

subject of that paragraph. He therefore proposed that the word "relevant" should be deleted.

54. Mr. BOTERO (Colombia), supported by Mr. CAKPO (Dahomey), Miss GARCIA (Ecuador), Mr. MUBARAK (Libyan Arab Republic), Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico) and Mr. GARCIA BELAUNDE (Peru), said that delegations had only just received the document and required time to study it and consult their authorities. It would be advisable therefore to defer adoption of the text to a subsequent meeting.

55. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) said that his delegation considered WIPO to be a matter of considerable importance. Moreover, the United Nations was about to embark on a review of its relationships with the specialized agencies and also on far-reaching reforms of the United Nations system. Other committees of the General Assembly had had an opportunity of considering the proposed agreement with WIPO, but the Second Committee had not. He therefore

suggested that the Committee might proceed to a vote on the draft resolution on the understanding that, any delegations interested in discussing it could do so in the plenary meeting.

56. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) said that if the Committee decided on postponement, it should be made clear that it was the decision which was being postponed, the debate on agenda item 12 having been closed.

57. Mr. GARCIA BELAUNDE (Peru), supported by Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico) and Mr. KANDE (Senegal), proposed that the Committee's decision on the draft resolution should be postponed.

The proposal was adopted by 49 votes to 29, with 21 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 11.30 p.m.

1647th meeting

Friday, 6 December 1974, at 11 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Jihad KARAM (Iraq).

A/C.2/SR.1647

AGENDA ITEM 48

Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States (continued)* (A/9615, TD/B/AC.12/3, TD/BAC.12/4 and Corr.1, A/C.2/L.1386 and Corr.1-6, A/C.2/L.1398-1415 and 1419)

1. Mr. OLIVERI LOPEZ (Argentina) said that, in a world characterized on the one hand by increasing interdependence of States and on the other by continuing resistance to vital structural changes in international economic relations and therefore in domestic affairs, the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States represented a meaningful effort to satisfy the need for a codification of legal principles based on agreements reached and decisions taken in international forums dealing with economic and social problems. It constituted a significant step forward in promoting the new international economic order called for by the General Assembly in its resolution 3202 (S-VI), which would be progressively strengthened as all the members of the international community displayed a renewed political will to achieve the objectives laid down in the Programme of Action.

2. His delegation not only supported all the provisions of the draft Charter as set forth in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1386 and Corr.1-6, but would refrain from exercising its right, as a sponsor, to formulate interpretive declarations. It was particularly gratified by the inclusion in chapter I, among the principles which should govern economic rela-

tions, of the principle of free access to and from the sea by land-locked countries. It attached special importance to article 2 of the draft Charter, which represented a compromise by the developing countries but which contained the essential principles guaranteeing the exercise by States of permanent sovereignty over their natural resources and making foreign investments subject to the domestic law of the host State. For many years the capital-exporting countries had urged the host countries to define "the rules of the game", but now that most of the host countries had done so they were still not satisfied and were demanding that the host countries should accept the duties supposedly established by international law, some of which they themselves had refused to perform.

3. Article 3 stated a universally recognized principle, namely, that economic co-operation between States should be based on a system of information and prior consultations in order to prevent disputes. It should not be interpreted as implying that any State had a right of veto.

4. The right of primary commodity producers to associate and form organizations, stated in article 5, should be promoted as a valid instrument for strengthening their negotiating power. The time had come to establish a reasonable balance between control over natural resources by primary producers and the technological capacity of a small number of developed countries to process those resources. The need to promote the regular flow of goods essential to the balanced development of the world economy at remunerative and equitable prices, stated in article 6, was a concept borrowed from EEC. His delegation

* Resumed from the 1644th meeting.

fully supported that concept, provided that, as the article specified, it was accompanied by a guarantee of regular access, which was vital to countries that produced primary or semi-manufactured products and depended on the earnings from them for their development planning.

5. His delegation had been one of the first to accept the need to include in the Charter provisions concerning groupings of States resulting from economic integration arrangements. Argentina, which favoured such arrangements for Latin America, believed that States members of such groupings should not only accept the obligations of the Charter but should also, as provided in article 12, paragraph 2, promote their acceptance by the regional groupings.

