

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



FORTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records

THIRD COMMITTEE
60th meeting
held on
Friday, 28 November 1986
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 60th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HAMER (Netherlands)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 101: ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES AND WAYS AND MEANS WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM FOR IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (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 DC1-750, 1 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.3/41/SR.60
9 December 1986
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued) (A/41/3, A/41/180, A/41/183, A/41/189, A/41/213, A/41/274 and Add.1, A/41/315, A/41/317 and Add.1, A/41/326, A/41/337, A/41/343, A/41/354, A/41/398, A/41/461 and Corr.1, A/41/462, A/41/494, A/41/507, A/41/523, A/41/607, A/41/667, A/41/710, A/41/719, A/41/729, A/41/771, A/41/778, A/41/787; A/C.3/41/1, A/C.3/41/3, A/C.3/41/6, A/C.3/41/10, A/C.3/41/11, A/C.3/41/L.18/Rev.1, L.49, L.57/Rev.1, L.76, L.77, L.79, L.83, L.84, L.86, L.87, L.91-96, L.97/Rev.1, L.98/Rev.1, L.99 and L.100/Rev.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to hear the delegations that had requested an opportunity to speak in exercise of the right of reply the preceding day.

2. Mr. DOWEK (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he wished to respond to the statement made by the delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, although in reality his reply would be addressed to the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, since - as everyone was aware - there was no such thing as an independent Ukrainian republic and the Ukrainian SSR was represented at the United Nations as a result of a diplomatic gimmick that allowed the Soviet Union to be overrepresented. The two delegations in question were so accustomed to oppression, repression, tyranny, fear, anguish, double-talk and double-think that they did not even know what the words liberty, democracy and human dignity meant. However, his delegation must thank them for the concern they had shown for the well-being of the Sephardic Jews in Israel. He hoped that the Jews in the Soviet Union would receive the humane, brotherly and equal treatment enjoyed by the Sephardic Jews in Israel and that they would at least be granted the right of free association, freedom of worship, freedom of movement in the USSR itself and the freedom to leave the country if they so wished.

3. He had been stunned to hear such a concentrated and unrestricted outburst of anti-Semitism at the United Nations. No diplomatic wording, no more artificial distinction between Zionism and Judaism - open Judaophobia at its worst, of the kind the Soviet authorities used inside their own borders in order to frighten 2.5 million Jews into silence and foment hatred of all that was Jewish and thus justify relentless discrimination against Jewish citizens. In their statement, the Soviets had surpassed the level of indecency and cynicism they had reached on other occasions when referring to Israel, the Jews and Zionism.

4. The Soviet speakers did not realize how ridiculous their infantile accusations against Israel and what they referred to as the "archaic" Talmud were. There was so much hatred and aggression in their diatribes that the Israeli delegation could not but be thankful for the fact that Israel was situated so far from the Soviet Union, because otherwise the Soviets would have had no qualms about attacking Tel Aviv and Jerusalem with their tanks, as they had done at Budapest, Prague and Kabul and had been about to do at Warsaw. The question was why a super-Power such as the Soviet Union should behave so heinously towards a small nation such as Israel and the Jewish people. Through their attitudes and policies, the Soviet authorities propagated hatred of the Jewish people, thereby making the Soviet Union an implacable, hostile Power that seemed to have forsaken the last remnants of

/...

(Mr. Dowek, Israel)

moral restraint and ethics. Had it not been for the Soviet Union and its boundless hatred of Jews, the Arab world would have long ago accepted the outstretched hand of Israel and agreed to live with Israel in peace and harmony, as was proper for peoples who had not only a common ancestor but also a common future.

5. The great Vladimir I. Lenin had been accustomed to say that liberty was so precious that it must be rationed. His successors had taken him literally and not only rationed liberty but suppressed it totally, depriving hundreds of millions of human beings in the Soviet Union itself and in its occupied territories in Europe and Asia of the most elementary freedoms and human rights.

