



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 89:</i>	
<i>Technical assistance to promote the teaching, study, dissemination and wider appreciation of international law: report of the Special Committee on Technical Assistance to Promote the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law (continued)</i>	179
<i>Agenda items 90 and 94:</i>	
<i>Consideration of principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations:</i>	
<i>(a) Report of the Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States;</i>	
<i>(b) Study of the principles enumerated in paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 1966;</i>	184
<i>(c) Report of the Secretary-General on methods of fact-finding</i>	
<i>Observance by Member States of the principles relating to the sovereignty of States, their territorial integrity, non-interference in their domestic affairs, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the condemnation of subversive activities.</i>	

Chairman: Mr. Abdullah EL-ERIAN
(United Arab Republic).

AGENDA ITEM 89

Technical assistance to promote the teaching, study, dissemination and wider appreciation of international law: report of the Special Committee on Technical Assistance to Promote the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law (continued) (A/5455 and Add.1-6, A/5744 and Add.1-4, A/5790, A/5791, A/5803, chap. VII, sect. III, para. 346, A/5887; A/C.6/L.565, L.567 and Corr.1 and Add.1; A/C.6/L.568, L.569 and Corr.1 and Add.1; A/C.6/L.570)

1. Mr. BAZAN (Chile), introducing joint draft resolution A/C.6/L.570, said that it was a combination of joint draft resolution A/C.6/L.567 and Corr.1 and Add.1 and the amendments in documents A/C.6/L.569 and Corr.1 and Add.1 and had been drafted with a view to bringing the points of view of the sponsors of the two documents closer together. Concessions had been made on both sides with that aim. Thus,

as far as the operation of the programme was concerned, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/L.567 and Corr.1 and Add.1 had accepted the idea put forward by the sponsors of the amendments that a final effort should be made to try to obtain voluntary contributions and that recourse should be had to the regular budget of the United Nations only for those parts of the programme which could not be financed from voluntary contributions. For their part, the sponsors of the amendments were no longer insisting that the question of the teaching and dissemination of international law should be included in the technical assistance programmes and had abandoned some of their ideas regarding the powers of the proposed advisory committee.

2. In addition, by making those concessions the sponsors of the compromise draft resolution had endeavoured to meet certain objections which had been expressed in the Committee and to bring their ideas more into line with those of the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.6/L.568. They had also tried to take into account certain observations made by the Legal Counsel.

3. In order to allay the financial anxieties of the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.6/L.568 it had been made clear in the compromise draft resolution that if the Secretary-General had to turn to the regular budget of the United Nations to complete the financing of the programme he would first have to consult the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. Moreover, in order to take account of the objections entered by the representatives of Canada and the United States, the sponsors of the compromise draft resolution had given up the idea of including the dissemination of international law in the technical assistance programmes, a decision which had enabled them at the same time to take into consideration one of the Legal Counsel's observations. Another observation by the Legal Counsel had inspired the new provision regarding the proposed advisory committee, which would now advise the Secretary-General only on the substantive aspects of the programme.

4. Nevertheless, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/L.570 had not felt able to abandon the idea that a programme for the dissemination of international law must be adopted immediately and the arrangements for financing such a programme made without delay.

5. However, the differences of opinion which existed on that point were not insurmountable. Indeed, the representative of the United Kingdom had indicated in a recent statement that the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.6/L.568 were not trying

to delay the start of the programme and that their objections only concerned the most suitable moment for taking a decision on the provision of the necessary financing in the regular budget of the United Nations.

6. He hoped that the members of the Committee would appreciate the spirit of conciliation which had moved the sponsors of the new draft resolution and that the great majority of them would vote for that text.

7. Mr. DADZIE (Ghana) said that as the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/L.570 had considered it uncertain that the question of the dissemination of international law could be included in the technical assistance programmes they had decided to delete the provision to that effect from the amendments in documents A/C.6/L.569 and Corr.1 and Add.1. It was still possible, of course, to make use of funds available under technical assistance programmes, but those funds would be regarded as voluntary contributions. The over-all procedure envisaged in the compromise draft resolution was therefore the following: the Secretary-General would first try to obtain voluntary contributions (including funds available under technical assistance programmes), but if necessary he would make such provision in the budget estimates for 1967 and 1968 as might be necessary to carry out the programme of activities. In a spirit of compromise however, the sponsors of the draft resolution had provided that the Secretary-General should first consult the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to determine whether or not that was feasible.

