amount to the establishment of a new kind of veto, which would be contrary to reason as well as to legality.

28. Mr. HYERA (United Republic of Tanzania) recalled the hope that a great many States had placed in the quest for a definition of aggression, one of whose main effects should have been, as the ninth preambular paragraph of the draft definition stated, "deterring a potential aggressor" and to simplify "the determination of acts of aggression". The text adopted by the Sixth Committee did not achieve any of the goals sought.

29. Far from defining aggression, the provisions of article 1 categorically precluded any act committed without the use of armed force from being considered as an act of aggression. There was no need to explain why acts committed without resorting to armed force could constitute acts of aggression. Article 1, far from forestalling such acts, seemed rather to point out to any potential aggressor a form of aggression not included in the definition.

30. Neither did articles 2 and 3 constitute a definition. They were merely indications which would be of little assistance to the Security Council in determining the existence of an act of aggression. Those articles were an admission of an unquestionable inability to define aggression, for they asked the Security Council to decide for itself whether or not an act of aggression had occurred. Those provisions gave rise to serious consequences, since they concentrated the power to define aggression in the hands of the five permanent members of the Security Council. If that was the intention, the 50 or so years spent in attempting to define aggression had merely been time wasted. History showed that aggression could be committed by the permanent members of the Security Council themselves. If that was so, the provisions adopted meant that the author of an act of aggression would be asked to state whether it was an aggressor. A further serious short-coming was that the text did not state that colonialism and racism constituted aggression in themselves, and that all acts to which they gave rise were also acts of aggression.

31. The impossibility of really defining aggression was due to the excessive importance given to the concept of consensus. However, the draft definition adopted by the Sixth Committee was not truly the outcome of a consensus, as his delegation understood that term. His delegation could not believe that the majority of the Committee took the view that aggression could only be committed by the use of force, and that the determination of the existence of an act of aggression could be left to the initiative of the very States which had committed the reprehensible act. His delegation requested that its reservations should be placed on record.

Organization of work

32. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that an additional meeting could be held on the afternoon of Monday, 25 November, in order to avoid a night meeting. However, it would not be possible to secure interpretation of the deliberations into Arabic at that time.

33. Mr. YASEEN (Iraq) said that the delegations of the Arab group would have to consult with each other on that question. He suggested that the decision in that regard should be deferred until the following meeting.

34. Mr. HASSOUNA (Egypt) supported the representative of Iraq and said that the Chairman's suggestion raised a question of principle. He asked whether the proposed meeting could not be held on another day of the week, when it would be possible to have interpretation into Arabic.

35. The CHAIRMAN assured the Egyptian representative that he appreciated the problem and requested the Secretariat to look into the situation. He said that the Sixth Committee's decision would be taken in accordance with the Arab group.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.

1504th meeting

Friday, 22 November 1974, at 3.20 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Milan ŠAHOVIĆ (Yugoslavia).

A/C.6/SR.1504

AGENDA ITEM 86

Report of the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression *(continued)* (A/9619 and Corr.1, A/C.6/L.988, L.990, L.993)

1. Mr. GARCIA ORTIZ (Ecuador) said that it was inconceivable that draft resolution A/C.6/L.993 should have been adopted by consensus. That was certainly an elegant way of resolving difficulties, but, as his delegation had already had occasion to point out (1476th meeting), the text of the draft definition of aggression was not satisfactory. He hoped that the statement relating to article 3 *(d)* would make it possible correctly to interpret that provision, which seemed to interfere with the right of States to adopt measures they considered appropriate and, *inter alia*, with Ecuador's right to take the necessary measures for the protection of its resources. That was why his delegation would have abstained if the draft resolution had been put to the vote.

2. Mr. RAO (India) said he was glad that the draft resolution had been adopted by consensus. The Committee had also approved two statements, one on article 3 *(c)* and the other on article 3 *(d)*. As many delegations had pointed out during the general debate on that item, article 3 *(d)* might be misinterpreted and it was therefore fortunate that the Committee had reached agreement on that matter. While the statement relating to subparagraph *(d)* was intended to clarify the wording on which the Special Committee had agreed, the other statement introduced a new element into the draft definition.

