate them; paragraph 2, however, laid equal stress on both solutions, and he failed to see why there should be any objection to both solutions being promoted. Certainly the repa-

triation of young children should be promoted, rather than merely facilitated. If the sponsors of the thirteen-Power draft resolution refused to accept that change, he would re-introduce, as his own amendment, the new paragraph contained in document A/C.3/L.639/Add.1, with the substitution of the word "promotion" for the word "facilitation".

41. Having heard the explanations of the Swedish and Canadian representatives on the meaning of the word "directives" as used in the draft resolution, he was prepared to withdraw points 2 and 3 of his amendments (A/C.3/L.642), provided that the words "with terms of reference as set forth below" were inserted after the words "the High Commissioner's Programme" in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution. That addition would make it clear that the proposed new Executive Committee was entitled to give directives only with regard to the matters mentioned in paragraphs 5 (a) and (f).

42. He thanked the sponsors for accepting his suggestion that the new Executive Committee should be elected with due regard to geographical distribution. The draft resolution was more free from political bias than the resolutions of previous years, and he would be glad to vote for it if his amendments were accepted.

43. He asked the Secretariat by what procedure the Economic and Social Council would elect the members of the proposed new Executive Committee.

44. Mr. VAKIL (Secretary of the Committee) replied that the Council would elect the members of the Committee by secret ballot.

45. Mrs. ELLIOT (United Kingdom) thanked the Saudi Arabian representative for his readiness to make concessions, but pointed out that the sponsors of the draft resolution had also done their best to meet his views. On their behalf, she accepted the insertion he had suggested in paragraph 5, so that the only point of disagreement was the use of the word "facilitate" in paragraph 2. That word was to be found in paragraph 1 of the High Commissioner's Statute, and was the only word used to describe the High Commissioner's actions in placing the alternative permanent solutions before the refugees; she hoped that the word would therefore be generally acceptable and that the draft resolution would receive unanimous support.

46. Mr. AGOLLI (Albania) said that the word "promote" was obviously preferable to the word "facilitate". Although the latter was to be found in paragraph 1 of the High Commissioner's Statute, the word "promote" was used in paragraph 8 (c), which laid upon the High Commissioner the obligation of "assisting governmental and private efforts to promote voluntary repatriation or assimilation within new national communities".

47. Mr. ROSSIDES (Greece) thanked the Swedish representative for her explanation concerning operative paragraph 5. Although it might have been more advisable to establish a clear demarcation between the executive and advisory functions of the new Committee, he would not press the point, as the sponsors obviously wished it to have much the same powers as the present UNREF Executive Committee.

48. There was, however, some confusion with regard to the functions of the new committee. As the Swedish

representative had explained, the power to give directives to the High Commissioner, specified in paragraph 1 A (a) of Council resolution 565 (XIX), was partly covered by paragraph 5 (a) but mainly by paragraph 5 (c) of the thirteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.639/Rev.1); but in the latter case, the power was advisory and not executive, as it had been in the Council resolution. In that case, the High Commissioner himself, and not the committee, would be responsible for decisions to suspend or cancel programmes, which would be most undesirable, first, because it would be an undemocratic procedure and, secondly, because it might place the High Commissioner in a difficult position with regard to the countries concerned.

49. The responsibility for such decisions should be taken by an international body, but under paragraph 5 (c), the new committee would be empowered only to advise the High Commissioner. The Greek delegation therefore proposed that the words "To advise", at the beginning of 5 (c), should be replaced by the words "To give directives to".

50. There was another disturbing point. In response to a request from the General Assembly (resolution 832 (IX)), the Economic and Social Council had established the UNREF Executive Committee, which was "responsible for giving directives to the High Commissioner... and for exercising the necessary controls in the use of funds". The Council had been left free to define the powers of the Executive Committee, which it had done in resolution 565 (XIX). In the case of the new committee, however, the Council's hands would be tied by the proposed resolution, in which the committee's powers were defined. He wondered whether it would not be wiser to leave the decision on the committee's powers to the discretion of the Council, but he would not press the point.

51. It could not be maintained that the power to exercise the necessary controls in the use of funds, defined in paragraph 1 A (e) of Council resolution 565 (XIX), was covered by the reference, in operative paragraph 8 of the thirteen-Power draft resolution, to the Financial Regulations of the United Nations. The draft resolution was therefore defective in that respect.

52. Miss MacENTEE (Ireland) said that, if she had understood the intentions of the sponsors, the Council was to decide upon a membership of between twenty and twenty-five for the new committee, in the light of the circumstances existing at the time. If that was so, the second sentence of operative paragraph 5 should be amended slightly to read "This Committee shall consist of the representatives of from twenty to twenty-five of the States Members...".

53. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would make the necessary changes.

54. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) said that the Third Committee should state its wishes with regard to membership of the new committee clearly, so that the Council would have no difficulty in interpreting them. Furthermore, it was obviously desirable for the membership to be as wide as possible, so as to ensure not only geographical representation, but the co-operation of as many countries as possible. She urged the sponsors of the draft resolution to specify twenty-five members in operative paragraph

5, in which case there would be no necessity for a separate vote on the words "from twenty to", proposed by the Iraqi representative.

55. Mr. MEANY (United States of America) said that the Irish representative's interpretation was correct. The aim had been a certain elasticity and no definite number of members had been specified, the Council thus being left free to make whatever decision seemed appropriate in the circumstances. He could not accept the Dominican representative's suggestion that the text should specify a membership of twenty-five.

56. Replying to the Greek representative, he said that paragraph 5 (c) should be read in conjunction with paragraphs 5 (d) and (e). It would then be seen that executive functions, namely those of authorizing the High Commissioner to make appeals for funds and of approving projects for assistance to refugees coming within the scope of sub-paragraph (c), were combined with the advisory function referred to in sub-paragraph (c). It was obvious that the Committee would not exercise its powers under sub-paragraphs (d) and (e) if it had not, under sub-paragraph (c), advised the High Commissioner that international assistance should be provided by his Office.

57. Referring to the Saudi Arabian representative's suggestions concerning operative paragraph 2, he said he regretted that he was unable to accept them. It was preferable to retain the present wording, with the quotation from paragraph 1 of the Statute of the High Commissioner, as operative paragraph 2 began with the word "Reaffirms". It was true that the word "promote" was stronger than the word "facilitate", but it was precisely for that reason that the sponsors had rejected it. They had felt that no pressure must be brought to bear on the High Commissioner to adopt one solution rather than another, as that might place him in a difficult position.

58. Mr. ROSSIDES (Greece) said that the United States representative's explanation that paragraph 5 (c) of the draft resolution should be read in conjunction with sub-paragraphs (d) and (e) applied only in the case of a decision to continue programmes of assistance. If the programmes were not continued, no action could be taken under sub-paragraphs (d) and (e).

59. Mr. MEANY (United States of America) said that he recognized the cogency of the Greek representative's argument and was ready to accept his amendment to paragraph 5 (c).

60. Mr. ROSSIDES (Greece) said that if his amendment was accepted, he would vote for the draft resolution.

61. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) opposed the Greek amendment. Her delegation could not agree to the new committee's giving directives for any other purpose than the one specified in paragraph 5 (a).

62. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) also opposed the Greek amendment. It was inappropriate to use the word "directives" when the decision involved a choice between two courses, namely to provide international assistance for refugees or not.

63. Mrs. ELLIOT (United Kingdom) felt that the original text of paragraph 5 (c) was preferable to the Greek amendment. As the sponsors had not been able to agree on its acceptance, the amendment should be put to the vote.

64. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) regretted that the United States representative had been unable to accept her suggestion with regard to the membership of the new Committee. Her purpose in making it had been to prevent difficulties and long discussion in the Council. Furthermore, it had been amply proved in the case of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund that an expansion of membership had resulted in increased effectiveness and support. She was convinced that the membership of the new committee should be as large as possible, but in view of the lack of support for her suggestion, she withdrew it.

65. Mr. ROJAS (Venezuela) said that the decision should be left to the Council, which would elect the number of members it decided on.

66. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) supported the Dominican representative. Twenty-five was an appropriate number of members for the new committee. It was for that reason she had asked for a separate vote on the words "from twenty to". Those who wished to leave the Council latitude to decide the point should vote for the retention of those words. She would vote for their deletion.

67. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.639/Rev.1) and the amendments to it. She pointed out that the joint amendment (A/C.3/L.641) had been withdrawn and replaced

by the Saudi Arabian oral amendment to operative paragraph 2 and that the original Saudi Arabian amendments (A/C.3/L.642) no longer stood.

68. She put to the vote the Saudi Arabian oral amendment calling for the replacement of operative paragraph 2 by the text contained in document A/C.3/L.639/Add.1, the word "facilitation" being replaced by the word "promotion".

The amendment was rejected by 33 votes to 25, with 15 abstentions.

69. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the words "from twenty to", in operative paragraph 5.

It was decided, by 38 votes to 11, with 23 abstentions, to retain those words.

70. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Greek amendment replacing the words "To advise", in operative paragraph 5 (c), by the words "To give directives to".

The amendment was rejected by 49 votes to 2, with 22 abstentions.

71. The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.639/Rev.1) as a whole to the vote.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 59 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.