

UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL

ASSEMBLY

LIBRARY
SEP 18 1966



Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.125/SR.17
25 July 1966

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

1966 SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PRINCIPLES OF INTERNATIONAL LAW CONCERNING
FRIENDLY RELATIONS AND CO-OPERATION AMONG STATES

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SEVENTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 18 March 1966, at 3.25 p.m.

CONTENTS

Consideration, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 2103 (XX) A and B of 20 December 1965, of principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations

- (i) Continued consideration of the four principles set forth in paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 1815 (XVII)
- (c) The duty not to intervene in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of any State, in accordance with the Charter (A/AC.125/L.12-15, L.17, L.19, L.20) (concluded)

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. Krishna RAO	(India)
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. RIPHAGEN	Netherlands
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. MAMERI	Algeria
	Mr. QUIJANO	Argentina
	Mr. McKEOWN	Australia
	U BA THAUNG	Burma
	Mr. ENGO	Cameroon
	Mr. GOTLIEB	Canada
	Mr. ALBONICO	Chile
	Mr. PECHOTA	Czechoslovakia
	Mr. IGNACIO-PINTO	Dahomey
	Mr. MONOD) France
	Mr. de BOUILLANE de LACOSTE)	
	Mr. VANDERPUYE	Ghana
	Mr. VIZCAINO LEAL	Guatemala
	Mr. MISHRA	India
	Mr. ARANGIO RUIZ	Italy
	Mr. AMAU	Japan
	Mr. BHOI	Kenya
	Mr. CHAMMAS	Lebanon
	Mr. RAMAHOLIMIHASO	Madagascar
	Mr. MERCADO	Mexico
	Mr. ODOGWU	Nigeria
	Mr. WYZNER)) Poland
	Mr. OLSZOWKA)	
	Mr. COVACI	Romania
	Mr. BLIX	Sweden
	Mr. NACHABE	Syria
	Mr. MOVCHAN	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. EL-REEDY	United Arab Republic
	Mr. SINCLAIR	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

PRESENT (continued):

Members (continued):

Mr. HARGROVE

United States of
America

Mr. MOLINA

Venezuela

Mr. SAHOVIC

Yugoslavia

Secretariat:

Mr. STAVROPOULOS

Legal Counsel

Mr. BAGUINIAN

Secretary of the
Committee

CONSIDERATION, PURSUANT TO GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 2103 (XX) A AND B OF 20 DECEMBER 1965, OF PRINCIPLES OF INTERNATIONAL LAW CONCERNING FRIENDLY RELATIONS AND CO-OPERATION AMONG STATES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

- (i) CONTINUED CONSIDERATION OF THE FOUR PRINCIPLES SET FORTH IN PARAGRAPH 3 OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 1815 (XVII)
- (c) THE DUTY NOT TO INTERVENE IN MATTERS WITHIN THE DOMESTIC JURISDICTION OF ANY STATE, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CHARTER (A/AC.125/L.12-15, L.17, L.19, L.20) (concluded)

1. Mr. EL-REEDY (United Arab Republic) said that the draft resolution (A/AC.125/L.17) submitted in a spirit of compromise and co-operation by his delegation and that of Chile had been based on two considerations: the desire to maintain intact the Declaration in General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX) as a pronouncement of the highest organ of the United Nations, and the conviction that the Committee's task was to take that resolution as its point of departure and widen the area of agreement reflected in it by adding additional elements. Of the amendments to the draft resolution which had been submitted in document A/AC.125/L.19, only that in sub-paragraph 1 (a) could be accepted by his delegation. Amendment 1 (b) was unacceptable because the passage which it would delete was a statement of fact: the virtually unanimous vote on the Declaration was justification enough for stating that it reflected a universal legal conviction. As far as amendment 2 was concerned, it was not enough for the Committee simply to take resolution 2131 (XX) as a basis for discussion rather than abide by it, for the Declaration was concerned with that principle of international law which was most closely identified with the struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Amendment 3 (a) would open the door to what would, in effect, constitute a rewriting of the Declaration. Amendment 3 (b) would tend to raise questions about the significance to be attached to the Declaration. For all those reasons he appealed to the Committee, on behalf of both the sponsors, to adopt the joint draft resolution without any amendments except that proposed in sub-paragraph 1 (a) of document A/AC.125/L.19. He also appealed to the Czechoslovak representative not to insist that his draft resolution (A/AC.125/L.20) should be put to the vote first.