8. In paragraph 8 of the new draft, the co-sponsors had accepted the decision of the Special Committee on Technical Assistance to Promote the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law on the point in question and had based their wording on that used in the Special Committee's report (A/5887).

9. His delegation regretted that it had not known in advance that the Executive Director of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and the Executive Chairman of the Technical Assistance Board (TAB) were to speak at the 869th meeting, but it welcomed the statements which they had both made on that occasion.

10. The sponsors of the joint draft resolution had decided to leave the decision on the membership of the proposed advisory committee to the Chairman of the Sixth Committee.

11. Mr. GAGLIOTTI (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that he wished to clarify the role which UNESCO could play in the proposed programme.

12. The new draft resolution referred in the third preambular paragraph to a communication by UNESCO (A/C.6/L.565). In that communication, UNESCO stated that it would publish the results of the Survey on the Teaching of International Law which was at present in progress and that if the proposals regarding the programme for 1967-1968 were accepted, it would undertake studies on the development of the teaching of international law in general. UNESCO would also organize an advanced training course on international

law, subject to the approval of TAB, in Africa. In addition, UNESCO could administer fellowships and help the exchange of international law publications within its programme. Outside those various forms of aid, however, no reliance should be placed on UNESCO's ability to provide additional financial assistance.

13. Mr. SINCLAIR (United Kingdom) regretted that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/L.570 had not seen fit to consult the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.6/L.568 in order to try to take into account the points which the latter considered important. Those amendments had been prompted by a sincere desire to participate in the drafting of a resolution which would be acceptable to all. However, the efforts which their sponsors had made to that end had not met with the understanding they deserved.

14. Nevertheless, the joint draft resolution contained many positive elements which the United Kingdom delegation willingly supported. It did not reflect, however, the important statements made at the 869th meeting by the Executive Chairman of TAB and by the Executive Director of UNITAR who had announced that UNITAR would be willing to organize in 1967 a course intended for a number of jurists from developing countries. Since that initiative was not mentioned in the joint draft resolution, it might be asked whether or not it would form part of the programme of activities contemplated in that draft. It was important to know what would be the financial implications of replacing the course already provided for in the programme by the one which UNITAR proposed to organize.

15. The Executive Chairman of TAB had dispelled the doubts as to whether certain projects envisaged in the programme could be carried out under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance. However, since the compromise draft resolution was based on the assumption that none of those projects would qualify for Expanded Programme financing, it failed to take all the available information into account.

16. Moreover, operative paragraph 8 was far from clear. It did not indicate when, how, or according to what criteria the members of the proposed advisory committee would be elected. Would the principle of equitable geographical distribution be respected? As for paragraph 5, it did not take into account the views expressed by certain delegations which had taken part in the discussion. His delegation would therefore be unable to support it in its present form.

17. Thus, the draft resolution left room for many improvements, and if its sponsors pressed for a vote immediately, he would be unable to support it.

18. Mr. MANNER (Finland) asked for a separate vote on operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

19. Mr. DADZIE (Ghana) said that the new paragraph 2 proposed in the amendments in documents A/C.6/L.569 and Corr.1 and Add.1 had not been included in the joint draft resolution because the latter's sponsors had not been sure whether the teaching of international law could be included in the technical assistance programmes. That was why they

had opted for the formula used in the new paragraph 12. Consequently, the Secretary-General would first have to try to obtain voluntary contributions to finance the programme and, if it became necessary, ask for appropriations under the United Nations regular budget. As he (Mr. Dadzie) had already said, that did not mean that the Secretary-General would be unable to contemplate using the funds available under the Expanded Programme or other technical assistance programmes, but merely that such funds would be classed as voluntary contributions. In fact, the Secretary-General would have to draw on those sources of financing before requesting appropriations under the regular budget.

20. With regard to the proposed advisory committee, he recalled that the sponsors of the draft resolution had left the task of determining its composition to the Chairman. It was, of course, understood that the principle of equitable geographical distribution must be respected.

21. The CHAIRMAN said that he was ready to assume any responsibility with which the Committee might entrust him. If such was the Committee's wish, he would begin consultations and announce the composition of the proposed advisory committee as soon as possible.