3. Although India had always recognized the need to protect the legitimate interests of the land-locked countries, he was of the opinion that those countries' problems should not be dealt with during the consideration of the draft definition. Moreover, none of the transit countries of Asia, Latin America and Africa had apparently been consulted on the statement relating to article 3 *(c)*. His own delegation had, in any case, not been consulted and it therefore did not consider itself a party to that statement, although it had not wished to raise any objections before the adoption of the draft resolution with a view to promoting consensus on the draft definition as a whole. Consequently, there could be no question of referring to it in the context of the access to the sea of land-locked countries or of extending the authority of transit States because those were problems to be settled by international treaties and the relevant bilateral instruments.

4. Mr. WISNOEMOERTI (Indonesia) was of the opinion that the fact that the draft resolution had been adopted by consensus showed that the draft definition had raised some difficulties for certain delegations. His delegation would have preferred the text of the statement relating to article 3 *(d)* to be incorporated in the text itself of the definition or at least reproduced in a foot-note. Moreover, as it had already explained, the wording of article 3 *(g)* could have been improved by the deletion of the word "substantial", which his delegation considered superfluous.

5. Mr. ARITA QUIÑONEZ (Honduras) said that, by adopting the draft resolution, the Committee had contributed to the development of international law, for the draft definition met the necessary conditions for the protection of States which might become or had already been the victims of an aggression. That definition would also help to strengthen the role of the United Nations.

6. Mr. MAHMUD (Pakistan) said that his delegation had some reservations with regard to the draft definition, as amended, particularly by the inclusion of the substance of working paper A/C.6/L.990 in the report of the Committee. The question of the access to the sea of land-locked countries was of direct interest to Pakistan, whose approach to that subject was based on international law and the practice of States. The problem therefore arose as to whether land-locked States enjoyed an extra-territorial right in the matter of transit or whether they must conclude bilateral agreements with the transit countries. According to the relevant conventions and practice, the transit of land-locked States should be the subject of agreements between the States concerned and subject to the principle of reciprocity. In that connexion, he referred to several provisions of the Convention on the High Seas and the Convention on Transit Trade of Land-locked States. In practice, the arrangements worked out through mutual agreement had satisfactorily met the needs of the land-locked States while safeguarding the interests of the transit States. Moreover, there was no need to ask whether transit was a right or a privilege; no discussion of that matter would further the cause of the land-locked States and might even harm it.

7. Mr. KOLESNIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) welcomed with satisfaction the adoption of the draft definition, which marked a new victory for the diplomacy of peace. The Soviet Union had always supported States advocating the strengthening of international peace and security and their foundations in law, which was the objective of the draft definition. Using words of the Secretary-General of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, he said that any State which aspired to peaceful co-operation, showed goodwill and adopted a realistic attitude, could always count on the support of the Soviet Union, which rejected reckless attempts at provocation. Although the majority of delegations welcomed the adoption of the draft definition, one or two delegations were advancing the absurd argument that the countries of the third world might have been duped. Those were, however, the very countries which had again taken the initiative of defining aggression and they did not need any mentors. The argument that the third world could not protect its interests was the hegemonistic slogan of the Maoists.

8. The sponsors of the draft definition had endeavoured to take account of generally recognized principles and standards of contemporary international law and to respect scrupulously the provisions of the Charter. That text should therefore constitute a legal obstacle to any attempt at aggression. His delegation hoped that it would contribute to the strengthening of détente and help the Security Council to determine the existence of acts of aggression and adopt the necessary measures.

9. It went without saying that, since the draft definition was the result of a compromise, it could not be fully satisfactory to all delegations. Thus, his delegation considered that the word "sovereignty" in the first article was unnecessary and that the distinction between a war of aggression and aggression made in article 5 was unfounded, but it was of the opinion that the draft definition represented the best which could have been achieved in view of the delicate political nature of the question. With regard to operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, his delegation was of the opinion that it meant that the Security Council could later consider the definition which had been adopted and take an appropriate decision to give the definition binding force, thus increasing the effectiveness of efforts aimed at the maintenance of international peace and security.

10. With regard to the statements it had been agreed to include in the Committee's report, his delegation considered that none of the provisions of the draft definition could be interpreted as interfering with the right of a State or group of States and that the statement relating to article 3 *(c)* was therefore unnecessary, although it had not objected to it. Moreover, the statement relating to article 3 *(d)* could in no way be considered as prejudicing the

outcome of the consideration by the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea of problems of the limits of the national jurisdiction of coastal States and the régime of the economic zone.

