

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

*Official Records**



SIXTH COMMITTEE
64th meeting
held on
Thursday, 6 December 1984
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 64th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GOERNER (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

AGENDA ITEM 133: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND ON THE STRENGTHENING OF THE ROLE OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 124: PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES BETWEEN STATES (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 129: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE DRAFTING OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AGAINST THE RECRUITMENT, USE, FINANCING AND TRAINING OF MERCENARIES (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 132: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH THE HOST COUNTRY (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 137: DRAFT STANDARD RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 134: DRAFT DECLARATION ON SOCIAL AND LEGAL PRINCIPLES RELATING TO THE PROTECTION AND WELFARE OF CHILDREN, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO FOSTER PLACEMENT AND ADOPTION NATIONALLY AND INTERNATIONALLY: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 135: REVIEW OF THE MULTILATERAL TREATY-MAKING PROCESS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 121: OBSERVER STATUS OF NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENTS RECOGNIZED BY THE ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY AND/OR BY THE LEAGUE OF ARAB STATES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

OTHER MATTERS

*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 DC2-750, 2 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.6/39/SR.64
12 December 1984

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.55 p.m.

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

1. The CHAIRMAN said that after consultations with the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.6/39/L.9, L.13 and L.18 and Corr.1, he was pleased to announce that agreement had been reached on the following dates for inter-sessional meetings. The Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations would meet from 28 January to 22 February 1985; the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization would meet from 4 to 29 March 1985; and the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries would meet from 8 April to 3 May 1985. If he heard no objections, he would take it that the Sixth Committee was in agreement with those dates.

2. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 133: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND ON THE STRENGTHENING OF THE ROLE OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)
(A/C.6/39/L.4, L.18 and Corr.1)

3. Mr. AZZAROUK (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), introducing draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.4 on behalf of the Iranian and Libyan delegations, said that the text reflected ideas expressed by several delegations and referred to a number of resolutions relating to the revision of Security Council procedures, in particular the veto. The sponsors were concerned at the failure of the Security Council to discharge its responsibilities, particularly because of its method of voting. They believed that the unanimity rule should be restricted with regard to issues relating to the rights of peoples struggling for self-determination and against colonialism and apartheid. They further believed that the maintenance of international peace and security was the common responsibility of all States Members of the United Nations.

4. Mrs. RAMIRO-LOPEZ (Philippines), introducing draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.18 and Corr.1 on behalf of the sponsors, said that it provided for the carrying forward of the work of the Special Committee on the Charter. The text represented a carefully negotiated balance, which should allow the draft to be adopted by consensus. Part A represented no great departure from previous years, only a slight refining of conditions recommended for the work of the Special Committee. The reference to the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations was new. Foremost among the activities of the United Nations at that time would be the work of the Special Committee.

5. In paragraph 2 of part A, the dates should read: "4 to 29 March 1985". She called special attention to paragraph 3, which outlined the work of the Special Committee to be undertaken at its next session. The significance of that work was becoming clearer and clearer and had gained the interest of the wider United Nations community. It was therefore desirable to have as much general agreement as possible on the results of the Committee's work.

(Mrs. Ramiro-Lopez, Philippines)

6. Concerning the peaceful settlement of disputes, she referred to paragraph 10, relating to the draft handbook on the subject, and paragraph 4, which would request the Special Committee to keep the question of the rationalization of the procedures of the United Nations under review.
7. The sponsors had been gratified by the broad participation in negotiations on the draft resolution. The text was unexceptionable, and she hoped that it would be adopted by consensus. She appealed to the members of the Sixth Committee to view the draft resolution on its own merits. She understood that the other draft resolution on the same item was causing concern in the Committee. It would be most unfortunate if the efforts of the Special Committee were thwarted by a linkage between the two draft resolutions.
8. The CHAIRMAN said that since the Sixth Committee had before it two draft resolutions on the same item, rule 131 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, according to which the proposals should be voted on in the order in which they had been submitted, unless otherwise decided, was applicable. Several delegations had proposed that a decision should be taken first on draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.18 and Corr.1, as orally revised.
9. Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that he would like to know which delegations had made that proposal, to which his delegation was strongly opposed.
10. The CHAIRMAN said that the proposal to take a decision first on draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.18 and Corr.1, as orally revised, had been made by the delegations of Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, New Zealand and Spain. The Committee would proceed to vote on that proposal.
11. The proposal was adopted by 73 votes to 23, with 26 abstentions.
12. Mr. AL-DUWAIKH (Kuwait) said that he wished to correct an error. His delegation was against, rather than in favour of, the proposal.
13. Mr. ABDULLAH (Oman) said he also would like to correct his delegation's vote. Oman was opposed to the proposal.
14. Mr. HOQUOQ (Afghanistan) said that if it had been present during the voting, his delegation would have abstained.
15. Draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.18 and Corr.1, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote.
16. Mr. SCHRICKE (France) said that there was no need to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.4. Rule 131 of the rules of procedure provided that the Committee could, after each vote on a proposal, decide whether to vote on the next proposal. On behalf of the delegation of the United Kingdom and his own delegation, he requested that that provision should be applied.