22. He wished to explain his reasons for inviting the Executive Director of UNITAR and the Executive Chairman of TAB to address the Committee again. As members were aware, the Canadian representative had asked at the 867th meeting for clarification of a large number of technical and financial questions. To meet that request, certain Secretariat officials had been invited to furnish information to the Committee which already had before it on that point, document A/5791. Moreover, both draft resolution A/C.6/L.567 and Corr.1 and Add.1 and the amendments to it requested the Board of Trustees of UNITAR to consider the ways in which international law was to be given its proper place among the activities of that body. It was because the Committee was already considering documents referring to TAB and UNITAR that he had seen fit to invite the heads of those two bodies to address the Committee, in conformity, moreover, with the provisions of rule 113 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

23. Mr. SPERDUTI (Italy) said that on several occasions he had stressed that UNITAR, which had been established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 1934 (XVIII), was very closely bound to the United Nations and should therefore be able to play an important role in activities to achieve the purposes of the draft resolutions before the Committee. In that connexion, the Italian delegation welcomed the offer which the Executive Director of UNITAR had made at the 869th meeting. In the circumstances it might be asked whether it was altogether logical for the sponsors of the joint draft resolution to appeal for help to UNESCO which, as an international organization, enjoyed much greater autonomy vis-à-vis the United Nations than UNITAR, without at the same time asking for UNITAR's help. If the Italian delegation had been consulted on the matter, it would have urged the retention in the compromise draft resolutions of the

new paragraph 5 proposed in the amendments in document A/C.6/L.568.

24. The proper course might perhaps have been to review the modest programme contemplated in the different proposals in the light of the new perspectives opened up by the Executive Director of UNITAR. Such a reappraisal would probably have enabled a number of difficulties to be eliminated. Assuming that UNITAR's plan had been considered an integral part of the programme, the latter could have been modified in view of the fact that the plan in question provided for the fulfilment of certain urgent needs. If it were possible to include the cost of UNITAR's plan in the over-all cost of the programme, that would eliminate some of the Secretary-General's future financing problems.

25. There was no question of the Italian delegation's voting against a draft which fulfilled a need. It was in favour of any reasonable initiative which would promote the dissemination of international law and it would, therefore, vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole while abstaining in the separate vote on paragraph 5.

26. Mr. WERSHOF (Canada) said that as he did not wish to hold up the voting if the sponsors of the draft resolution wanted a decision to be taken during the meeting, he would confine himself to raising a minor point of procedure. If it was, in fact, decided that the members of the proposed advisory committee should be elected by the General Assembly, as provided for in operative paragraph 8, that would mean applying the procedure prescribed in rule 94 of the rules of procedure and holding a secret ballot. However, as could be verified by consulting General Assembly resolution 1966 (XVIII), there were other ways of appointing the members of a committee: for example, the secretariat of the Sixth Committee could submit a list of names to the President of the General Assembly who would make the decision. But operative paragraph 8 as worded precluded recourse to such a procedure. Accordingly, the matter should perhaps be settled before the vote was taken or, failing that, after the vote.

27. The CHAIRMAN also considered that the Sixth Committee should address a recommendation on those lines to the General Assembly. He therefore asked the sponsors of the new draft resolution whether the word "elected" in operative paragraph 8 could be replaced by the word "appointed".

28. Mr. DADZIE (Ghana), as one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/L.570, accepted that solution. With regard to the separate vote requested for operative paragraph 5, he made it clear that the sponsors of the draft resolution had no intention of asking the impossible of the Secretary-General and had left him considerable latitude to hold consultations. In drawing up that paragraph, the sponsors had tried to forestall all possible objections.

29. Mr. LOPEZ VILLAMIL (Honduras) said that the new draft resolution had his delegation's full approval. He stressed the scientific value of international law which, throughout the long history of institutions, had retained its importance under all systems. International law had, likewise, a universal value and it

was therefore desirable that the draft resolution should not merely be adopted by a simple majority, but should secure the support of all the developed countries. The Sixth Committee was fighting against time: United Nations achievement in the fields of industry, agriculture and trade was already considerable. The economists had been more successful in securing the Organization's attention without paying too much heed to the legal obstacles which might limit their field of action. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development had been accorded a degree of autonomy which, without being contrary to the provisions of the Charter, was at least based on a very wide interpretation of it. The Honduran delegation considered that the Sixth Committee should act to promote the teaching of international law, which must be based on the United Nations Charter. As the Israel representative had remarked, the Committee must lay systematic foundations for that teaching. The draft resolution might be further improved and perhaps there had not been sufficient consultations among the groups.

30. Mr. S. N. SINHA (India) said that, although the representatives of Italy and the United Kingdom seemed to consider that the sponsors of the draft resolution had not taken into account the recent statements of the Executive Director of UNITAR and the Executive Chairman of TAB, the wording of operative paragraph 4 implied that any contribution from those institutions to the implementation of the programme would be welcome. In reply to a point raised by the United Kingdom representative at the beginning of his statement, he said that the sponsors of the draft had meant no discourtesy in not formally consulting certain other groups.

31. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Legal Counsel) said that he himself had suggested that the Executive Director of UNITAR and the Executive Chairman of TAB should make explanatory statements to the Sixth Committee, which had accepted the suggestion. While it might have been expected that the heads of those two bodies would not have any precise idea as to how they could contribute to the execution of the programme, he thought the Committee would be interested to hear that the Executive Director of UNITAR had in fact announced that he could allot \$100,000 to the programme for one year.

32. The time had come for him to make a statement on the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.6/L.570. That new draft replaced the original text (A/C.6/L.567 and Corr.1 and Add.1) and the amendments to it (A/C.6/L.569 and Corr.1 and Add.1); the amendments in document A/C.6/L.568 had no further *raison d'être* since they related to a proposal that had been superseded. Since the programme outlined in the annex to the new draft resolution was the same as that proposed by the Special Committee the estimated costs remained the same, namely \$210,000 for 1967 and some \$270,000 to \$280,000 annually thereafter. The expenses shown in the Special Committee's report for 1966 and 1967 would now relate to 1967 and 1968 respectively. Operative paragraphs 4 and 5 would appear to require the Secretary-General first of all to call for voluntary contributions, and secondly to include in the budget estimates for 1967

and 1968 such financial provision as might be necessary to carry out the activities specified in the annex to the draft resolution, after taking into account the voluntary contributions received. As the Secretary-General would be unable to assess the possible extent of voluntary contributions as early as March-April 1966, when he was required to draw up his budget estimates for 1967, he would have to include in his estimates the total costs of the 1967 portion of the programme set out in the annex to the draft resolution. He would state at the time that those estimates were provisional and subject to downward revision later in the year, depending on the level of voluntary contributions; in September 1966 he would submit his revised estimates, limiting his request to those activities for which no assured voluntary financing had emerged. Any resources for projects approved under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance or financed by UNITAR from its own budget would be treated as entirely outside the provision to be made by the Secretary-General either in his initial or his revised estimates. The representatives of Ghana and India had implied that the proposed advisory committee would have an area of discretion through which it would be able to cause the Secretary-General to take action at variance with the provisions of the resolution. In fact, it appeared that only voluntary contributions would have to be deducted. The point should be cleared up at once.

33. Mr. HARGROVE (United States of America) said that he had refrained from speaking on draft resolution A/C.6/L.570 until he had precise information on its financial implications. He had therefore listened with great interest to the Legal Counsel's statement on the relationship between the Expanded Programme and the programme for the dissemination of international law contemplated by the Sixth Committee. His delegation sincerely hoped that it would be able to support any resolution which the Committee might adopt. His Government remained basically committed to the worthwhileness of technical assistance in the field of international law, not only through bilateral arrangements but also through multilateral programmes under United Nations auspices. Now that the United Nations was embarking on that course, broad support of the programme from the outset was essential, and it was therefore important that the various possibilities of financing should be thoroughly explored before resorting to the Organization's regular budget. The ease of recourse to the regular budget as a solution was only apparent; and as for other sources of financing, the procedure previously proposed—that the Secretary-General should compile a list of the voluntary contributions received and take into consideration the funds available following the requests submitted by Governments under the existing technical assistance programme (the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and part V of the regular budget) before resorting to special appropriations under the regular budget—had been partly abandoned. He wondered why the second stage of that procedure had been dropped. According to the statement of the representative of Ghana, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/L.570 would not be opposed to the Secretary-General's preparing a list not only of the amount of voluntary contributions but also of funds

made available upon request under the technical assistance programmes, which the representative of Ghana had said might be regarded as "voluntary contributions" for the purposes of the draft resolution. The Legal Counsel, however, had given a very different analysis of the resolution on that point. The United States delegation, for its part, considered that not only voluntary contributions but also funds made available under part V of the regular budget and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance should be taken into account before calls were made on the regular budget through additional appropriations. If the sponsors of the draft resolution were willing to amend it to take those views into consideration, he would vote for its adoption. Otherwise, he would be unable at present to give an affirmative vote.