11. He expressed his delegation's appreciation to all those who had worked so untiringly on the preparation of the draft definition and to the delegations in the Committee and, in particular, the delegations of land-locked countries, which had shown a spirit of compromise.

12. Mr. LEKAUKAU (Botswana) said that, as a sponsor of document A/C.6/L.990, his delegation had had to agree to a compromise on article 3 *(c)* of the draft definition, although it had not been offered any convincing reasons for not including that text in the draft definition itself. The delegations of the land-locked countries had been threatened that, if they insisted on their original position, they would be held responsible if the draft definition failed to be adopted. His delegation had already explained its point of view on the right of access to the sea of land-locked countries (1488th meeting) and therefore accepted the compromise on the statement relating to article 3 *(c)*, on the understanding that the provisions of the draft definition and the texts to which the foot-note referred would be interpreted in the spirit of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

13. Mr. MANIANG (Sudan) recalled that his delegation, although it had participated actively in the deliberations of the Special Committee, recognized that the draft definition was not perfect. The statements to be reproduced in the Sixth Committee's report would fill in certain gaps in the draft. Nevertheless, he felt that there was every justification for the question raised at the previous meeting by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, who had envisaged the possibility that a permanent member of the Security Council might be accused, under article 4, of having committed an act of aggression. Article 7 should be interpreted as referring to all forms of struggle against colonialism and alien domination, including armed struggle.

14. Mr. FUENTES IBAÑEZ (Bolivia) said that it was regrettable that the legitimate aspirations of the land-locked countries had been considered worthy only of mention in a foot-note. He associated himself with the Paraguayan delegation which at the preceding meeting had expressed its astonishment at the unexpected manner in which the Committee had pronounced on document A/C.6/L.993. If that text had been put to a vote, his delegation would have abstained. He deplored the contempt shown by the Soviet delegation for delegations whose point of view differed somewhat from its own.

15. Mr. MILLER (Canada) welcomed the adoption of the draft definition after half a century of effort. He shared the view expressed by the representative of the Soviet Union that it had not been possible to draft a more satisfactory text and that, in order to achieve a final form, it had been necessary to strike a delicate balance between the different views held. It was to be hoped that the text would have considerable moral authority. However, only the test of time would show whether the Security Council would find it useful, and the permanent members of the Council would be largely responsible for the extent to which it was respected. He recognized that the text was not perfect and deplored the fact that the coastal States had been late in presenting their objections to article 3 *(c)*. He thanked the delegations of the land-locked countries and those of the coastal States which had endeavoured to reach a compromise on both article 3 *(c)* and article 3 *(d)*.

16. As the representative of Canada had said during the general debate on the item (1473rd meeting), the draft definition would help to prevent and contain aggression, two of the reasons for the creation of the United Nations. His delegation hoped it would help to maintain peace and that all countries would realize its importance.

17. Mr. ESSY (Ivory Coast) noted that many delegations had stressed the imperfections and limitations of the draft definition, while others had asserted that any amendment to the text could destroy the balance achieved. It was for that reason that his delegation had agreed that the statement on article 3 *(d)* should be reproduced in the report of the Sixth Committee. However, he wished to stress that that statement would have the same legal force as the provisions of the definition itself.

18. He wondered what was to become of the Special Committee in the future and hoped that the question of the definition of aggression would always be kept under review for, as the Soviet delegation itself had demonstrated to the First Committee when speaking of the influence which one State could exert over the geophysical environment of another, States were continually developing new forms of aggression. In that respect, article 4 was a guarantee for the future, but its role as a safety valve was nevertheless very limited. He hoped that the adoption of the draft resolution would be considered as a first step only and not as an end in itself.

19. Mr. BAMBA (Upper Volta) said that during the discussions prior to the drafting of draft resolution A/C.6/L.993, the group of land-locked countries, of which Upper Volta was one, had tried in vain to win acceptance for a number of proposals but, to avoid bearing the responsibility for a failure, had finally had to be content with the least unsatisfactory wording for the foot-note which was to be added at the end of the preambular part of the draft definition. His delegation considered that foot-note to be an integral part of the definition of aggression. It was to be hoped that the adoption of that draft would constitute only a first step and that the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression would do everything necessary to complete the definition.

20. Mrs. ULYANOVA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) expressed her delegation's satisfaction at the adoption of the draft definition, which was a triumph for the forces of peace that favoured the peaceful settlement of the problems of the world community.