6. Mr. MOHAMMED (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that in his statement the representative of Iran had attempted to conceal the terrible crimes perpetrated against Israel, as well as the suffering to which the Iranian population had been subjected for political reasons. The representative of Iran had tried to make the international community believe that his Government had undertaken a major development effort, whereas it had in fact simply committed crimes both on and off the battlefields. In 1986 Iranian forces had fired missiles at Baghdad on a number of occasions, causing thousands of casualties among the civilian population, and had also shelled other Iraqi cities.

7. The representative of the Government of Iran had also attempted to attack Israel, which was a farce rejected by all, since it was well known that Israel had been sending United States weapons to Iran. In that instance it was not a question of mere propaganda but, rather, of facts known to everyone.

8. Where human rights were concerned, the representative of Tehran had originally said that his Government wished to co-operate with the United Nations. However, at the end of his statement he had said that his Government was not going to co-operate, since the United Nations had previously condemned it. Iran's response to the United Nations resolution on human rights violations in Iran should be borne in mind. In December 1985, 325 people had been sentenced to death for political reasons, and there had been further death sentences in 1985 and 1986.

9. The CHAIRMAN said that he wished to draw the attention of the representative of Iraq to the fact that his first statement in exercise of the right of reply should be no longer than five minutes. He therefore wished to request him to complete his statement in 30 seconds.

10. Mr. MOHAMMED (Iraq) said that he would be unable to complete his statement within that time and would therefore prefer to continue his remarks when he made his second statement in exercise of the right of reply.

11. Mr. AKYOL (Turkey), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Bulgarian and Greek Cypriot representatives had joined together in directing accusations against Turkey. After the representative of Turkey had described to the Committee the plight of the Turkish minority in Bulgaria and the oppression of which they were victims, it was not surprising that the Greek Cypriot representative should have attempted to collaborate in that bad cause.

/...

12. Mrs. MARCOULLIS (Cyprus), speaking on a point of order, said that she wished to request the Chairman to remind the representative of Turkey that she was the representative of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus and should be addressed as such.

13. The CHAIRMAN said that he wished to request the representative of Turkey to refer to States Members of the United Nations by their correct names.

14. Mr. AKYOL (Turkey) said that the point of order was out of order, since reference was being made to the Greek Cypriots and not to the Government.

15. Mrs. MARCOULLIS (Cyprus), speaking on a point of order once again, said that she wished to inform the representative of Turkey that she intended to interrupt him constantly until he referred to her delegation as the delegation of the Republic of Cyprus.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that he wished to reiterate his request to the representative of Turkey.

17. Mr. AKYOL (Turkey) said that he drew no distinction between the Government and the people of Cyprus. Resuming his statement, he said that, in view of the fact that the Greek Cypriots' goal was to oppress and ultimately wipe out the Turkish community, there was no doubt some sinister logic in their unfortunate attitude.

18. There was no question that it took a great deal of self-confidence and hypocrisy to dare to play the role of the victim in Cyprus, after having committed crimes that had led to Turkish Cypriot loss of life and dignity for years. The representative in question had referred to a number of massacres, but she had forgotten the greatest one - the massacre of Turkish Cypriots that had been carried out in 1963. The representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus would make an appropriate, detailed response to the accusations made by the Greek Cypriot representative.

19. Mrs. MARCOULLIS (Cyprus), speaking on a point of order, said that the representative of Turkey was referring to a non-existent entity which, in its resolution 541 (1983), the Security Council had condemned and which it had called on Member States not to recognize or assist. In her opinion, it was out of order for the representative of Turkey to refer to that entity in the Third Committee.

20. The CHAIRMAN said that it was up to him to decide whether a representative's statement was in order. In his opinion, the representative of Turkey had not abused his right to speak.

21. Mr. AKYOL (Turkey) said that, in the Committee, the representatives of Bulgaria had tried to defend a policy of oppression and forced assimilation of the Turkish minority in that country. However, the explanation given to justify that policy was in total contradiction with the findings of studies carried out in the areas of cultural anthropology and the sociology of religion. It was surprising that a large group representing 10 per cent of Bulgaria's population should have suddenly decided to change its name, in other words to change its identity. To

(Mr. Akyol, Turkey)

attribute to an ethnic group a racial origin other than its own, without taking into account its national, cultural and religious identity, was outright racism.