34. Mr. CHKHIKVADZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said it was gratifying to note the interest shown by the majority of the Committee's members in the dissemination of international law. He was surprised, however, that the question of financing should have caused such a lengthy debate; it might well be asked whether the Committee was composed of international law specialists or of financial experts. It was surprising that after so much discussion the problem of financing should still not have been settled; it would really seem that the debate was being unduly dragged out. It was particularly regrettable that the United States delegation had not yet adopted a really firm attitude on the question. The USSR delegation had long held a definite opinion and was ready to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.6/L.570.

35. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.6/L.570.

Operative paragraph 5 was adopted by 55 votes to 6, with 22 abstentions.

36. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole.

The draft resolution as a whole (A/C.5/L.570), as orally amended by the sponsors, was adopted by 75 votes to 2, with 10 abstentions.

37. Mr. DELEAU (France) explained that although he had voted against operative paragraph 5 and, since that paragraph had been adopted, against the draft resolution as a whole, his delegation did not lack interest in the establishment by the United Nations of a technical assistance programme for the teaching of international law. It considered, however, that such a programme should be financed exclusively by voluntary contributions from Member States, and should not be charged to the regular budget of the United Nations. That was a principle on which his delegation, which had just submitted proposals to the General Assembly for putting the financial affairs of the Organization in order, could not enter into any compromise.

38. Mr. BRAZIL (Australia) said that while his delegation shared the concern of the sponsors of the draft resolution to encourage the teaching and dissemination of international law, he had voted against the draft resolution because operative paragraph 5 involved a decision at the present session to resort to the regular budgets for 1967 and 1968.

39. Mr. KRISPIS (Greece) said that under the draft resolution which had been adopted, the Board of Trustees of UNITAR would take into account, in drawing up its programmes concerning international law, the views expressed in the Sixth Committee. He wished to state that in his opinion the establishment of a model curriculum, far from contributing usefully to the teaching of international law, would tend to undermine the principle of freedom of instruction and research which was one of the essential features of modern civilization.

40. Mr. BLIX (Sweden) said that the draft resolution just adopted was a great improvement on the original text (A/C.6/L.567 and Corr.1 and Add.1), account having been taken of many of the considerations which had been in the minds of the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.6/L.568. However, the draft resolution still had the fault of committing the Secretary-General in advance to requesting appropriations under the regular budget of the United Nations. The Swedish delegation could not approve that decision, and had therefore been obliged to abstain from voting on operative paragraph 5 and on the draft resolutions as a whole.

41. Mr. WERSHOF (Canada) said that he had voted against operative paragraph 5 which, although it was preferable to the corresponding text of documents A/C.6/L.567 and Corr.1 and Add.1 and A/C.6/L.569 and Corr.1 and Add.1, in particular because it provided for consultation with the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, nevertheless requested the Secretary-General, in certain circumstances, to request funds under his budget estimates for 1967 and 1968, a procedure to which Canada as it had stated, was opposed even on a conditional basis. His delegation had therefore been obliged to abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole, although it considered its purposes praiseworthy and approved the substance of the proposed programme.

42. Mr. O CLERIGH (Ireland) said it was gratifying that the Sixth Committee had adopted by so large a majority a text which represented an excellent starting point for a rational programme to promote wider appreciation of international law and closer co-operation among States. Ireland, which contributed to UNITAR and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, was glad to note that those two organs would have a useful role to play in carrying out the programme laid down in the draft resolution. It would certainly consider the possibility of making voluntary contributions in accordance with operative paragraph 4, but he wished to make it clear that by voting for the draft resolution, he had not thereby committed his Government to making such a contribution.

43. Mr. S. N. SINHA (India), replying to the observations of the United States representative, said it was clear from the programmes listed in the annex to the draft resolution, read in conjunction with operative paragraphs 4 and 5, that UNITAR and TAB were in a position to co-operate in carrying out those programmes within the scope of the draft resolution. However, the sponsors specifically wished to prevent that possibility from inhibiting in any way the normal

operation of existing technical assistance programmes under which the United Nations and other United Nations agencies provided assistance to various countries at their request in fields to which they attributed high priority.

44. Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand) said that he had voted against operative paragraph 5, and had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole. In so doing, he had not wished to express any reservations as to the usefulness of a United Nations technical assistance programme in the field of international law, or any objection in principle to financing such a programme under the regular budget. Nor had he been influenced solely or even primarily by the present financial crisis of the Organization. He simply felt that it was not wise at any time to decide to finance all or part of a programme of the sort proposed from the regular United Nations budget before adequately exploring other financing possibilities, in particular, the Expanded Programme and the programmes under part V of the budget, and without having given due weight to the contribution which could be made by UNITAR. That procedure did not, in his view, satisfy the principle of the most rational utilization of available resources.