21. The draft definition, although based strictly on the Charter, was the result of a compromise and, as such, could be improved. Nevertheless, her delegation particularly appreciated the balance achieved in the selection of the objective criteria for the definition which, in fact, met all the basic requirements of a definition of aggression.

22. For her delegation, the words "the use of armed force by a State against the sovereignty" of another State in article 1 meant the use of armed force against the territorial integrity or political independence of a State. Furthermore, the statements which were to be added to the report of the Committee could not be used to limit the scope of the definition. They could not prejudice the results of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, the aim of which must be to afford equal protection for the interests of all States.

23. The international community wished the definition to be applied as effectively as possible. The Security Council should use that instrument as a basis when called on to determine whether acts of aggression had been committed, and it should make it binding so as effectively to discourage any would-be aggressor.

24. Mr. SHAFAGHAT (Iran) reaffirmed the adherence of his delegation to the consensus which had made the adoption of draft resolution A/C.6/L.993 possible but said that his Government maintained its position of principle explained earlier within various United Nations organs concerning the statement made by the Chairman on article 3 *(c)* of the draft definition.

25. Mr. HASSOUNA (Egypt) recalled that his delegation had already made known its views and reservations on the draft definition which had been adopted (1483rd meeting). Nevertheless, he wished to emphasize the considerable importance of the declaration for the maintenance of international peace and security. It would have been advisable, however, to include in the draft resolution a request to the Security Council to apply the draft definition when discharging its responsibilities under the Charter. His delegation also felt that the Sixth Committee should have recommended that the General Assembly should adopt the draft definition of aggression in the form of a declaration rather than simply of a resolution, as was customary for instruments whose import was to be emphasized.

26. Mrs. GROSSMAN (Dominican Republic) stressed the usefulness of the definition, which would make it possible to take measures to prevent acts of aggression, and consequently to strengthen the security of peace-loving peoples. The definition was in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and applied only to armed aggression. As the representative of a small developing country, she regretted the limited scope of the definition, while appreciating the positive results achieved by the Special Committee's text.

27. Mr. TIEN Chin (China) observed that in his statement, the representative of the USSR had not replied to the questions raised by China and other third world countries, thus demonstrating the weakness of the USSR's position. The attitude adopted by the Soviet delegation throughout the preparation of the draft definition showed indisputably that the Soviet Union still had ulterior motives and was constantly endeavouring to put its own interests as a super-Power first.

28. Mr. PRIETO (Chile), speaking on a point of order regarding the debate on the definition of aggression, said that following the 1503rd meeting, a number of delegations had approached the Chilean delegation to ask if Chile was in fact to be one of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/L.993. His delegation was in no doubt as to its status as a sponsor since no opposition had been demonstrated when, at the 1502nd meeting of the Committee, it had stated its intention of becoming a co-sponsor of the draft resolution. The situation called for clarification, however, since a number of delegations had expressed their uncertainty and also because press release GA/L/1712 stated that "several other delegations have expressed their willingness to become co-sponsors", but went on to list only the original sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/L.993. In order to clear up any doubts, his delegation wished to know the opinion of the Officers of the Committee on Chile's position in that connexion.

29. The CHAIRMAN noted that the Chilean delegation was addressing a question to the Officers of the Committee. It seemed possible to conclude from the replies given at the 1503rd meeting that the solution of the question depended on the wishes of the original sponsors of the draft. He was, however, prepared to consult the Officers and to communicate their reply at a later meeting.

30. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) recalled that the draft definition had been finally adopted by the Committee. Before its adoption, some countries, including Chile, had taken the floor and had expressed the wish to become co-sponsors of the document. The Chairman himself had then brought up a rarely invoked rule by indicating that the original sponsors could make an objection if they wished. No such opposition had emerged before the adoption of the draft resolution, and the question had been briefly touched on in the statement which his delegation had made after that adoption. It had stated on that occasion that it presumed that an agreement existed to the effect that all the countries which had expressed the desire to become co-sponsors were in fact considered as such. No delegation had raised the least objection at that time.

31. His delegation could not agree that the Chairman, in collaboration with either the Committee Secretary or the Officers, should have the right to revert to the question of who was to be considered as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution. The Committee could not go so far as to create a "non-event".