22. His country was proud to have a democratic régime. There were prisons in Turkey, but the Government was trying to improve the conditions in them. That contrasted sharply with the special detention conditions which extended to entire towns or to the internment camps set up on remote islands off the Bulgarian coast. He did not wish to engage in a polemic with the representative of Bulgaria concerning living conditions in his country, given the differences which existed between their two countries' régimes and the concept of freedom which applied in each of them, but only wanted to reiterate that Turkish citizens who were discontented were free to leave his country.

23. It should come as no surprise to the Bulgarian delegation that Turkey was interested in the humanitarian problem he had just described. The Turkish Government was prepared to consider that question seriously in bilateral negotiations. His delegation hoped that Bulgaria would abandon its rigid position and stop defending racist theories which ran counter to the principles of bilateral and regional relations. Until then, Turkey would raise that question in international forums and would demand that the Turkish minority be given the right to emigrate to Turkey.

24. Mr. ZARIF (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he would not refer to the situation of human rights in Iraq since it was not his Government's policy to interfere in such questions. Nor was the Third Committee the most appropriate forum for considering the question of Iraq's bombardment of civilian areas in Iran or the fact that, for three years, the Government of Iran had refrained from taking reprisals. He simply wished to draw attention to the fact that a régime which had invaded Iran and was at war with his country was discussing in the Committee the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran. He wondered just how concerned the Iraqi Government really was about the human rights of the people it was killing.

25. Mr. MATSOUKA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Israeli delegation, which always voted against the main human rights resolutions, was trying hypocritically to present itself as a champion of those rights. Any criticism of zionism was regarded as a hostile act against Jews, Judaism and the State of Israel. It had been stated repeatedly, however, that zionism was not the same thing as Judaism. The representative of Israel seemed to think that only racism against Jews should be condemned and that the racism of the Zionists themselves against Arabs and against those who were regarded as "inferior" Jewish citizens did not warrant criticism.

26. The situation in Israel was deteriorating steadily as a result of the endless succession of military interventions, the climate of military psychosis, the socio-economic crisis, and political radicalization. That had in effect on human rights and fundamental freedoms and, since the late 1970s, had given rise to massive emigration. The representative of Israel mentioned the difficulties faced by Soviet Jews who wanted to leave the Soviet Union, but did not mention that it was very difficult to leave Israel because of the provisions of the immigration law.

/...

(Mr. Matsouka, Ukrainian SSR)

27. He reiterated that no one had given the representative of Israel the right to speak on behalf of all the Jews in the world, and he wondered what would happen if the Ukrainian delegation were to begin to speak on behalf of the hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians living in other countries.

28. Mrs. MARCOULLIS (Cyprus), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of Turkey had the audacity to question the legality of the Republic of Cyprus, which had been recognized by the entire international community with the sole exception of the aggressor. That recognition ought to be a resounding answer to Turkey and demonstrate clearly its isolation within the international community. Turkey had been the usurper of lands, the invader who had uprooted the Cypriot people and tried to change ancestral traditions, and now it dared to accuse others of killings and aggression. The Turkish representative had not come to the Third Committee with clean hands. On the contrary, his hands were bloodied by genocide. History abounded with examples of the human rights violations that had occurred during the Ottoman Empire and the atrocities committed against peoples who had had the misfortune to come under its sway.

29. She had already heard too many baseless accusations against the Cypriot people. The reasons for those accusations were obvious. Turkey needed to prove that an invasion which was morally and legally unacceptable had been inevitable.

30. Mr. MITREV (Bulgaria), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Third Committee was once again the setting for Turkey's baseless accusations against Bulgaria. His delegation rejected such slanders, which were politically motivated. He recalled the words of Bulgarian President Todor Zhivkov who, on 12 September 1986, had said that Bulgaria attached great importance to good relations and co-operation with its neighbours, including Turkey. Its 500 years of suffering under the yoke of the Ottoman Empire were a legacy which would not be forgotten easily, but neither the Turkish nor the Bulgarian people were to blame. History showed that people must put the past behind them. The Bulgarian people, who were realistic and forward-looking, had always wanted a constructive relationship with Turkey and would do everything possible not to give in to feelings or emotions which might jeopardize that relationship.