6. Articles 18, 19 and 21 contained points of particular interest to his Government. There was a need for “discrimination” in favour of the developing countries, which should themselves grant trade preferences to other States in the same category. Articles 27 and 28 referred to matters of vital importance to the third-world countries. Later revisions of the Charter would undoubtedly make it possible to strengthen those and other articles by eliminating the compromise formulae which the search for a consensus had made necessary. Article 30 also referred to a matter of vital importance, and his delegation rejected the amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.1414, the sponsors of which were well aware that there was as yet no general international convention on protection of the environment, so that acceptance of the amendment would simply mean giving States the “freedom to pollute”.

7. While the lengthy negotiations had not resulted in unanimity on all the articles of the Charter, they had led to universal support for 80 per cent of them and to the formulation of an eminently balanced document. The lack of unanimity was not due to a lack of effort, but rather to the fact that some developed market-economy countries had not appreciated the historic nature of the document, which should be seen in the context of the determination to work for the establishment of a new international economic order. However, while consensus was desirable, it was not something that should be sought at any price; the Charter would not lose its value because of objections to certain of its provisions on the part of some States, even though they included the most powerful in the world.

8. The draft Charter should be supported by all who had participated in its formulation, since the articles it contained did not represent the position of the Group of 77 alone but reflected, as far as possible, the desire to accommodate the interests of all States Members of the United Nations. He was sure that such support would be forthcoming, as evidence of the good faith with which the negotiations had been conducted and because no State could fail to participate in a movement designed to reduce the disparities between nations and to give real substance to the principles of the United Nations.

9. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico), introducing on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution the revisions indicated in document A/C.2/L.1386/Corr.6, explained that they were the result of consultation and negotiation

between the contact group of the Group of 77, representatives of the group of Western European and other States and the Chinese delegation.

10. The change in subparagraph (c) of the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft Charter had been made to meet the objections raised by several delegations to the word “obligations”. In article 2, the second sentence of paragraph 2 (a) had been redrafted and, in paragraph 2 (c), a more explicit clause had been substituted for the words “provided that all relevant circumstances call for it”. In article 6, the first sentence had been revised to include a specific reference to long-term multilateral commodity agreements. Article 12, paragraph 2, had been redrafted in order to satisfy those States which wanted the Charter to apply, within certain limits, to the groupings of States mentioned in the article. In article 32, everything after the words “sovereign rights” had been deleted in order to settle the lengthy controversy concerning the use of the word “or”.

11. The introduction of those revisions showed that the Group of 77 did not consider the draft Charter an immutable, definitive text and had been open to reasonable suggestions for changes in it. Although the sponsors regarded the Charter as a balanced instrument, two thirds of which had already been approved by consensus in the Group of 40, they had wished to give further proof of their conciliatory attitude. They had therefore been surprised at the flood of amendments (A/C.2/L.1398-1415), only three of which had proved acceptable to them. If the other amendments were pressed to a vote, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1386 and Corr.6 would have to vote against them.

12. They would also have to vote against the procedural proposal (A/C.2/L.1419) to postpone adoption of the Charter until 1975. The General Assembly, at two successive sessions, had recommended that the Charter should be adopted at the twenty-ninth session, and the debate on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1374/Rev.1 had made it clear that it would be a practical impossibility to add to the many important problems to be dealt with at the seventh special session an item reopening the debate on the draft Charter. The rejection by the sponsors of the draft resolution A/C.2/L.1386 of any attempt to postpone adoption of the Charter was based not on arbitrariness, but on a mature assessment of all the factors involved; after two and a half years of concerted efforts to produce a document which had already obtained the widest possible acceptance, there was a real danger that any prolongation of work on it instead of reconciling views, would cause even greater divergence and a hardening of positions. While the third-world countries were always prepared to exert every effort to achieve consensus, consensus was not an end in itself; the objective was to secure agreement on the substance of the Charter provisions. Consequently, the sponsors of the draft resolution rejected all attempts to use the pretext of consensus to disguise the ambitions of a minority which sought to impose their views on the overwhelming majority of Member States. Since consensus was highly improbable, those States which had insuperable objections to parts of the Charter were free to request separate votes and to vote against them; they could still vote in favour of the Charter as a whole.