17. Mr. AZZAROUK (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said it was regrettable that the Sixth Committee seemed to be using the same methods as in the past to impede the adoption of necessary measures. Draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.4 was designed to improve the inner workings of the United Nations and to strengthen its role. Unfortunately, the delegations of France and the United Kingdom were submitting a proposal which in fact was designed to subvert the democratic character of United Nations proceedings. Such tactics would lead to paralysis and a new kind of veto. He therefore strongly urged all delegations, particularly those belonging to the non-aligned group, to vote against the proposal and to uphold democracy, especially in view of the intense negotiations that had taken place on draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.4.
18. Mr. KAHALEH (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the proposal of France and the United Kingdom was a procedural manoeuvre designed to prevent a vote on draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.4. If there was general opposition to that draft resolution, it should be expressed through a vote, following a valid democratic process, not through a fraudulent procedure. His delegation would vote against the proposal of France and the United Kingdom.
19. Mr. FOROUTAN (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had also expressed dissatisfaction with the Security Council's existing methods of work, which served the interests of the super-Powers. In spite of efforts at the international level to establish institutions to protect and guarantee the rights and security of States, the international community was defenceless in the face of aggression and violations of human rights. His delegation was apprehensive at the trend being followed in the Security Council, particularly with regard to acts of aggression. The Council yielded to political pressure in every case. Worst of all was the right of veto enjoyed by the permanent members of the Council, which often paralysed the work of the United Nations as a whole. His delegation considered that right of veto to be unjustified and contrary to the principle of equality of States. Not only had the Security Council shown itself incapable of acting to solve conflicts, but the abuse of the right of veto had reduced the effectiveness of the United Nations and impaired its credibility. A new assessment of the Charter was therefore necessary, and the mandate of the Special Committee should be extended in order to enable it to bring the Charter up to date.
20. The proposals contained in draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.4 concerning the amendment of the Charter did not seem to present any major difficulties. The Special Committee would merely be requested to continue its work in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, and to examine the adverse effects of the voting system in the Security Council. He therefore could not understand the apprehension of some delegations with regard to that text. The Charter was not divine law. It had deficiencies, and necessary amendments to it would lead to better understanding and a better sense of responsibility among Member States. He urged members of the Sixth Committee which believed it was the right time to re-examine the Charter to vote against the proposal of France and the United Kingdom.

21. Mr. ABDEL KHALEK (Egypt) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on the proposal of France and the United Kingdom because of Egypt's attitude to the substance of the issue. It maintained its previous position on the topic and considered that it was not the right time, and the Sixth Committee was not the right place to discuss the content of draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.4. His delegation had therefore become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.18 and Corr.1, which it believed to be more valid and more acceptable to the various regional groups.

22. The proposal of France and the United Kingdom that draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.4 should not be put to a vote was adopted by 46 votes to 36, with 39 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 124: PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES BETWEEN STATES (continued)
(A/C.6/39/L.7)

23. Mr. DIACONU (Romania), introducing draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.7, said that since the question of peaceful settlement of disputes should be one of the main concerns of the international community, the Special Committee on the Charter would be requested to continue its consideration of the proposal concerning the establishment of a commission on good offices, mediation and conciliation, as set forth in the documents submitted by Nigeria, the Philippines and Romania. In 1984, those three countries had submitted a new document aimed at clarifying certain aspects and thus facilitating an in-depth examination of the proposal.

