

UNITED NATIONS  
**General Assembly**  
FORTY-FIFTH SESSION  
*Official Records*

THIRD COMMITTEE  
61st meeting  
held on  
Monday, 3 December 1990  
at 4 p.m.  
New York

---

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 61st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SOMAVIA (Chile)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 110: ENHANCING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PRINCIPLE OF PERIODIC AND GENUINE ELECTIONS (continued)

---

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2/50, United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.3/45/SR.61  
12 December 1990  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 5.40 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 110: ENHANCING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PRINCIPLE OF PERIODIC AND GENUINE ELECTIONS (continued) (A/C.3/45/L.56, L.96\* (reissued) and L.99)

Draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56, amendments in document A/C.3/45/L.96\* and sub-amendments in document A/C.3/45/L.99

1. The CHAIRMAN said it would be recalled that draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56 had been introduced by the representative of the United States at the 49th meeting, on 21 November, on behalf of the sponsors, now joined by Australia, Haiti, Honduras, Malta, Portugal and Saint Kitts and Nevis.
2. Amendments to that draft resolution had been submitted in document A/C.3/45/L.96\* introduced at the 55th meeting, on 28 November, by the representative of Cuba, now joined by Lesotho, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.
3. The Committee also had before it the text of sub-amendments (A/C.3/45/L.99), introduced by the representative of the United States at the 59th meeting.

Sub-amendments in document A/C.3/45/L.99

4. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on the sub-amendments as a whole, and called on those delegations which so wished to explain their vote before the vote.
5. Mr. PEÑALOSA (Colombia) said that the Committee had to take a decision on a draft resolution whose sole purpose seemed to be for the Secretary-General to examine suitable approaches that would permit the Organization to respond to the requests of Member States for electoral assistance. There would be no reason to oppose such a praiseworthy idea except that, as everyone knew, the real intention of the sponsors was to institutionalize the participation - in principle, technical participation - of the Organization in the elections of its Member States. However, sovereignty, the right of self-determination and the independence of States and peoples were fundamental elements of the Charter. Thus, the national electoral processes were a matter only for the domestic jurisdiction of States and were the expression of their sovereignty. That was why the Committee could not accept initiatives which threatened in one way or another to undermine the sovereign rights of each State freely to choose and develop its political system.
6. United Nations participation in elections had never stemmed from a right or an established practice, but rather from very particular circumstances - decolonization or the peace process. In such cases, Colombia supported the granting of specific assistance by the Organization. The United Nations could also legitimately refuse to satisfy a particular request. Nevertheless, it would be dangerous to generalize and institutionalize such assistance. That might provide certain circles with an additional means of interfering in the internal affairs of States or opposing the self-determination of States and peoples, of

(Mr. Peñalosa, Colombia)

justifying the subjection of political institutions and national laws to models imposed from the outside and enabling Governments formed as a result of fraudulent elections to legitimize their existence through the intermediary of the Organization, whose credibility would thereby be seriously threatened.

7. Elections should be viewed in the light of international law, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. It was regrettable that certain countries had not yet ratified the Covenant, and the efforts exerted with regard to elections would be much better employed in encouraging States to accede to that instrument. For all those reasons, Colombia would be unable to vote in favour of the texts submitted.

8. Mr. COTTAFVI (Italy) expressed surprise at the statement by the representative of Colombia and read out, as an example, paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of the draft resolution as it would be in its amended form, which in no way justified the concerns expressed by the Colombian delegation.

9. Mr. ZAWACKI (Poland) expressed support for the sub-amendments, which, together with the amendments in document A/C.3/45/L.96\*, would help to make draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56 a well-balanced text, drafted in a spirit of compromise. His delegation therefore hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

10. Mr. LUNA (Peru) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on documents A/C.3/45/L.56, L.96\* and L.99. He emphasized that Peru enjoyed genuine representative democracy and accordingly felt entitled to express his Government's conviction that any mechanism, such as the organization of elections, aimed at enhancing representative democracy was exclusively a matter for States. It was for them to determine electoral procedures, in accordance with their constitutions. That issue was closely linked with respect for Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

11. The countries of the Rio Group had drafted amendments with that purpose in mind; if their proposals had been duly taken into account, they would have provided the Organization with valuable guidelines. Draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56, as currently worded, constituted a first step on the dangerous path of institutionalized electoral assistance provided by the United Nations on the basis of universal models and practices which would inevitably conflict with the sovereignty of States.

12. So far, the United Nations had provided assistance only to those States which had so requested, in the full exercise of their sovereignty. That should be the policy of the United Nations if it was to continue to contribute to democracy and pluralism.