31. Mr. DOWEK (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that when he referred to Jews in the Soviet Union his intention was not to slander that country but to show what really happened to the Jews. He did not deny that Soviet Jews were Soviet citizens first and foremost, with rights and obligations, nor was he trying to set himself up as the spokesman or representative of Soviet Jews. However, he had a moral duty to speak out on their behalf when they were a persecuted minority and suffered discrimination. When the Soviet representative talked about zionism, he was referring to the Jews. He doubted whether the delegation of the Nazi régime to the League of Nations had used language as anti-Semitic as that used by Soviet representatives when they equated zionism with nazism and insulted Judaism's sacred writings.

32. Mr. AKYOL (Turkey), speaking in exercise of the right of the reply, said that it was difficult to break the alliance between the oppressors, which was extremely strong. The Turkish minority in Bulgaria was the target of a policy of forced assimilation, and the facts were a matter of public record. Even the experts who were members of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination had voiced criticism in that respect. Bulgaria had submitted a report to that Committee containing references to the Turkish minority. Several months later, the report had been revised and all references to the Muslim Turks in Bulgaria deleted. Turkey would continue to be concerned with the fate of the Turkish minority in Bulgaria: that did not constitute interference in the domestic affairs of that country but rather a demonstration of humanitarian interest. Turkey was prepared to negotiate with a view to reaching a wide-ranging agreement on migration.

33. Mrs. MARCOULLIS (Cyprus), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, noting the reference by Turkey to a so-called alliance, pointed out that Cyprus was a non-aligned country. United Nations resolutions on Cyprus were filled with recommendations relating to Turkey: only Turkey could act on them, but it refused to do so, excusing itself by distorting the issue.

34. Mr. MOHAMMED (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that members would recall the deplorable reaction of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the General Assembly's resolution on human rights in that country. He drew attention in that connection to the statement made by Iran's Minister for Foreign Affairs on 15 December 1985, in which the latter had stated that the United Nations General Assembly was not the appropriate forum for seeking justice and that his country was only using the Assembly as a platform, since Islamic law was applicable in the Islamic Republic of Iran. It would also be recalled that in a recent statement the representative of Iran had said that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants were incompatible with the legal foundations of Islam.

35. Mr. ZARIF (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that he had already stated clearly in the Third Committee the reasons for his country's position on the Commission on Human Rights and the resolutions of the General Assembly. Resolution 1986/41 of the Commission on Human Rights and the draft resolution before the Third Committee were destructive, unhelpful, and politically motivated. In addition, the lies bandied about by the representative of Iraq, which were based on the ridiculous accusations made by the terrorist organization the People's Mojahedin, based in Baghdad, would not change the situation one bit. He called upon the Third Committee to judge whether the representative of Iraq spoke of human rights out of genuine concern or whether what he said reflected political differences which had prompted his country to impose a war on Iran, announcing from the outset that its aim was to destabilize and destroy the Islamic revolution.

AGENDA ITEM 101: ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES AND WAYS AND MEANS WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM FOR IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/41/3 (chap. V, sect. A), 464, 607 and 701; A/41/70-S/17708; A/C.3/41/L.4 and Corr.1, L.5, L.34, L.42/Rev.1, L.58/Rev.1-L.60/Rev.1 and L.62/Rev.1-L.64/Rev.1)

36. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take up revised draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.42/Rev.1, entitled "Respect for the right of everyone to own property alone as well as in association with others and its contribution to the economic and social development of Member States", and the amendments proposed in documents A/C.3/41/L.58/Rev.1, L.59/Rev.1, L.60/Rev.1, L.62/Rev.1 and L.64/Rev.1. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to hear explanations of vote after the vote after it had taken action on all the proposals.

37. It was so decided.

38. Mr. STIRLING (United States of America) said that revised draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.42/Rev.1 was the result of lengthy negotiations with the regional group that had expressed reservations over the draft resolution as originally submitted. Account had been taken of the suggestions put forward by that group that did not alter the character of the draft resolution. The language used in the draft was intended to secure the broadest possible acceptance, taking into account the positions of Member States which had different forms of property ownership. The draft also reflected the view that there did not exist an absolute right to property in isolation from other considerations.