24. At the same time, the Special Committee would be requested to examine the report of the Secretary-General on the progress of work on the draft handbook on the peaceful settlement of disputes. The final version of the draft handbook would have to be submitted eventually to the Special Committee for approval. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

25. Mr. BERMAN (United Kingdom), noting that paragraph 3 of the draft resolution contained the same request to the Special Committee as paragraph 3 (b) of part A of draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.18, said that he hoped the General Assembly would not have to discuss the report of the Special Committee under two separate agenda items, which would not be a rational method of work. He would like an assurance from the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.7 that, at the fortieth session, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the report of the Special Committee would be discussed in conjunction, as they had been at the current session. He felt that that understanding should be reflected specifically in future resolutions.

26. Mr. DIACONU (Romania) said that the question of whether an item was to be discussed separately or in conjunction with another item was a matter to be decided by the General Assembly when it organized its work for the session. For its part, his delegation had no objection to continuing the practice of discussing the two items together.

27. Mr. BERMAN (United Kingdom) said that he was satisfied with the reply given by the representative of Romania. He did, however, believe that when the Sixth Committee had before it two draft resolutions with similar paragraphs, it should ensure that the matters were considered together, if possible under the same agenda item.
28. Mr. FLEISCHHAUER (Under-Secretary-General, the Legal Counsel) said that, under paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.7 and paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.18 and Corr.1, the Secretary-General was requested to prepare a draft handbook on the peaceful settlement of disputes between States and to report to the Special Committee at its forthcoming session on the progress of work, before submitting to it the draft handbook in its final form, with a view to approval at a later stage. The Secretary-General had taken note of paragraph 133 of the report of the Special Committee (A/39/33) and would not fail to consult periodically, in order to obtain assistance in his task, a representative group of competent individuals from among the members of the permanent missions of the States Members of the United Nations. The preparation of that document would require a considerable amount of work, and the only reason he had not suggested to the Special Committee that additional staff should be recruited or outside assistance used was that he had felt it necessary first to make an accurate assessment of the work to be done. He had therefore informed the Special Committee that the progress report which the Secretary-General was to submit at its 1985 session would state whether it appeared possible to prepare the handbook within the limits of existing resources. He would provide the Special Committee with more precise details on the matter at that session. At the current stage, he assured the Sixth Committee that the Secretariat would do its best to live up to the expectations of the General Assembly.
29. Mr. SCHRICKE (France) said that his delegation had requested the Secretariat to report on the progress achieved on the preparation and publication of the supplements to the Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council and the Repertory of Practice of United Nations Organs, a task entrusted to it under resolution 36/123. He wondered whether the Legal Counsel was in a position to provide such information. In addition, he hoped that the time taken to update those two publications was not indicative of the time that would be required to complete work on the draft handbook.
30. Mr. FLEISCHHAUER (Under-Secretary-General, the Legal Counsel) said that he intended to provide the information at a subsequent meeting of the Committee.
31. Draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.7 was adopted without a vote.
32. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his delegation's position, said that the Soviet Union had not objected to the adoption without a vote of draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.7, since the draft was a procedural one. It was, however, against the proposal to establish a commission on good offices, mediation and conciliation for the settlement of disputes, since it ran counter to the Charter and would undermine the prerogatives of the Security Council.

AGENDA ITEM 129: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE DRAFTING OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AGAINST THE RECRUITMENT, USE, FINANCING AND TRAINING OF MERCENARIES (continued) (A/C.6/39/L.13)