13. With the approval by consensus in 1989 of the principle of periodic and genuine elections, it had not been the intention to establish machinery for assistance within the United Nations Secretariat. The study called for in the draft resolution touched upon absolutely essential aspects of the sovereign right of each people to choose its government.

(Mr. Luna, Peru)

14. Far from defending realistically a universal democratic principle, the United Nations ran the risk of politicizing "technical" assistance provided by the Secretariat without regard for the diversity of political cultures, which should be an overriding consideration.

15. Mr. AYALA LASSO (Ecuador) said there was no doubt that Latin America was currently experiencing an extraordinary period of flourishing democracy. Countries in which a democratic régime was being re-established after a long interval were seeking to restore respect for legality and to overcome the innumerable difficulties faced in building a just, free, independent and sovereign society. In his delegation's view, the capacity of a people to exercise its right to develop its own political system and to choose its government was an essential characteristic of democracy. That was why Ecuador had for many years supported draft resolutions aimed at enhancing the effectiveness of the principle of periodic and genuine elections. It would have liked to be able, at the current session, once again to vote in favour of the draft texts submitted under item 110 but it had, together with other Latin American countries, put forward views regarding draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56 which were aimed not only at enhancing the effectiveness of the principle of periodic and genuine elections but also at preventing assistance provided by the United Nations at the request of Member States from giving rise to unwarranted interpretations and practices.

16. Ecuador reiterated its unswerving belief in democracy and its conviction that participation of the people in the electoral process was a vital element of the building of democracy. The organization of electoral processes was so closely bound up with national sovereignty - understood as the right to choose without interference in the internal affairs of States - that any bending of that principle must be avoided. Accordingly, Ecuador would abstain from the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56 and on the proposed amendments and sub-amendments.

17. Mrs. DU Yong (China) said that her country would vote against the sub-amendments contained in document A/C.3/45/L.99, because it believed that, according to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the Organization did not have the mandate to intervene in the electoral matters of Member States. So far there had been no need for the United Nations to provide electoral assistance to States, except in connection with arrangements relating to the decolonization process and the resolution of regional conflicts that jeopardized world or regional peace and security. There was therefore no need to ask the Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States concerning approaches to electoral assistance. It would not be in keeping with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations to seek to expand the procedures adopted by the United Nations in exceptional cases and to institutionalize its role in electoral procedures. Her delegation considered that electoral matters were part of the internal affairs of a sovereign State and that a State had the right to choose its own political system and electoral system in the light of its national conditions and according to the will of its people. That right should not be subject to any form of external interference.

18. Mr. MONTAÑO (Mexico) said that the best way of strengthening the effectiveness of the principle of periodic and genuine elections would be for all States to accede to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Organization of the electoral process fell within the domestic jurisdiction of a State and was the responsibility of the people. Draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56 and the amendments and sub-amendments thereto were part of the efforts to expand the activities of the United Nations in the area of electoral processes. Supporters of such expansion argued that the organization and supervision of elections had been central to certain peace processes which had been placed under the auspices of the Organization and also that the number of States requesting electoral assistance was increasing. However, his delegation was convinced that a clear distinction must be drawn between the two cases.

19. It was essential that States should expressly ask for United Nations assistance and Mexico therefore could not subscribe to draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56 which requested the Secretary-General to seek the views of bodies which did not normally speak for Member States. He reiterated that the major principles which should govern United Nations action in respect of electoral processes were: respect for national sovereignty, non-interference in domestic affairs and the right of States to freely choose and work out their political, social, economic and cultural systems.

20. There was no single political system or mechanism which would suit all nations and peoples equally well; moreover, any action which constituted intervention in the smooth running of national electoral processes or which jeopardized their outcome was not in keeping with the spirit and letter of international law and with Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter of the United Nations. For those reasons, his delegation would not vote for draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56 or for the amendments and sub-amendments.

21. Mr. KHODAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had participated in the drafting of draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56 out of support for the principles of openness and transparency in international relations and a concern to see that openness and transparency extended to international co-operation in the field of human rights.

22. His delegation supported the sub-amendments contained in document A/C.3/45/L.99, for they would make it possible to take account of the views of the sponsors of the initial draft resolution and also to introduce into the draft a number of the provisions from resolution 44/146 which other countries were anxious to see included. The final text would thus be a balanced one and would dispel, in particular, the misgivings of some countries concerning the intentions of the sponsors. The Committee would then have a sound basis for constructive efforts to strengthen the effectiveness of the principle of periodic and genuine elections. The USSR felt, as did other delegations, that the United Nations could provide electoral assistance to States - depending on the outcome of the survey to be carried out by the Secretary-General, if the draft resolution was adopted - only if requested to do so by a given Government.