32. However, if the question was illegally reopened, his delegation would be obliged to raise very serious questions concerning many of the States which were sponsors of document A/C.6/L.993 and several of the delegations which had spoken and whose practice in the sphere of political and human rights was unquestionably deplorable. His delegation would not be able to associate itself as a sponsor with a great number of States whose names appeared at the head of the draft resolution if it considered that the fact of accepting a co-sponsor amounted to approval of its political régime.

33. Mr. KOLESNIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said the Chilean delegation could not be considered as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution, since paragraph 93 of annex V to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly

stated that it was for the sponsors of the document to make the decision. The very fact that that rule had been mentioned before the adoption of the draft resolution proved, if proof was needed, that the question could not be resolved without due consideration. The rules should be respected and the Committee should beware of creating an unfortunate precedent for the future.

34. Mr. STARČEVIĆ (Yugoslavia) considered that the Chairman had been right to stress the existence of applicable rules which conferred the power of decision on the original sponsors. As one of the original sponsors, his delegation was opposed to the inclusion of the Chilean delegation among the sponsors of the draft resolution.

35. The situation was thus clear and if Chile pressed its question and if the officers' reply was that agreement among the original sponsors was not enough to prevent a delegation from becoming a co-sponsor of a document, there would then be no way of preventing a delegation from becoming a co-sponsor of any document. If, however, the opposite solution was adopted, the opposition of one of the original sponsors would be enough to prevent a delegation which expressed a wish to that effect from being included among the sponsors of a document.

36. Mr. PRIETO (Chile) said that he would like to receive clarification on the meaning of paragraph 93 of annex V to the rules of the procedure of the General Assembly. Two theories had emerged following the statement by the representative of Yugoslavia. To his delegation, paragraph 93 meant that the opposition of the majority of sponsors was necessary to refuse the request of a delegation which wished to become a co-sponsor of a document. However, the Yugoslav and Soviet delegations maintained that each of the original sponsors had the right of veto, although that was contrary to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and of its organs.

37. As it was not satisfied with the Chairman's reply, his delegation called for a recorded vote on the validity of the two theories.

38. Mr. STEEL (United Kingdom) recalled that the draft resolution had been adopted before the least objection had been raised concerning the statements made by any of the delegations which had expressed the intention of becoming co-sponsors of the document. Any vote would therefore seem pointless and the Chilean delegation had the right to be included among the sponsors of the draft.

39. However, if that statement of the facts was contested and if the Yugoslav delegation was allowed to raise an objection, his own delegation, which was also one of the original sponsors of the draft, would then, with the deepest regret, oppose the inclusion of any sponsor apart from the original sponsors.

40. Mr. HASSOUNA (Egypt) said that his delegation was not a sponsor of the draft resolution. However, he considered that it could be concluded without the slightest doubt from the provisions of paragraph 93 of annex V to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly that the agreement of all the original sponsors was necessary for a delegation to be able to join them. The situation was identical to that in which the sponsors had to decide whether to accept or reject an amendment to a draft resolution which they had proposed. Furthermore, that interpretation was confirmed by the practice of the General Assembly; as a matter of principle, his delegation could not accept that a sponsor should be deprived of the right to oppose the inclusion of an additional sponsor.

41. Mr. JEANNEL (France) observed that the basic principle laid down by paragraph 93 of annex V to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly was that it was for the sponsors of a draft to make the decision. United Nations practice did not seem in any way to require that the sponsors should meet and formally take a position. In reality it was necessary for an objection to be raised if the request of a delegation wishing to become a co-sponsor of a draft was to be rejected. In the case in question, his delegation, which was a sponsor of the draft resolution, had not been consulted, and furthermore had not heard the least objection before the adoption of the draft resolution. The United Kingdom representative had rightly stressed that once the draft resolution had been adopted it was no longer possible either to become a co-sponsor or to discuss the legitimacy of the co-sponsorship. It was clear that since no objection at all had been raised when the Chilean delegation had become a co-sponsor, its proposal had been accepted before the adoption of the draft resolution. Had it been otherwise, his delegation would have protested, since it would then have had to have been consulted before any decision was taken, because it was one of the sponsors.

42. Moreover, he considered that it was unnecessary for the Committee to take a vote, since the officers were not empowered to interpret paragraph 93 of annex V to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which laid down a perfectly clear rule.