39. In the fourth preambular paragraph, the word "upon" should be added before the words "international law". His delegation hoped that the draft resolution was acceptable and would receive broad support.

40. Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the amendments proposed by his delegation in document A/C.3/41/L.58/Rev.1 were perfectly clear and there was therefore no need to explain them. Despite intensive consultations, it had not proved possible to eliminate all the difficulties raised by the United States proposal. Had more time been available, it might have been possible to work out a more acceptable compromise on the issue.

41. The proposed amendments were prompted by the necessity of taking into account the practices of the different economic and social systems of various groups of States. Consequently, the draft resolution must reflect three basic ideas: that the right to own property was also a right of the State and that the sovereignty of States extended to the solution of problems relating to property ownership; that ownership of property was also the right of groups of individuals, whether communities, collective organizations or co-operatives; and that individuals also had the right to own property. Those were the three forms of ownership which actually existed. To give preference to any one form over another would result in an unbalanced approach to the issue. Such imbalance would, in turn, adversely affect the development of peoples and the enjoyment of human rights. He expressed the hope that all delegations would support the amendments without their having to be put to a vote.

42. Mrs. BROŠNAKOVA (Czechoslovakia) said that if greater emphasis was placed on one human right than on others, imbalances resulted which had adverse consequences, such as the massive unemployment which existed in many Western countries. The text submitted by the United States did not make it clear that the right to own property must not be exercised at the expense of other human rights, such as the rights to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work, and to protection against unemployment. That was the reason for the amendments proposed by her delegation in document A/C.3/L.59/Rev.1.

43. Mr. MITREV (Bulgaria) said that the purpose of the amendments proposed in document A/C.3/41/L.60/Rev.1 was to introduce balance into the text, so that once adopted, it could provide adequate guidance for United Nations bodies. The amendments reflected broad agreement on issues relating to economic and social development, the right to own property, and human rights. His delegation hoped that an amended draft resolution would receive wide support.

44. Mr. BUZO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the purpose of the amendments contained in document A/C.3/41/L.62/Rev.1 was to provide a logical link between the preambular and the operative parts of the draft resolution. The right to own property should not prejudice the economic and social development of States. The amendments were sufficiently clear and he therefore hoped that they would meet with the approval of all delegations.

45. Mr. LEBAKIN (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation felt it necessary to introduce the amendments contained in document A/C.3/41/L.63/Rev.1 because the revised draft resolution (A/C.3/41/L.42/Rev.1) did not duly reflect the proposals contained in document A/C.3/41/L.63.

46. Mrs. SARANGEREL (Mongolian People's Republic) said that the amendments contained in document A/C.3/41/L.64/Rev.1 were based on the concept that economic and social development created conditions favourable for the well-being of all individuals and, accordingly, for the full enjoyment of human rights. Her delegation therefore hoped that the amendments would be accepted.

47. The CHAIRMAN said that a recorded vote had been requested on draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.42/Rev.1 and the amendments to that text. As there was no voting machine in that conference room, it would be necessary to take a vote by roll-call. He pointed out that none of the draft resolutions concerning that item had any financial implications.

48. Mr. STIRLING (United States), said that the amendments now being proposed were very similar to those which had been presented on the basis of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.42. The wording of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.42/Rev.1 was neutral and did not depart from previous formulations, particularly in so far as article 17 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was concerned. The revised document referred to various forms of property ownership, including communal and state forms. Although emphasis was placed on the right to own property, the other human rights were also reaffirmed. The concept of equal right to own property was not enshrined in any United Nations document. In general, the amendments did not contribute to the clarity of the draft resolution; rather, they altered the nature

(Mr. Stirling, United States)

of the draft resolution. For those reasons, his delegation moved that the Committee should not take any decision on the amendments contained in document A/C.3/41/L.58/Rev.1. He asked that the vote on that motion be taken by roll-call.

49. The CHAIRMAN said that a motion had been presented and that a request had been made for the vote on the motion to be taken by roll-call. He read out rule 116 of the rules of procedure, concerning adjournment of debate.

50. Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in view of the fact that negotiations were still going on and that delegations had not had much time to examine the documents, he had hoped that the representative of the United States would propose that consideration of the draft resolution and of the amendments be postponed to the next session. He objected to unilateral and arbitrary action by the United States, adding that the United States was highlighting only one of the many aspects of the issue.

51. Mrs. ALVAREZ (France) said that the amendments contained in document A/C.3/41/L.58/Rev.1 entailed changes of substance which could alter the nature of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/41/L.42/Rev.1; accordingly, she supported the proposal of the representative of the United States to the effect that consideration of the text containing the amendments be postponed.

52. Mr. ONONAIYE (Nigeria) said that the various proposed amendments had not been circulated until that morning and that many delegations would have liked to have more time to examine them at greater length. He urged delegations to endeavour to reconcile their viewpoints, as had always been done in similar situations. If a vote were to be taken by roll-call, it would be impossible to speed up the Committee's work that day.

53. Mr. BUZO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that, in view of the situation, his delegation proposed that no decision be taken, either on the draft resolution or on the proposed amendments.

54. Miss LAFORTUNE (Canada) said that she supported the proposal made by the representative of the United States and seconded by the representative of France to the effect that the Committee should vote on the motion to adjourn the debate.

55. Mr. GOLEMANOV (Bulgaria) said that priority should be given to the motion presented by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic; it encompassed the motion presented by the United States and his delegation supported it.

56. The CHAIRMAN said that, according to the rules of procedure, the Committee must proceed to vote on the motion presented by the United States.

57. Mr. GOLEMANOV (Bulgaria) said that he had listened carefully to the exact wording of the motion presented by the representative of the United States and he believed that it did not relate to rule 116 of the rules of procedure, whereas the motion put forward by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic was relevant to that rule. He therefore requested that the latter motion be considered and that the issue of priority be examined, for one of the motions encompassed the other.

/...

58. Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he supported the motion put forward by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

59. Mr. TROUVEROY (Belgium) said that rule 116 was very clear; he regretted that the Chairman had given the floor to several delegations to speak on matters which did not relate to rule 116. The reason rule 116 stated that the motion should be immediately put to the vote was to avoid manoeuvres which merely created confusion.

60. The CHAIRMAN said that, having given the floor to two representatives in favour of and two against the motion, the motion presented by the representative of the United States must be put to the vote.

61. Mr. BUZO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) requested that the Legal Counsel be asked to give an opinion so as to settle the matter.

62. The CHAIRMAN said that that would be done, and he suggested that the meeting be suspended.

The meeting was suspended at 12.20 p.m. and resumed at 12.55 p.m.

63. The CHAIRMAN said that consultations had been held with the delegations concerned and the Committee could proceed to vote on the motion presented by the representative of the United States to the effect that the Committee should take no decision on the amendments contained in document A/C.3/41/L.58/Rev.1.

64. At the request of the representative of the United States, a vote was taken by roll-call on the motion that no decision be taken on the amendments contained in document A/C.3/41/L.58/Rev.1.

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

In favour: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Poland, Romania, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahrain, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

66. Mr. NIVOKINDI (Burundi) said that, had he been present at the time of the voting, his delegation would have abstained.

67. By 31 votes to 24, with 74 abstentions, the motion presented by the United States was adopted.

68. Mr. BUZO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) proposed that no decision be taken on draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.42/Rev.1 or on the amendments to that text.

69. The CHAIRMAN said that he would give the floor to two speakers in favour of the motion and two speakers opposing it. Since there were no speakers, he invited the Committee to vote immediately on the motion presented by the representative of the Byelorussian SSR.

70. At the request of the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, a vote was taken by roll-call on the motion that no decision be taken on draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.42/Rev.1 or on the proposed amendments to that text.

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

In favour: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Poland, Romania, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam.

Against: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahrain, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Colombia, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

72. By 34 votes to 29, with 67 abstentions, the motion presented by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic was rejected.

73. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) said that he wished to present a motion to the effect that no decision be taken on document A/C.3/41/L.59/Rev.1.

74. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would continue its consideration of the item at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.