33. The CHAIRMAN announced that Burundi, Cameroon and Tunisia had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.13.
34. Mr. APOE (Nigeria), introducing draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.13, said that the preambular paragraphs were the same as those of resolution 38/137. Following the consultations referred to by the Chairman earlier in the meeting, the dates of the Ad Hoc Committee's session had been revised in paragraph 8 to read: "8 April to 3 May 1985".
35. In adopting the resolution, the General Assembly would renew the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee and request it to make every effort to complete that mandate at its 1985 session. He stressed, however, that to make that request was not to set a rigid timetable for the Ad Hoc Committee, although he believed that the atmosphere prevailing in that Committee was conducive to the completion of its work in 1985. He had been heartened by the progress achieved at the 1984 session, particularly the adoption of a single text as the basis for negotiation, and by the favourable views expressed in the debate in the Sixth Committee. He was grateful to all those who had participated in the negotiations on the dates of the 1985 session and hoped that the draft resolution could be adopted by consensus.
36. Mr. GRANIZO ROMERO (Ecuador) proposed the deletion of the word "temático" in the second line of paragraph 6 of the Spanish text.
37. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Spanish text should be brought into line with the English, where the word used was "topical".
38. Mr. GRANIZO ROMERO (Ecuador) agreed to that suggestion.
39. Draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.13, as orally revised, was adopted by consensus.
40. Mr. HOLMES (Ireland), explaining the position of the 10 States members of the European Economic Community, said that they had been able to join in the consensus on the draft resolution because they agreed with its primary purpose, namely the continuation of the Ad Hoc Committee's negotiations on the drafting of a generally acceptable international convention. However, the Ten considered the wording of the fifth preambular paragraph too far-reaching. The activities of mercenaries might be contrary to international law, for example in cases of interference in a State's internal affairs at the instigation or with the support of another State; but in other cases the misdeeds of private individuals acting in a personal capacity, however reprehensible, could not be imputed to States or regarded as breaches of international law.
41. The Ten recognized the accuracy of the eighth preambular paragraph, stating that the Ad Hoc Committee had made progress but had not yet fulfilled its mandate, and agreed that every effort should be made to finalize an international convention

(Mr. Holmes, Ireland)

as soon as possible. However, paragraph 9 should not be interpreted as imposing a rigid time-limit for the completion of the Committee's mandate. A draft convention should not be submitted until all outstanding issues had been solved, and the Committee must continue to work on the basis of consensus.

42. The Ten supported the renewal of the Ad Hoc Committee's mandate and the use of the consolidated negotiating basis for future negotiation, and were ready to work constructively in that Committee towards a universally acceptable convention on mercenaries.

43. Mr. BERNHARD (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the Nordic States, said that they had participated in the consensus because they were in general agreement with the content and objectives of the draft resolution. In fact, their legal systems already contained prohibitions against mercenary activities. However, they considered the fifth preambular paragraph too far-reaching, for the reasons put forward by the preceding speaker.

44. Mr. HAYASHI (Japan) endorsed that statement.

45. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) said that his delegation's participation in the consensus did not mean that it agreed with the fifth preambular paragraph or that it interpreted paragraph 9 as imposing a rigid deadline rather than embodying an expression of hope. His delegation would seek to participate as constructively as possible in the preparation of a draft convention.

AGENDA ITEM 132: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH THE HOST COUNTRY
(continued) (A/C.6/39/L.22)

46. Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus), introducing draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.22, said that it was based on generally accepted formulations and on previous General Assembly resolutions on the subject. It was the result of consultations with a number of delegations and covered all aspects of the objectives of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country. He hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

47. Draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.22 was adopted by consensus.

AGENDA ITEM 137: DRAFT STANDARD RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR UNITED NATIONS
CONFERENCES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.6/39/L.24)

48. Draft decision A/C.6/39/L.24 was adopted by consensus.

AGENDA ITEM 134: DRAFT DECLARATION ON SOCIAL AND LEGAL PRINCIPLES RELATING TO THE PROTECTION AND WELFARE OF CHILDREN, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO FOSTER PLACEMENT AND ADOPTION NATIONALLY AND INTERNATIONALLY: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
(continued) (A/C.6/39/L.23)

49. Mr. BRING (Sweden), introducing draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.23, said that Colombia, Spain, Suriname and Uruguay had joined its sponsors. Since the operative part of the text was procedural in character, the sponsors hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

50. Mr. BHINDER (Pakistan) reaffirmed his delegation's position that adoption was prohibited by Islamic law, which was currently being introduced into Pakistan. Since his country's Constitution prohibited the enactment of any law repugnant to the injunctions of Islam, his delegation could not subscribe to the principle of adoption as such. However, the prohibition of adoption in Islamic law should not be interpreted as meaning that orphans and destitute children were left to their own misery in a Muslim society. The Prophet Muhammad, as an orphan himself, had attached great importance to the welfare of such children. The Islamic social and legal system therefore spelled out a variety of methods to alleviate their suffering.