2. Mr. SINCLAIR (United Kingdom) said that his approach to the Czechoslovak draft resolution was governed by certain considerations of principle deriving from the Committee's terms of reference as set forth in General Assembly resolution 2103 (XX). Operative paragraph 4 (a) of that resolution called upon the Committee

(Mr. Sinclair, United Kingdom)

to continue the consideration of certain principles, and the sixth preambular paragraph referred to the significance of continuing the effort to achieve general agreement. The Czechoslovak proposal would, in effect, have the Committee confess to defeat in its work on the principle of non-intervention, abandon its work and remit the issue to the General Assembly. There was the further practical consideration that the agenda of the Assembly's forthcoming session was expected to be a lengthy one and the Sixth Committee would be unlikely to have the time to work out a better solution than could the Special Committee.

3. With regard to sub-paragraph 1 (b) of the amendments in document A/AC.125/L.19, he said that while resolution 2131 (XX) gave expression to the political will of the General Assembly, that was not the same thing as setting forth an authentic and definite principle of international law. The reason for the submission of the amendments to the operative paragraphs should be obvious in the light of the general debate on the principle.

4. It should be remembered that the two-Power draft resolution had actually been submitted before the proposal in document A/AC.125/L.13. In the light of the changed situation brought about by the latter, he would like in particular to have a clarification concerning the words "additional proposals" in operative paragraph 2 of the two-Power draft. A proposal could be made by way of an addition to a text and at the same time derogate from it, or it could express the same idea in different language. If the intention was to consider only additional proposals which would simply seek to add new elements to the content of resolution 2131 (XX), while taking the wording of that resolution as sacrosanct, it would mean that the draft resolution called upon the Committee to make a qualitative judgement of the content of substantive proposals before the Committee. That would not be in accordance with its terms of reference, nor would it assist the work of the drafting committee.

5. Mr. ALBONICO (Chile) said that to accept any of the amendments in document A/AC.125/L.19 except that in sub-paragraph 1 (a) would be tantamount to accepting the proposals submitted by the sponsors of those amendments in document A/AC.125/L.13. That would give delegations complete freedom in formulating the principle of non-intervention, as though the Assembly had never adopted the Declaration in resolution 2131 (XX). The Czechoslovak proposal went to the other extreme, treating the Declaration as though it was the ultimate expression of human thought on the principle of non-intervention. The joint draft resolution submitted by his own delegation and that of the United Arab Republic struck a happy medium

(Mr. Albonico, Chile)

between those two positions, recognizing the great political, juridical, sociological and even philosophical significance of the Declaration and at the same time leaving the door open to the consideration of additional proposals which might improve upon it. The amendments in paragraphs 1 (b), 2 and 3 (a) would impair the most vital provisions of the two-Power draft resolution. There could be no question that the Declaration embodied an authentic principle of international law, for it had been agreed upon in form and substance by 109 States after exhaustive discussion. In those circumstances, it could be regarded as applicable under the provisions of Article 38 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice. He could not accept the proposal to substitute another formulation for the words "abide by", for the Committee could not do otherwise than abide by a decision of the General Assembly.

6. With regard to amendment 1 (a), he could accept it on the understanding that the new words were inserted only because they constituted a part of the title of the Declaration. However, if any of the amendments other than that in paragraph 1 (a) were accepted, his delegation would have to withdraw its support of the two-Power draft resolution and vote in favour of the Czechoslovak draft.