13. Member States should not be deluded into thinking that the provisions of the Charter might create legal or economic difficulties for any Government which was conscious of the needs of the contemporary world. All that was needed in order to accept the Charter was the political will to build a more equitable economic order as the best guarantee of lasting peace.

14. Since the final stage in the work on the draft Charter had been reached, the contact group of the Group of 77 had concluded at its last meeting that, as further proof of its spirit of conciliation, two more changes might be made in the text. In the fourth paragraph of the preamble the words "codify and develop rules for" would be replaced by the word "promote", and in the operative paragraph at the end of the preamble the words "as a first step in the codification and progressive development of this subject" would be deleted. However, the contact group was not empowered to take a decision and could only recommend to the Group of 77 as a whole that those further changes should be made. He therefore requested the Chairman of the Committee to inquire whether those members of the Group of 77 which were not represented in the contact group were in agreement with the unanimous recommendation of the latter group.

15. The CHAIRMAN said that, since he heard no objection, he took it that all members of the Group of 77 agreed to the revisions indicated orally by the representative of Mexico. He would also take it, if there was no objection, that the Committee approved the request of the representative of France at the preceding meeting that priority consideration should be given to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1419.

It was so decided.

16. Mr. ROUGE (France), speaking on behalf of the States members of EEC, said that the members of the Community had supported the Mexican proposal for a charter of economic rights and duties of States from the outset and had participated actively in the negotiations in the hope of arriving at a text which could be accepted by all Member States. The text contained in document A/C.2/L.1386 and Corr.6 showed that the negotiations had been constructive and the additional changes made orally by the representative of Mexico represented a further important advance. None the less, the text still contained certain provisions which were manifestly unacceptable to some delegations. While appreciating Mexico's desire for a decision on the draft Charter before the end of the year and its hope that there would be unanimous agreement on the text, the members of EEC were aware that in all the groups there were some States which felt it desirable to postpone what could at present be only a contested decision, with a view to further consultations. If a vote was taken on the text in its present form, the representatives of the EEC countries would have to signify, with regret, that their Governments could not endorse all its provisions. They had introduced draft resolution A/C.2/L.1419 in the hope that the representative of Mexico would recognize that acceptance of that proposal would be the best solution at the present stage; since the representative of Mexico had indicated that his Government did not share that opinion, they had asked for it to be given priority consideration.

17. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that his delegation and the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1386 and Corr.1-6 would vote against the purely procedural proposal contained in document A/C.2/L.1419.

18. The CHAIRMAN announced that, as requested by the representative of the United States, recorded votes would be taken on all draft resolutions and amendments relating to the Charter. He invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1419.

In favour: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Abstaining: Australia, Cyprus, Dahomey, Finland, Greece, Grenada, Indonesia, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Laos, Malawi, Malaysia, New Zealand, Singapore, Thailand.

The draft resolution was rejected by 81 votes to 20, with 15 abstentions.

19. Mr. TOUKAN (Jordan), speaking in explanation of vote, said his delegation had abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1419 because it believed that further negotiations could have reduced the differences of opinion on the draft Charter, a document of such vital importance to the future of international economic relations, especially those of the developing countries, that its adoption by consensus was essential.

20. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to continue its consideration of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1386 and Corr.1-6 and the amendments thereto.

21. Mr. PITARKA (Albania) expressed appreciation for the initiative taken by the President of Mexico regarding the draft Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States now before the Committee, which marked an important step forward in the struggle of the developing countries to establish a new international economic order based on equality and respect for national sovereignty. It also reflected the efforts of the developing countries towards independent economic and social development and political

independence and against exploitation by the imperialist Powers and their monopolies. During the discussion of the draft Charter, as during the sixth special session of the General Assembly, the imperialists, old and new, had used all kinds of manoeuvres to prevent the implementation of the just demands of the developing countries. The United States had tried to nullify the sovereign rights of the developing countries and to divide them, while the Soviet Union had tried to impose the inclusion in the Charter of its social-imperialist policy on so-called disarmament measures, détente and peaceful coexistence. At the same time, that super-Power was seeking to establish inequitable relations with a view to penetrating and exploiting the developing countries. The United States and the Soviet Union had been able to insert in the Charter certain provisions and articles which had nothing to do with the sovereign rights of the developing countries, an objective they had been unable to achieve in the case of the Declaration and the Programme of Action adopted at the sixth special session. The developing countries must safeguard and consolidate the successes they had achieved and continue towards new achievements for their independent economic and social development.