51. Pakistan was making great efforts to improve the conditions of orphans and destitute children. Despite heavy constraints on its meagre resources and other urgent priorities, it was spending large sums on their welfare and providing scholarships for needy students. Individual contributions to that cause were also being encouraged. His delegation therefore supported the drafting of a declaration to alleviate the suffering of orphans and destitute children by any means which conformed to Pakistan's legal system. While it would co-operate in any method that facilitated that process, it would prefer the system of inter-sessional consultations.

52. Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Sudan) said that the drafting of a declaration required consultation between the representatives of different legal systems. His delegation supported the draft resolution, but had difficulties with paragraphs 1 and 2.

53. Mr. ALHAJ (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that human, legal and practical considerations, as well as the Islamic religion, prevented his delegation from supporting the draft resolution. He fully endorsed the comments made by the representative of Pakistan. He asked the Committee to put the draft resolution to the vote and said that his delegation would abstain.

54. Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Sudan) suggested that action on the draft resolution should be postponed so that the sponsors could hold consultations on paragraphs 1 and 2.

55. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 135: REVIEW OF THE MULTILATERAL TREATY-MAKING PROCESS (continued)
(A/C.6/39/L.12, L.16/Rev.2)

56. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of the Soviet Union had requested a vote on draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.16/Rev.2.

57. Mr. KIRSCH (Canada) said that the draft resolution had been the object of extensive consultation and many amendments. There was nothing in it which was unhelpful or which prejudged the position of any delegation. He therefore wondered why there was any need for a vote.

58. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation could not support the draft resolution because the so-called "final document" (A/C.6/39/L.12, annex) had never been submitted to Governments for their reaction or properly discussed in the Sixth Committee. For many countries which had little experience with multilateral treaties the so-called "final document" would only create difficulties. It could be used by those which were opposed to the progressive development of international law to justify their positions. The value of United Nations documents, including the one in question, depended upon how they were adopted and the extent to which they were in keeping with the interests of all States. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

59. Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Sudan) said his delegation would like the text to be adopted by consensus because it had been drafted in such a way as to meet the concerns expressed by delegations in the Working Group. It was not a political draft, but a technical and a descriptive one designed to consolidate procedures and promote the progressive development of international law. The paragraphs were self-explanatory and the purposes were clear. Technical resolutions were traditionally adopted by consensus and that tradition should be maintained.

60. Mr. KIRSCH (Canada) said that the language used in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution in reference to the final document was very mild. He therefore assumed that the representative of the Soviet Union had difficulties with the final document itself and wanted to know what they were.

61. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would insist on a vote unless the sponsors agreed to delete paragraphs 2 and 3.

62. Mr. NOLAN (Australia), supported by Mr. NIYOMRERKS (Thailand), said that all the delegations which had been involved in the preparation of draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.16/Rev.2 realized that paragraphs 2 and 3 were essential and could not be deleted. Paragraph 3 was mildly worded. It was descriptive rather than prescriptive. He therefore could not agree to the deletion of paragraphs 2 and 3.

63. Mr. BHINDER (Pakistan) said there was nothing objectionable in paragraphs 2 and 3. Paragraph 3 was only a recommendation. He therefore asked the Soviet representative not to insist on a vote.

64. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that the final document had been prepared by a Working Group of the Sixth Committee and that delegations had had every opportunity to express their views on it. It would be a pity if members of the Sixth Committee detracted from the value of the Working Group's efforts by forcing a vote on the draft resolution. His delegation found the draft useful and appealed to the Soviet representative not to insist on a vote. The term "final" did not give the document any more significance than was inherent in it.

65. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would not change its position because the "final document" had never been submitted to Governments, which was a normal procedure even for so-called "technical" documents. In any case, such documents often had political and legal implications. He drew attention in that connection to the chapeau and subparagraphs (a) and (b) of paragraph 1 of the "final document" (A/C.6/39/L.12, annex), and observed that opinions differed as to what considerations Governments wished to take into account.
66. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, said that the Soviet representative had every right to ask for a vote but that now was not the time to reopen a debate on substance.
67. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that some delegations had asked his delegation to explain the reasons for its position. There was a group of States in the United Nations which was not interested in the progressive development of international law; a representative of that group had just interrupted him. To justify his own negative attitude to any State he did not like, that representative would invoke paragraph 1 (a) of the "final document" by arguing that a particular subject-matter was already regulated by international law. As for paragraph 1 (b), it was clear that the "extent of interest" was not the same for all States and that some would prefer not to take any initiative whatsoever. His delegation's position was aimed at avoiding any subsequent impediment to the progressive development of international law.
68. Draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.16/Rev.2 was adopted by 111 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.
69. Mr. ABDEL-RAHMAN (Sudan) pointed out that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution, but that his vote had been erroneously recorded as an abstention.
70. The CHAIRMAN said that the matter would be rectified.
71. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) reiterated his support of the right of any Member State to request a vote on a draft resolution. He also strongly supported the principle of working by consensus and believed that the progressive development and codification of international law, and the very working of the United Nations itself, must be based on good faith. The negotiations leading up to the draft resolution had been conducted on the understanding that a consensus would be reached. The text was therefore much weaker than the majority of States would have wished. The progressive development and codification of international law could not be carried out effectively without a measure of self-restraint on the part of States. A much clearer call for such self-restraint should have been expressed in the draft resolution. The final document had been generally accepted by all concerned, despite any belated endeavours to question various aspects of it. To prey on the willingness of others to attain general agreement and make concessions and then request a vote at the last minute was to negotiate in bad faith.

72. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he was not too surprised by the statement by the representative of the United States, a country which made no proposals designed to develop international law but, on the contrary, had consistently opposed such endeavours. Behaviour similar to that witnessed at the current meeting had been seen with respect to other issues more important to the international community. His delegation too had approached the preparation of draft resolutions with a view to achieving consensus, and had made numerous concessions, in particular, to the United States delegation with respect to matters not only of a technical but also of a political character which were of interest to the overwhelming majority of States. However, despite the efforts of the sponsors, it had proved impossible to adopt those resolutions without a vote because the United States representatives refused to accept the principle of the progressive development of international law and had even voted against them.

73. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) said that what had taken place in the Working Group and at the current meeting was obvious to all. He was not aware of any instance when his delegation had misled any other delegation or obtained concessions under false pretences and then, at the last minute, requested a vote. He would be very interested if anyone could cite such an instance, provided that that person did not attempt to rewrite history.

74. Mr. SCHRICKE (France) said that only the Soviet Union and its closest allies had seen anything dangerous in a draft resolution which merely recommended some common-sense rules for States to apply as they wished. That attitude was disturbing and even slightly insulting to the analytical capabilities and intelligence of the delegations which had voted in favour of the draft resolution.

75. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that his delegation had never given any other delegation an incorrect impression of its intentions with respect to the draft resolution, but had clearly stated its position to the sponsors. To claim that his delegation had misled others was to mislead the Committee itself.

AGENDA ITEM 121: OBSERVER STATUS OF NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENTS RECOGNIZED BY THE ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY AND/OR BY THE LEAGUE OF ARAB STATES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.6/39/L.25)

76. The CHAIRMAN announced that Angola and Uganda had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.25.

OTHER MATTERS

77. The CHAIRMAN said that he had received a letter from the Chairman of the Fifth Committee requesting the views of the Sixth Committee on the proposed revisions to chapter 3 of the medium-term plan for the period 1984-1989 (A/39/6 and Corr.1), which dealt with the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law. The Chairman of the Fifth Committee had also approached him in order to explore methods by which the Sixth Committee might contribute to the consideration of the harmonization and development of the statutes, rules and practices of the United

(The Chairman)

Nations Administrative Tribunal and the ILO Administrative Tribunal, a question that had been on the agenda of the Fifth Committee for a number of years. Some members of the Fifth Committee had suggested that before they themselves considered the matter, it might first be considered by the Sixth Committee. He had informed the chairmen of the regional groups of both matters, to which he would return at a subsequent meeting so that the Committee could prepare a reply to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.