23. Mr. MORA-GODOY (Cuba) said that his delegation would vote against the sub-amendments contained in document A/C.3/45/L.99. It was in favour of paragraphs 2 and 4 of the document but, for reasons of procedure, the vote was to be taken on the document as a whole.

24. With regard to paragraph 1, he pointed out that the Secretary-General's opinion concerning electoral processes was certainly not shared by all delegations. Those processes were the sole responsibility of States and peoples; the latter must be able freely to choose their political, economic and social systems without interference, in accordance with Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter of the United Nations. Any attempt to establish a supra-national mechanism under cover of a new world order was contrary to the very essence of the principles set forth in the Charter. While the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization was a reference document, it was not one which had been prepared in response to a request by States and there was therefore no need to take note of the comments it contained. The Secretary-General had referred to the issue of elections within a very specific context, that of international conflicts and peace-keeping operations; those issues were not within the competence of the Third Committee. Moreover, the Secretary-General had pointed out that peace-keeping operations were justified only if a conflict had an international dimension. So far the activities which had given rise or which might give rise to supervision of electoral processes had always fallen within the context of the settlement of an international conflict, save in one case where a State had requested technical assistance. States had the right to request technical assistance from the Organization; in such cases the General Assembly should take an ad hoc decision.

25. Paragraph 3 of the sub-amendments was unacceptable; it totally contradicted the amendment proposed by Cuba in document A/C.3/45/L.96\*, which was justified on procedural and also substantive grounds. With regard to procedure, draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56 contradicted resolution 44/146 in which the General Assembly entrusted consideration of the means of enhancing the effectiveness of the principle of periodic and genuine elections to the Commission on Human Rights. The Commission had not considered nor had it recommended measures to the General Assembly; no State had asked it to do so at its forty-sixth session. Cuba therefore did not understand why certain States should insist on bringing the matter directly to the General Assembly. With regard to the substance, the purpose of paragraph 3 was to establish, in the medium-term, supra-national mechanisms which were incompatible with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The text of draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56 was not explicit on the subject, but earlier versions of the draft had referred to designating a special co-ordinator for elections, establishing an electoral commission within the framework of the Organization, establishing a special electoral assistance programme and having the Security Council participate directly in assistance operations.

26. Paragraph 5 of the sub-amendments was also unacceptable because the amendment which would thus be modified aimed precisely at reiterating the request made in 1989 to the Commission on Human Rights. Moreover, in the initial draft resolution, there was question of inviting the Secretary-General to carry out a study which was incompatible with Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. Lastly, the misgivings expressed by many delegations had not been taken into account.

(Mr. Mora-Godoy, Cuba)

27. To sum up, document A/C.3/45/L.99 was far from innocent. Cuba hoped that delegations would oppose it, bearing in mind the achievements of the peoples over the centuries, namely, independence, national sovereignty and the principle of respect for non-interference.

28. Miss ZINDOGA (Zimbabwe) said that her delegation would vote against the sub-amendments (A/C.3/45/L.99) because the United Nations was in no case empowered to establish a mechanism that would interfere in the electoral process of a country. Zimbabwe held elections every five years, without requiring the least bit of aid from the Organization; it would consider such aid as interference in its internal affairs.

29. Mr. GROLIG (Germany) announced that his country would vote in favour of the sub-amendments, whose text met two important requirements, the first being the principle of strict respect for non-interference in the internal affairs of a State and the second being that electoral assistance would be granted only on the express request of a Member State, which was clearly specified in the paragraphs which the sub-amendments would reinsert in the initial draft resolution. Requesting the Secretary-General to solicit the views of Member States, specialized agencies and other competent bodies was entirely in conformity with usual practice.

30. A recorded vote was taken on the sub-amendments contained in document A/C.3/45/L.99.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Angola, Burkina Faso, Burundi, China, Cuba, Ghana, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lesotho, Mali, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nigeria, Sudan, Swaziland, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Bhutan, Cameroon, Colombia, Cyprus, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gabon, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Niger, Peru, Viet Nam, Yemen.

31. The sub-amendments contained in document A/C.3/45/L.99 were adopted by 82 votes to 18, with 18 abstentions.

32. Miss MANSARAY (Sierra Leone) said that her delegation had wished to vote against the text of the sub-amendments.

33. Mrs. HADDAD (Lebanon) said that her delegation had not wished to abstain in the vote on the text of the sub-amendments (A/C.3/45/L.99) but to vote in favour.

34. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on the amendments submitted by Cuba and contained in document A/C.3/45/L.96\* as a whole as modified by the adoption of the sub-amendments contained in document A/C.3/45/L.99.