43. Mr. FERNANDEZ BALLESTEROS (Uruguay) shared the view of the representatives of France and the United Kingdom. It, too, was a sponsor of the draft resolution and had never had any knowledge of an agreement among the original sponsors not to accept any additional sponsor. It was for that reason that his delegation had invited the Chilean delegation and many other delegations to co-sponsor document A/C.6/L.993 so as to facilitate the attainment of a consensus in the Committee.

44. His delegation supported the interpretation of paragraph 93 of annex V to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly as confirmed by practice. It had no objection with regard to any of the delegations which had expressed the wish to become co-sponsors of the draft resolution before the vote had been taken. All such delegations had the status of co-sponsors.

45. Mr. CHAVES (Grenada) assured the Chilean and Uruguayan delegations of his firm support. He stressed the importance of the solution to be found for the problem, as it would set a precedent.

46. Mr. SCIOLLA-LA GRANGE (Italy) made it clear that as a sponsor of the draft resolution his delegation had never been consulted by any delegation wishing to become a co-sponsor itself. No objection had been raised before the vote against any of the delegations which had expressed the

desire to become co-sponsors and there was therefore no way to deny them that status. If that interpretation did not prevail, however, his delegation would take the same attitude as the United Kingdom delegation towards all other delegations.

47. Mr. KOLESNIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed, in connexion with the comments by the representatives of France and Italy, that his delegation had referred to the rule in paragraph 93 of annex V to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly prior to the vote on the draft resolution. Its intention at that time had been to draw attention to the existence of that provision on the sponsorship of draft resolutions and to stress that the question had not been settled by the sponsors of the draft in question. The Chilean delegation, moreover, had understood its intervention in that sense, and the comments of the French and Italian delegations were not absolutely relevant.

48. One delegation had, moreover, proposed that a vote should be taken. It went without saying that if the question raised by the Chilean delegation was to be considered from a political point of view, the Sixth Committee could in fact give its opinion by means of a vote. If, however, the problem was to be considered from a legal point of view, a vote would be pointless, since it was obvious that the answer had to be given by the sponsors alone who should, consequently, consult each other and settle the problem among themselves, since the Sixth Committee had no competence.

49. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia), speaking on a point of order, observed that the discussion was still concerned with the question of defining aggression. The question raised by the Chilean representative was a legal one and of considerable practical importance. Since the Committee was not yet able to find a solution to it, and in order to save time, it would be better to instruct experts to study it. Accordingly, he proposed that the debate should be adjourned in accordance with rule 116 of the rules of procedure and that the next agenda item, namely diplomatic asylum, should be taken up.

50. Mr. MAI'GA (Mali), speaking on a point of order, recalled that the Chairman had stated that the debate on the question of defining aggression would be closed after the explanations of vote. The Committee therefore seemed to be considering another question, namely that raised by the Chilean representative. Accordingly, it was the adjournment of the debate on that question which was apparently being proposed.

51. The CHAIRMAN explained that, in accordance with article 116 of the rules of procedure, two representatives might speak in favour of, and two against, the motion for adjournment, after which the motion should be immediately put to the vote.

52. Mr. ROBINSON (Jamaica) supported the Australian motion, pointing out that the Committee had more to lose than gain by continuing the discussion. It would be better to entrust the question raised by the Chilean representative to experts. They should perhaps make a distinction between proposals with very few original sponsors and those with at least 60 or so original sponsors. In the first instance, one might insist that they should give their unanimous consent to another delegation becoming a co-sponsor of the proposal, while in the other instance, it would be unfair to confer on every one the right of veto.

53. Mr. PRIETO (Chile) opposed the motion by the representative of Australia. He reiterated that his country was in fact a co-sponsor of the draft resolution in question, and that the question he had raised was of general concern to the United Nations. That question could be settled forthwith.

54. Mr. JEANNEL (France) said that he, too, was opposed to adjourning the debate. Since the Soviet delegation did not dispute the fact that the Chilean delegation was a co-sponsor of the draft resolution in question, there was no reason why the question raised by the Chilean representative should not be decided upon immediately.

55. Mr. HASSOUNA (Egypt), noting that the Committee was by no means unanimous with regard to the question raised by the Chilean representative, supported the Australian motion.

56. Mr. ZULETA (Colombia) said he, too, supported the Australian motion and suggested that the Chairman should give his interpretation of paragraph 93 of annex V to the rules of procedure at the next meeting.