7. Mr. PECHOTA (Czechoslovakia) could not agree with the United Kingdom representative that if the Committee adopted the Czechoslovak draft resolution it would be departing from its terms of reference and abandoning its task. Operative paragraph 4 (c) of resolution 2103 (XX) requested the Committee to submit conclusions and recommendations, and that was precisely what the Committee would do if it adopted the Czechoslovak draft resolution, for it would, in effect, conclude that the Declaration enunciated a principle of international law and would make a recommendation to the General Assembly on the basis of that conclusion. That course of action would not be tantamount to remitting the whole issue to the General Assembly as though the Committee had not discussed it. Furthermore, such recognition by the Committee of the significance of the Declaration, far from being a confession of defeat, would constitute an expression of satisfaction at the progress made by the General Assembly on the principle of non-intervention.

8. It might be pertinent to recall that when the principle of sovereign equality had been discussed the United Kingdom delegation had said that the Committee should not try to add to the formulation worked out in Mexico City but should refer that formulation to the General Assembly as it stood. Yet the United Kingdom was now

(Mr. Pechota, Czechoslovakia)

objecting to the application of a similar procedure to a text which represented a wider area of agreement than did the Mexico City text on sovereign equality.

9. Mr. ARANGIO RUIZ (Italy) observed that, in operative paragraph 4 (c) of General Assembly resolution 2103 (XX), the General Assembly had requested the Committee to submit a report on the seven principles - including that of non-intervention - with a view to enabling the General Assembly to adopt a declaration containing an enunciation of those principles. If the Committee adopted the proposal of the Czechoslovak representative it would be disregarding the very purpose of the mandate given to it, as indicated in the paragraph to which he had referred. The same objection applied to any proposal which, like that of Chile and the United Arab Republic, involved the acceptance of General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX) in whole or in part as a definitive legal statement of the principle under discussion. While resolution 2131 (XX) might perhaps be regarded as containing the political expression of a general principle of non-intervention, the Assembly had clearly not viewed it as the final expression of legal thought on the subject.

10. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) thought that it was undoubtedly within the Committee's competence to recommend the incorporation of all or part of General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX) in an enunciation of the principle of non-intervention. There were three possible courses of action before the Committee: it could regard resolution 2131 (XX) as an adequate enunciation of the principle and recommend its adoption without change; it could decide, in the words of draft resolution A/AC.125/L.17, to "abide by" the resolution but also to consider possible additional proposals; or it could merely regard the resolution as a basis for discussion. His delegation would be opposed to the third course, which would place no limits on the Drafting Committee's discussions. The best formula would seem to be that proposed in draft resolution A/AC.125/L.17, but perhaps there could be a consensus that the wording of that draft did not preclude the consideration by the Drafting Committee of purely drafting changes in the General Assembly's text. The draft resolution would, of course, allow delegations which felt that the text in resolution 2131 (XX) could be improved by additions to propose such additions.

11. Mr. VIZCAINO LEAL (Guatemala) said that his delegation could support the amendments in paragraph 1 of document A/AC.125/L.19. General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX) certainly reflected, inter alia, a universal legal conviction on the principle of non-intervention. The Guatemalan delegation could not, however, support the amendment appearing in paragraph 2. As he understood the two-Power draft resolution (A/AC.125/L.17), the Drafting Committee, while basing itself on resolution 2131 (XX), would be free to consider any proposals which would strengthen the principle of non-intervention, but not proposals which would undermine it. His delegation had always been in favour of full discussion, and therefore would not wish to close the door to continued discussion of the principle by the Drafting Committee on the understanding he had stated.

12. Mr. ENGO (Cameroon) affirmed his delegation's support of draft resolution A/AC.125/L.17. It would be very difficult for the Committee to ignore such a categorical statement by the General Assembly as resolution 2131 (XX). However, he wished to make it clear that his delegation did not interpret the expression "abide by" in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution as precluding drafting amendments which would not affect the substance of the General Assembly's text or weaken it. He could not accept the view that the Special Committee was bound by the actual wording contained in resolution 2131 (XX). Moreover, as he had said at the previous meeting, he felt that the only additional proposals which the Drafting Committee could consider were those which had been submitted in the Special Committee.