45. Mr. SINCLAIR (United Kingdom) said that he had abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 5 and on the draft resolution as a whole. Despite the efforts of the sponsors to meet the objections raised as to the financial implications, his delegation still felt that it was not necessary for the Sixth Committee to decide in 1965 on procedures for financing the 1967 and 1968 programmes, in so far as such financing might have to be procured by resort to the United Nations regular budget. However, since the paragraph on financing in the draft resolution was an advance on the original text, in particular because it gave the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions a part to play, the United Kingdom delegation had not wished to vote against it. Nor had his delegation wished to vote against the draft resolution as a whole, the more so as it considered that the time was ripe for the United Nations to organize a limited technical assistance programme in international law, and the draft resolution could be the first step in that direction.

46. Mr. HARGROVE (United States of America) said his delegation still thought that it was inadvisable to resort to appropriations under the regular budget to finance a programme of technical assistance in the field of international law. Nor was it rational to exclude funds which countries might receive at their request under existing technical assistance programmes from the total sum which would determine whether or not the Secretary-General should include additional provisions in his regular budget estimates. Consequently, the United States delegation had been compelled to vote against operative paragraph 5 and to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole. It was still convinced, none the less, of the intrinsic value of a programme of technical assistance, organized under United Nations auspices, for the dissemination and better appreciation of international law. For the benefit of the Soviet delegation, he explained that he had not expressed his views on draft

resolution A/C.6/L.570 earlier because it had not yet been submitted.

47. Mr. USTOR (Hungary) said that he had voted for the draft resolution because the bilateral assistance already being provided to the developing countries in the field of international law, however valuable, could not be a substitute for a programme organized under United Nations auspices. Moreover, the programme set forth in the draft resolution was similar to the one he himself had helped to draw up, as a member of the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 1968 (XVIII). With regard to the financial implication, he was fully aware of the difficult budgetary position of the United Nations and was therefore glad to note that under operative paragraph 5 the Secretary-General was requested to make additional provisions in his budget estimates only when voluntary contributions were not sufficient to cover the cost of the programme. It should also be borne in mind that such additional provisions would in turn be discussed by the General Assembly, and he had abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 5 so as not to commit his delegation in advance to a particular position during the budgetary discussions.

48. Mr. MARTINEZ CARO (Spain) said that he had been happy to vote for the draft resolution as a whole. He had felt compelled to abstain in the vote on operative paragraph 5, but he hoped that the differences of opinion on the question of financing could be reconciled through close co-operation between the Secretariat and the proposed advisory committee.

49. Mr. CHKHIKVADZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed gratification that the Committee had adopted the draft resolution; his delegation favoured all steps which could be taken by the United Nations to assist countries in all fields, including international law. The Soviet delegation had abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 5 not because it objected in principle to financing programmes from the regular budget, but because it believed that the question of financing the proposed programmes should not be isolated from other financial matters but should on the contrary be considered within the context of all United Nations activities and programmes for the coming year. He could only hope that the budgetary organs would find some way to act favourably on the requests made.

50. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had completed consideration of agenda item 89 and invited members to proceed with the consideration of agenda items 90 and 94.

AGENDA ITEMS 90 AND 94

Consideration of principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations (A/5725 and Add.1-7, A/5763, A/5865; A/C.6/L.537/Rev.1 and Corr.1 and Add.1):

(a) Report of the Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States (A/5746);

- (b) Study of the principles enumerated in paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 1966 (XVIII);
- (c) Report of the Secretary-General on methods of fact-finding (A/5694)

Observance by Member States of the principles relating to the sovereignty of States, their territorial integrity, non-interference in their domestic affairs, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the condemnation of subversive activities (A/5937)

51. The CHAIRMAN briefly reviewed the basic documents relating to the two items, and also drew attention to the relevant passages in the Declaration entitled "Programme for Peace and International Co-operation", adopted by the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries, held in Cairo in October 1964 (see A/5763).

52. Mr. KANE (Senegal) said that item 94 had been placed on the agenda of the twentieth session at the request of the delegation of Madagascar. Consequently, that delegation should be called upon to introduce the item, and the Committee should hear its views on the organization of work and, in particular, on whether delegations should deal with both items at the same time during the general debate.

53. Mr. FARTASH (Iran) proposed that in view of the lateness of the hour, the Committee should not begin consideration of items 90 and 94 until its next meeting.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.