22. In that context, his delegation wished to draw attention to some of the short-comings of the draft Charter. With regard to the fourth preambular paragraph, he pointed out that the industrialized countries were in fact dependent on the developing countries in their economic relations, since the latter were the main producers of raw materials; yet what interdependence meant at present was exploitation of the developing countries by the industrialized countries, which were enormously enriched to the detriment of the developing countries.

23. Article 15 should not be included in the Charter. The social-imperialist thesis on disarmament which the Soviet Union had constantly tried to insert in every document or resolution adopted at international conferences was merely part of its campaign of demagogy and propaganda. It was quite evident that the United States and the Soviet Union had never saved a penny from so-called disarmament measures for the benefit of the developing countries. On the contrary, they had continually increased their defence budgets and stepped up the arms race. The objective of the Soviet social-imperialists was clearly to justify and legalize the intensification of their arms race, to disarm the peoples and to derive political gains in relation to the developing countries. If the developing countries were to consolidate and safeguard their national economies, they must ensure their economic, social and cultural development and industrialization through maximum utilization of national resources, strengthening of self-reliance, and opposition to neo-colonialist policies and imperialist exploitation.

24. His delegation also had reservations concerning article 20, which emphasized trade with socialist countries. It was evident that the Soviet Union thereby sought to secure favourable conditions for its neo-colonialist penetration into the developing countries with a view to exploiting them, which was in no way in their interest. The developing countries had a sovereign right to develop their trade in their own national interest.

25. His delegation considered that most-favoured-nation treatment, referred to in article 26, was directly related to the principle of national sovereignty and should be decided on the basis of bilateral agreements between States. The Charter should not stipulate that most-favoured-nation treatment was a basic principle for economic international relations. Obviously, the Soviet Union intended to impose that principle upon sovereign States.

26. His delegation reiterated its resolute support for the just struggle of the developing countries and believed that they would achieve their lofty goals if they continued to work together.

27. Mr. GODOY (Paraguay) said that, after lengthy negotiations and many compromises, the final text of the draft Charter was generally balanced and almost entirely acceptable to his delegation. However, he wished to explain his delegation's position on article 3, which it found absolutely unacceptable. His delegation considered that the principle enunciated in article 2, paragraph 1, was the most important in the Charter and should be fully respected. There could be no question that States had the sovereign right to dispose of their natural resources as they wished. However, article 3 undermined that principle. No one could deny that the idea of information and consultations was present in all formulae for international co-operation. However, the modalities, scope and subject-matter of such consultations must be clearly stated, and article 3 was neither clear nor objective on that point.

28. Together with the four neighbouring countries which were parties to the Treaty of the River Plate Basin, Paraguay had defined at the highest political and technical level the meaning of shared resources and of natural resources subject to the sovereignty of a single State. Concerning the utilization of international rivers—a shared natural resource and, in his delegation's view, one of the very few, or perhaps even the only one, which could be shared—they had laid down that any use of the waters of contiguous international rivers, over which more than one State had sovereignty, should be preceded by a bilateral agreement between the riparian States. They had also laid down that, where sovereignty over successive stretches of international rivers was not shared, each State could use the waters according to its needs, provided that it did not harm another State. The distinction made was quite clear.

29. In the case of shared natural resources, not only consultations but a prior agreement was needed, and his country would continue to act accordingly with regard to the use of shared resources. A system which merely established prior consultations without any qualification would lead to a negation of sovereignty, to totally unacceptable interference in domestic affairs and to a situation of permanent conflict. He did not think that article 3 was deliberately intended to establish a veto, but the vagueness of its terms would mean that a State was dependent on the goodwill of other countries for the implementation of its own national development plans, which were almost always based on the rational exploitation of natural resources. For those reasons, his delegation did not agree with article 3 and would vote against it. However, it fully endorsed the rest of the draft Charter.