13. Mr. SAHOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation remained convinced that the approach proposed in draft resolution A/AC.125/L.17 was sound. The opposition to that draft resolution seemed to indicate a desire to minimize General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX) and to reopen questions on which the Assembly had already taken a position. His delegation would therefore vote against the amendments in document A/AC.125/L.19.

14. Mr. MISHRA (India) said that it had been suggested that the Committee would be failing in its task if it accepted the text in General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX) as it stood. But even if the Assembly had enunciated only the "political" principle of non-intervention it was difficult to see how the Special

(Mr. Mishra, India)

Committee could propose to reduce the content of the principle as so enunciated. His delegation was quite ready to accept the possibility of adding to the Assembly's formulation; indeed, it had joined in sponsoring certain additional proposals which appeared in document A/AC.125/L.12/Rev.1. If, however, the Committee could not agree to try to widen the area of agreement established in resolution 2131 (XX), his delegation would prefer to go back to the Czechoslovak proposal, which had now been submitted in the form of a draft resolution (A/AC.125/L.20). In his view, the adoption of the amendments proposed in document A/AC.125/L.19 would threaten the very large area of agreement which had been achieved in the General Assembly. His delegation would therefore vote against those amendments - apart from that in paragraph 1 (a) which had been accepted by the sponsors. If the amendments were adopted, his delegation would vote against draft resolution A/AC.125/L.17 as amended and ask for a vote on the Czechoslovak draft resolution.

15. Mr. GOTTLIEB (Canada) said that the amendments in document A/AC.125/L.19 reflected what his delegation regarded as the true relationship between General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX) and the Special Committee's task. It was nowhere suggested in that resolution that it represented a definitive legal definition of the principle of non-intervention, and a number of delegations had stated in the General Assembly at the time of its adoption that they did not regard it as such. However, draft resolution A/AC.125/L.17 was largely based on the assumption that the General Assembly's text did represent such a legal definition; it was therefore not satisfactory to his delegation in its present form. The Canadian delegation had consequently joined other delegations in submitting the amendments in document A/AC.125/L.19. That in no way implied a change in Canada's position on resolution 2131 (XX), which it continued to support.

16. Mr. HARGROVE (United States of America) associated his delegation with those delegations which had already explained why they must oppose draft resolution A/AC.125/L.20. The Czechoslovak representative had argued that the Committee had been given a mandate to reach conclusions and make recommendations, but the sixth preambular paragraph of General Assembly resolution 2103 (XX) made it clear that the Committee was to continue its efforts to achieve general agreement at every stage during the elaboration of the principles. No effort had yet been made in the Committee to achieve general agreement on the present

/...

(Mr. Hargrove, United States)

question, and what seemed to be proposed was the mere acceptance of a lack of agreement. The Czechoslovak representative had drawn a comparison with an earlier proposal by the United Kingdom representative in connexion with the principle of sovereign equality, but the two cases were different. In the case of the principle of sovereign equality, the Special Committee, after a long process of study, had succeeded in formulating a text on legal aspects of the matter reflecting a consensus. That was not so in the case of the principle of non-intervention. The third preambular paragraph of the Czechoslovak draft resolution did not reflect the true situation, since a number of delegations, including his own, had made it clear in the First Committee of the General Assembly that, although they fully supported it as an important political declaration by the General Assembly, they did not consider resolution 2131 (XX) qualified to be regarded in toto as an authentic and definite principle of international law. His delegation would therefore be obliged to vote against draft resolution A/AC.125/L.20.

17. The considerations underlying the amendments in document A/AC.125/L.19 had been explained by the United Kingdom representative, and he hoped that those amendments would be adopted. What he had said regarding the third preambular paragraph of the Czechoslovak draft resolution applied equally to preambular sub-paragraph (c) of draft resolution A/AC.125/L.17. For similar reasons, he could not support the present wording of the operative part of that text.