35. Mr. PEÑALOSA (Colombia) requested a recorded vote.

36. Mr. RAVEN (United Kingdom) said that, since it had voted in favour of the sub-amendments (A/C.3/45/L.99), his country was therefore in favour of the amendments contained in document A/C.3/45/L.96\*, as modified by the adoption of the sub-amendments.

37. A recorded vote was taken on amendments A/C.3/45/L.96\*, as modified by the adoption of the sub-amendments contained in document A/C.3/45/L.99.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.



Against: None.

Abstaining: China, Colombia, Ecuador, Gabon, India, Liberia, Mexico, Nigeria, Peru.

38. The amendments contained in document A/C.3/45/L.96\*, as modified by the adoption of the sub-amendments contained in document A/C.3/45/L.99, were adopted by 120 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56

39. The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56, as modified by the amendments contained in document A/C.3/45/L.96\*, which had been modified by the adoption of the sub-amendments contained in document A/C.3/45/L.99.

40. Mr. MORA GODOY (Cuba) requested a separate recorded vote on the penultimate preambular paragraph (eighth preambular paragraph in the final version of the draft resolution) and on new paragraphs 10 and 11 (former paras. 3 and 4) of draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56 as amended and announced that his delegation would vote against.

41. Mr. COTTAFVI (Italy) said that he did not understand why Cuba, which had voted in favour of the amendments (A/C.3/45/L.96\*) now wished to vote against certain paragraphs. He proposed that draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56 should be adopted by consensus.

42. Mr. MORA GODOY (Cuba), replying to the question put by the representative of Italy, explained that document A/C.3/45/L.96\*, as amended by the adoption of the sub-amendments (A/C.3/45/L.99) resulted in the insertion in draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56 of several preambular and operative paragraphs, with only operative paragraph 8, as worded in paragraph 2 of document A/C.3/45/L.96\*, disappearing. Thus, draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56, as amended by document A/C.3/45/L.96\*, which had been modified by document A/C.3/45/L.99, brought together elements of the initial draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56 and the main part of the amendments (A/C.3/45/L.96\*) which Cuba had wanted to insert. Nevertheless, as the final text of the draft resolution contained provisions that did not meet with the approval of his delegation, it felt obliged to request a separate vote on the provisions in question.

43. Mr. HENNESSY (Ireland) supported by Mr. GROLIG (Germany), invoked rule 90 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which stipulated that where the adoption of one amendment necessarily implied the rejection of another amendment, the latter amendment should not be put to the vote. If one or more amendments were adopted, the amended proposal should then be voted upon.

44. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that delegations were entitled to request a separate vote on any paragraph of a draft resolution.

45. Mr. RAVEN (United Kingdom), recalling that the relevant rule was more properly referred to as rule 130 of the rules of procedure of the Main Committees, said that, in his view, it applied to document A/C.3/45/L.99 and precluded a separate vote on the paragraphs in question.

46. The CHAIRMAN said that, having consulted the Office of Legal Affairs, he agreed with the Moroccan delegation that rule 90 of the rules of procedure did not apply to the present case. He therefore proposed that the three paragraphs in question should be put to the vote.

47. A recorded vote was taken on the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Angola, Burkina Faso, China, Congo, Cuba, Mali, Myanmar, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Cameroon, Colombia, Ecuador, Gabon, Ghana, India, Mexico, Mongolia, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Swaziland.

48. The eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56 was adopted by 96 votes to 11, with 12 abstentions.

49. A recorded vote was taken on new paragraph 10 (former para. 3) of draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56.

In favour: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany,

Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Angola, Burkina Faso, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Myanmar, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Algeria, Cameroon, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, India, Mexico, Mongolia, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Sudan, Swaziland, Uganda.

50. Paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56 was adopted by 85 votes to 12, with 15 abstentions.

51. A recorded vote was taken on new paragraph 11 (former para. 4) of draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Angola, Burkina Faso, China, Colombia, Cuba, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Myanmar, Sudan, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Cameroon, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, India, Iraq, Mexico, Mongolia, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Swaziland, Uganda.

52. Paragraph 11 of draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56 was adopted by 88 votes to 12, with 14 abstentions.

53. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56 as a whole, as modified by the amendments contained in document A/C.3/45/L.96\* incorporating the sub-amendments contained in document A/C.3/45/L.99.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Angola, Burkina Faso, China, Cuba, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Myanmar.

Abstaining: Burundi, Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Ecuador, Gabon, Ghana, India, Mexico, Niger, Peru, Uganda.

54. Draft resolution A/C.3/45/L.56, as modified by the amendments contained in document A/C.3/45/L.96\* incorporating the sub-amendments contained in document A/C.3/45/L.99, was adopted by 106 votes to 9, with 12 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.