30. Mr. CHANG Hsien-wu (China) said that the draft Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States contained in the draft resolution reflected certain legitimate demands of the third-world countries to safeguard their State sovereignty and protect and develop their national economies, and set forth a number of guiding principles for international economic relations. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft Charter as a whole. However, it was regrettable that the draft still contained a few irrational and even harmful articles, and his delegation hoped that they would be eliminated by further revision in the future.

31. His delegation was opposed to the insertion of article 15 on disarmament into the Charter and had repeatedly stated its views during informal consultation. It would therefore ask for a separate vote on article 15 and would vote against it. The theory of utilization of the funds saved from disarmament to provide assistance to developing countries had been propagated by the so-called socialist super-Power for over a decade and had become a laughing-stock. However, the arms race between the super-Powers had never stopped; the so-called strategic arms limitation talks and the relaxation of tension had only intensified it in quantity and quality. There had been no true disarmament and no money had been saved on military expenditure for assistance to the developing countries. The super-Powers were engaged in wild arms expansion and war preparations under the smoke-screen of disarmament and were carrying out wanton plunder under the guise of aid. The super-Power which styled itself a natural ally of the third-world countries had talked about the utilization of funds saved from disarmament to provide assistance to developing countries while actively engaged in munition deals to make super-profits. It had always subjected recipient countries to political control and economic exploitation through its so-called aid.

32. The inclusion of article 15 in the Charter greatly impaired its seriousness. Some countries friendly to China hoped that disarmament would one day come about and that the funds released by disarmament would be used for assistance to their own development. His delegation understood their desire. However, the super-Power which had deceitfully advocated disarmament had been defeated in its attempts to include an article on the subject in the declarations adopted by the General Assembly at its sixth special session and by the World Food Conference. He could not understand why the sponsors of the draft resolution refused to delete article 15 from the Charter. The super-Power he had referred to would undoubtedly use it to mislead the public and to cover up its arms expansion and aggression.

33. The Charter should be a serious document, free from the deceptive propaganda of a super-Power. China would never trade in principles; it had always stood together with other countries of the third world and would join them in the struggle for the establishment of a new international economic order. His delegation would continue to expose sham disarmament and sham aid for what they were, namely, arms expansion and plunder, and it would be futile for anyone to try to distort China's position.

34. His delegation had already expressed its different view on article 20. Explicit reference was made in article 4 to the

right of every State to engage in international trade and other forms of economic co-operation irrespective of any differences in political, economic and social systems. There was therefore no need for a separate reference to trade with socialist countries. Moreover, the super-Power which arbitrarily insisted on the insertion of article 20 into the Charter had long since become what Lenin had called "socialism in words and imperialism in deeds". Therefore his delegation would not participate in the vote on article 20.

35. The provision on most-favoured-nation treatment contained in article 26 was irrational. Each State had the sovereign right to decide whether or not to grant most-favoured-nation treatment, which should be arranged, after consultations, through bilateral and multilateral agreements between the countries concerned. His delegation could not accept the wording of article 26 and, if it was put to a separate vote, would not participate in the vote.

36. In its international relations, the People's Republic of China had consistently abided by the five principles of mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence. It was firmly opposed to a super-Power's pursuing the policies of aggression and expansion, infringing upon the sovereignty of other countries, interfering in their internal affairs and contending for world hegemony with the other super-Power under the smoke-screen of what it called "peaceful coexistence". The five principles of peaceful coexistence were closely interrelated and inseparable. His delegation would not, therefore, participate in the vote on chapter I, subparagraph (f), if it was put to a separate vote.