57. The CHAIRMAN said he did not believe that it devolved upon him, in his capacity as Chairman, to interpret that provision.

58. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, noted a slight divergence between the position of the Australian delegation and that of the Colombian delegation. Both wanted the debate to be adjourned, but the former did not specify when it should be resumed, while the latter desired that it should be resumed at the following meeting. To enable them to resolve that divergence, he moved the suspension of the meeting for a few minutes, in accordance with rule 118 of the rules of procedure. Invoking rule 119 *(a)* of the rules of procedure, he requested that a decision should be taken on his motion forthwith.

59. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted the motion of the representative of the United States.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 5.20 p.m. and resumed at 5.25 p.m.

60. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) said that his delegation and the Colombian delegation had agreed to move the adjournment of the debate, on the understanding that it would be resumed when the Chairman deemed appropriate, but at the latest after the conclusion of the general debate on the right of asylum. In point of fact, the Colombian delegation feared that the question raised by the representative of Chile might drag on indefinitely.

61. Mr. PRIETO (Chile), speaking on a point of order, requested that the question he had raised should be put to the vote before the Committee took up the question of the right of asylum.

62. Mr. KOLESNIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that the Australian delegation had shifted its position after its consultations with the Colombian delegation. It was no longer requesting the adjournment of the debate in accordance with rule 116 of the rules of procedure, but a disruption in the order in which the agenda items would be considered. Amended in that fashion, his motion could not be put to the vote.

63. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) stated that his motion had in no way been amended. The Jamaican, Egyptian and Colombian delegations had supported it, while two other delegations had opposed it. The Committee should now abide by rule 116 of the rules of procedure and put the motion to the vote.

64. Mr. MILLER (Canada) pointed out that an adjournment of the debate did not necessarily imply a change in the agenda. He suggested that the Chairman might subsequently give a ruling on whether the request by the Chilean delegation had been opposed by any of the original sponsors of the draft resolution before it had been adopted by consensus.

65. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia), replying to a question by Mr. KOLESNIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explained that his motion was based on rule 116 of the rules of procedure and was intended solely to adjourn the debate, without disrupting the work programme established by the Committee.

66. The CHAIRMAN put the Australian motion to the vote.

The motion was adopted by 70 votes to 16, with 9 abstentions.

67. Mr. STEEL (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had voted against the motion because it felt that the question raised by the representative of Chile deserved to be settled quickly.

68. Mr. FUENTES IBAÑEZ (Bolivia), speaking in explanation of of vote, said that the Committee should have taken a decision at once on the question raised by the Chilean representative.

69. Mr. PRIETO (Chile), speaking on a point of order, requested that his question should be put to the vote.

70. The CHAIRMAN said that he did not think he could comply with that request, since the Committee had just decided to adjourn the debate.

71. Mr. ROBINSON (Jamaica) explained that he had voted for the Australian motion, for the reasons he had already adduced, but that he was nevertheless of the view that the Chilean delegation should be considered as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution in question.

72. Mr. ZULETA (Colombia) said that his delegation's vote indicated a position identical to that of the Jamaican delegation.

73. Mr. GODOY (Paraguay) said that he had voted for the Australian motion, although he believed that Chile was in fact a co-sponsor of the draft resolution. However, the atmosphere currently prevailing in the Committee was not conducive to an immediate decision. He urged his colleagues to devote the necessary time to studying that question, and to take account of the consequences which might arise from an interpretation of paragraph 93 of annex V to the rules of procedure which would authorize the exercise of a right of veto.

74. Mr. PRIETO (Chile) said there was no reason why an immediate decision should not be taken on the question he had raised and requested that a vote should be taken on it.

75. Mr. HASSOUNA (Egypt) pointed out that the Committee had just decided to take up the next item on its agenda and that it was no longer possible for the question raised by the Chilean representative to be put to the vote.

76. The CHAIRMAN said that in the circumstances, he would put to the vote the ruling by which he had declined to comply with the request of the Chilean delegation that its question should be voted on after the adoption of the Australian motion.

The ruling of the Chairman was approved by 78 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

77. Mr. JEANNEL (France) stated that he had abstained in the vote since he felt that the vote was not warranted.

AGENDA ITEM 105

Diplomatic Asylum (A/9704, A/C.6/L.992)

78. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) said that, in view of the lack of time, he would prefer to postpone his statement until the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.