18. Mr. MOVCHAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had been anxious to see the Committee recommend an agreed formulation of the principle of non-intervention to the General Assembly and had therefore supported the Czechoslovak proposal introduced at the outset of the Committee's work on principle C, feeling that it would enable the Committee to adopt a business-like approach to its tasks. However, since a number of delegations had objected to that proposal, his delegation had agreed to support the draft resolution submitted by Chile and the United Arab Republic. In supporting the latter draft, however, his delegation interpreted operative paragraph 2 as restricting the Drafting Committee to the consideration of the possibility of reaching agreement on additional proposals; the positions of principle established in resolution 2131 (XX) could not be open to question. His delegation was categorically opposed to any proposal which would call in question the agreement achieved in the General Assembly, and would therefore vote against the amendments in document A/AC.125/L.19.

/...

19. Mr. BLIX (Sweden) said that he still hoped it would not be necessary for the Committee to take a vote. He largely agreed with the interpretation of the expression "abide by" given by the representative of Cameroon. The Committee could perhaps content itself with a consensus on the lines of the Cameroonian representative's statement and thus avoid the necessity of putting draft resolution A/AC.125/L.17 to a vote.
20. Mr. MOLINA (Venezuela) thought that the Committee had already devoted enough time to the question now before it. He therefore moved the closure of the debate.
21. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Special Committee should hear one remaining speaker who wished to comment on the substance of the proposals.
22. Mr. McKEOWN (Australia) said that as the sponsors had already explained their reasons for submitting the amendments in document A/AC.125/L.19, he would simply state that his delegation shared the sense of uncertainty about the meaning of the Chilean and United Arab Republic joint draft resolution (A/AC.125/L.17). Preambular paragraph (c) of that text was a particular source of difficulty. In the discussion in the First Committee on the draft Declaration, the Australian delegation had emphasized that it did not consider that Declaration as laying down in definitive form a legal definition of the principle of non-intervention. Accordingly, he must associate his delegation with those delegations which did not share the universal conviction referred to in paragraph (c).
23. Since the Declaration was addressed to States, he wondered in what sense the Special Committee, which was a drafting and negotiating body, could be asked to "abide by" the Declaration. The explanation offered by the Cameroonian representative had dissipated some of his doubts concerning that wording, and a statement of consensus on that interpretation, as suggested by the Swedish delegation, would go a long way towards meeting his delegation's wishes.
24. His delegation was completely out of sympathy with the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/AC.125/L.20) and the philosophy it reflected. For the Special Committee to refer the Declaration back to the General Assembly at the present stage would be tantamount to renouncing its mandate, particularly as the possibilities of achieving agreement had not yet been exhausted. Another source of difficulty for

(Mr. McKeown, Australia)

his delegation was the assumption in the second preambular paragraph and the operative paragraph of that draft resolution that the Declaration was ripe in that form for adoption as a legal statement of the principle of non-intervention. That assumption overrode the understanding on which many delegations, including his own, had accepted the Declaration, and was contrary to the statements made by those delegations in the First Committee and the General Assembly. Indeed, the very terms of the Declaration suggested that it was what it purported to be - a statement of political principles - and not a definitive legal statement of the principle of non-intervention.

25. Mr. MONOD (France) suggested that the words "se fondera sur" in the French version of the joint draft resolution (A/AC.125/L.17) should be replaced by the expression "s'en tiendra à", which was a more accurate translation of the Spanish text.

It was so agreed.

26. The CHAIRMAN noted that the members of the Special Committee were in general agreement that paragraph 1 of the joint draft resolution submitted by Chile and the United Arab Republic (A/AC.125/L.17) was to be interpreted in the manner suggested by the Cameroonian and Lebanese representatives, i.e., as not precluding the Drafting Committee from recommending appropriate drafting changes. He suggested that, since there was a consensus on that interpretation, the joint draft resolution might be adopted by acclamation.