37. In his delegation's view, the term "interdependence" used in the draft Charter was inappropriate. The colonialists and imperialists had attained their affluence through plunder and exploitation of the oppressed peoples and nations of the world. They could not continue their existence without external aggression and plunder. The term "interdependence" failed to give a correct picture of the current situation in international economic relations because it concealed the true relationship between exploiters and exploited. Indeed, that term might be distorted by the super-Powers to mean that the developing countries must depend on them and obtain their approval for any act in defence of their sovereignty and their economic rights and interests. Some said that the developed countries and the developing countries were economically interdependent, because the former needed the latter's raw materials and the latter needed the former's funds and technology. However, the result of such "interdependence" had been that the developing countries were exploited in trade and suffered an annual loss of some \$10 thousand million, their external debts had reached the level of tens of thousands of millions of dollars, and the gap between rich and poor had widened further. The third-world countries wished to establish a new, just and reasonable international economic order, and the economic requirements of various countries, such as technology, raw materials, and commodities, could be met through trade and economic and technical co-operation based on equality and mutual benefit. That was a kind of interrelationship, and by no means "interdependence".

His delegation therefore expressed its reservations on the term "interdependence".

38. In his delegation's view, it was essential, in dealing with the exploitation of natural resources shared by two or more countries, to respect the sovereignty of the countries concerned while taking into consideration the mutual interests of neighbouring countries and avoiding damage to them. If disputes arose between the countries concerned, a reasonable solution should be sought through friendly consultations on an equal footing. Since some developing countries had different views on the question, China would abstain in the event of a separate vote on article 3. His delegation hoped that the third-world countries would seek common ground while reserving differences and would gradually arrive at a unified opinion on the question of natural resources shared by two or more countries.

39. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) said that his delegation regarded the Charter as one of the most important items on the Committee's agenda and welcomed the far-sighted initiative of the President of Mexico. Although New Zealand was not a member of the Group of 40, it had followed the laborious drafting process closely and congratulated those involved on their efforts. His Government had encouraged the initiative on the Charter, since its broad aims were parallel to one of its own basic political objectives, namely, the promotion of a shift in the world economic order which would benefit the developing countries and result in a more equitable distribution of the world's wealth. His Government believed that the world was in the opening stages of a major shift in world opinion, the economic ramifications of which would parallel the political consequences of the decolonization movement of the past two decades. The old international economic order had been dominated by a number of countries which did not represent the majority of the world's population. In the world outside these few countries, there was malnutrition, starvation, poverty and disease. That was hardly indicative of the fairness or even the effectiveness of the old international economic order. His Government wished to see orderly and peaceful changes taking place.

40. For those reasons, New Zealand had not joined in the efforts of those fighting to preserve the old order, but the decision had been difficult, since those same States were its close friends and major trading partners. However, New Zealand had not sponsored any of the amendments to the Charter and would have to vote against some of them and abstain on others. Despite its imperfections and a few provisions which caused his Government considerable difficulty, none of those difficulties were fundamental and

they were outweighed by the positive elements of the Charter. His delegation would therefore vote for the Charter as a whole. It welcomed the changes in the fourth preambular paragraph and in the operative paragraph at the end of the preamble, announced by the representative of Mexico. The Charter was important, in that it could influence the political will of Governments to make changes in the present international economic order and because it would serve as a guide for the conduct of international economic relations. His Government had traditionally accepted and would continue to accept the pre-eminence of international obligations and commitments. Because of its understanding of the status of the Charter, his delegation would not enter specific reservations against any of its articles once it had been adopted.

41. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to begin voting on the amendments to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1386 and Corr.1-6.

42. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Committee) pointed out that the second amendment in document A/C.2/L.1398 had already been incorporated in the text of the draft Charter and that the Committee was thus called upon to vote only on the amendment to the fourth preambular paragraph.

A recorded voted was taken.¹

The first amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.1398 was rejected by 89 votes to 17, with 13 abstentions.

The amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.1399 was rejected by 92 votes to 20, with 10 abstentions.

The amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.1400 was rejected by 94 votes to 14, with 14 abstentions.

The amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.1401 was rejected by 92 votes to 18, with 12 abstentions.

The amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.1402 was rejected by 94 votes to 21, with 8 abstentions.

The amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.1403 was rejected by 95 votes to 16, with 10 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

¹ The full voting record of all the votes which follow is contained in the report of the Committee to the General Assembly (A/9946).