27. Mr. EL-REEDY (United Arab Republic) stressed that while the Drafting Committee could recommend drafting changes in the General Assembly resolution, it could not make such changes itself. Only the General Assembly could amend its own text.

28. Mr. ALBONICO (Chile) said that since there were proposals before the Special Committee which were directly contrary to the joint draft resolution, that resolution must be put to the vote.

29. Mr. HARGROVE (United States of America) said that his delegation was unable to support the joint draft resolution for the reasons he had stated earlier, and suggested that the Special Committee should proceed to vote.

30. Mr. MONOD (France) said he appreciated the efforts of those delegations which had sought to avert a vote but feared that the acceptance of a vague statement of consensus would merely create difficulties for the Drafting Committee and obstruct its efforts to reach specific solutions. His delegation could in no circumstances accept preambular paragraph (c) of the joint draft resolution. For the sake of clarity, the joint draft resolution should be put to the vote.
31. Mr. ENGO (Cameroon) said that his d elagation would prefer to vote on an unequivocal text. Accordingly, he proposed that paragraph 2 of the joint draft resolution should be preceded by a new paragraph in the following terms: "Instructs the Drafting Committee, without prejudice to the provisions of the preceding paragraph, to direct its work on the basis that the Special Committee is bound by the substance of the said General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX) and that it may make any drafting changes it may deem necessary, provided that it shall not alter the substance of the said resolution and shall do nothing to reduce in any way the effect of the spirit of that resolution".
32. Mr. MOLINA (Venezuela) protested against the introduction of new proposals at that stage of the proceedings and asked the Chairman to act on his motion for closure of the debate.
33. The CHAIRMAN considered that the members should be permitted to attempt to reach a consensus, as they had in the past. He asked the sponsors of the joint draft resolution whether they could accept the Cameroonian representative's proposal.
34. Mr. ALBONICO (Chile) said that he could not consider a new proposal at that stage. He supported the Venezuelan representative's request for the closure of the debate.
35. Mr. EL-REEDY (United Arab Republic) and Mr. MISHRA (India) urged the Cameroonian representative to withdraw his proposal, since it was covered in substance by the oral understanding adopted earlier.
36. Mr. ENGO (Cameroon) said that as there appeared to be general agreement that the joint draft resolution should be read in the light of the text he had submitted, he would not press for its formal adoption.

37. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment in paragraph 1 (b) of document A/AC.125/L.19.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Netherlands, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Canada, France, Guatemala, Italy, Japan.

Against: Mexico, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Algeria, Argentina, Burma, Cameroon, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, India, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar.

Abstaining: Venezuela.

The amendment was rejected by 19 votes to 10, with 1 abstention.

38. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment in paragraph 2 of document A/AC.125/L.19.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Canada, France, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Sweden.

Against: Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Algeria, Argentina, Burma, Cameroon, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Mexico, Nigeria, Poland, Romania.

The amendment was rejected by 22 votes to 9.

39. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment in paragraph 3 (a) of document A/AC.125/L.19.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Canada, France, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Sweden.

Against: Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Algeria, Burma, Cameroon, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Mexico, Nigeria, Poland, Romania.

Abstaining: Venezuela, Argentina.

The amendment was rejected by 20 votes to 9, with 2 abstentions.

40. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment in paragraph 3 (b) of document A/AC.125/L.19.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Canada, France, Italy, Japan.

Against: Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Algeria, Burma, Cameroon, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ghana, India, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Mexico.

Abstaining: Sweden, Venezuela, Argentina, Guatemala.

The amendment was rejected by 19 votes to 8, with 4 abstentions.

41. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Chilean-United Arab Republic joint draft resolution (A/AC.125/L.17), as amended.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

The United States of America, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Algeria, Argentina, Burma, Cameroon, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Mexico, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic.

Against: United States of America, Australia, Canada, France, Italy
Japan, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland.

Abstaining: Sweden.

The joint draft resolution was adopted by 22 votes to 8, with 1 abstention.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.