



Chairman: Mrs. Helvi SIPILÄ (Finland).

AGENDA ITEM 55

Importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights (continued) (A/8331, A/8403, chap. XVII, sect. D; A/C.3/L.1877/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1878 to 1880, A/C.3/L.1881/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1882, A/C.3/L.1886/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1888, A/C.3/L.1889, A/C.3/L.1893)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS
(concluded)

1. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that she had hoped that the Barbadian delegation would withdraw its subamendments (A/C.3/L.1888 and A/C.3/L.1889) but, as it had maintained them, her delegation must follow the dictates of its conscience and was therefore proposing two oral subamendments to those subamendments.

2. Her country had spared no effort in the defence of peoples who were victims of violations of their human rights and had consistently supported all delegations protesting against acts contrary to the ethic embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and accepted by all States Members of the Organization. Such being its attitude, her delegation was surprised that that of Barbados should seek to maintain its subamendment to document A/C.3/L.1882, thereby refusing to recognize the legitimacy of the struggle of the Palestinian people. Furthermore, the choice of the expression "and elsewhere" struck a jarring note in the context of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1882. Following as it did a precise enumeration of all the peoples whose inalienable rights were reaffirmed, the expression was too vague and was, moreover, superfluous.

3. Her delegation therefore hoped that the two subamendments which it was proposing would satisfy the delegation of Barbados, having regard to the sympathy which the latter had always shown on other occasions towards the Palestinian people. The first subamendment related to document A/C.3/L.1888. Her delegation proposed that the words "and elsewhere" should be replaced by "as also of the Palestinian people". To preserve the logical sequence of the text, the Barbadian subamendment (A/C.3/L.1889) should be amended by replacing the words "and elsewhere" by "in particular, that of Zimbabwe, Namibia, Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau) as also of the Palestinian people". Her delegation hoped thereby to help those delegations which would find it difficult to vote

in favour of the Barbados subamendment, and thus to ensure that the latter would command a sufficient majority.

4. Mrs. ESHEL-SHOHAM (Israel) said that the Moroccan subamendments, proposed at the eleventh hour, were an attempt to prevent the thorough consideration of the item before the Committee. Her delegation had thus far abstained from detailed comment on matters introduced artificially into the debate but, in the face of such diversionary tactics, she was obliged to put matters in their true perspective.

5. The re-establishment of Jewish independence in Israel after centuries of struggle had been the realization of the Jewish people's right to self-determination. The Jewish people alone of all the peoples which had lived in Israel saw in that country a distinct and independent political and cultural entity. All other inhabitants who had settled there after the Jews had been exiled and enslaved by foreign invaders and had regarded themselves as integral parts of larger entities—political, national or religious. For nearly two millennia, the land of Israel had stood desolate, considered by all as occupied territory, and its ancient capital, Jerusalem, had never been considered as even an administrative centre, except by the mandatory Power. The non-Jewish inhabitants of Israel had never produced a national culture of their own.

6. Until the return of Jews at the end of the nineteenth century and, especially, after the First World War, Palestine had been inhabited by impoverished peasants in debt to absentee landlords residing at Beirut, Damascus or Cairo. With the return of the Jews, Palestine, which was traditionally a country of emigration, had become a land which attracted Arab immigrants from neighbouring countries. Thus, the Arab population, which in 1922 had numbered 565,000 had increased to 1.2 million by 1947—an increase of 100 per cent. That increase had been particularly noticeable in areas where the Jewish population had created new economic opportunities.

7. The country had had different names in different historical periods; that most widely used by Jews, however, was "Israel". For the Arabs, the land which was to be Palestine had been known under the Ottoman Empire as "Southern Syria" and certain representatives of Arab countries still considered that Palestine remained a part of Syria.

8. Originally, the United Kingdom's Mandate over Palestine had extended to the areas on both sides of the Jordan river. In 1922, the area of Transjordan had become Jordan, thereby creating a separate Palestinian Arab entity. In October 1970, Mr. Anwa Nusseibeh, a former Jordanian Defence Minister, had said: "The Jordanians are also

Palestinians. This is one State. This is one people. The name is not important.” That was a definition of the relationship between Jordan and Palestine.

9. In 1947, when the newly-independent Arab States belonging to the Arab League, of which the Palestinians felt themselves to be part, had attacked the newly-established State of Israel, Palestine had been partitioned again, the western portion being annexed by Jordan and the Gaza Strip coming under Egyptian rule. It could be asked who had prevented the establishment of a Palestinian State alongside Israel west of the Jordan. It had been the Arab States which, by force of arms, had seized parts of the territory which was to have become a second Palestinian entity, the same sovereign Arab States which denied those Palestinians who had found themselves in their territory the right to work, to travel and to citizenship. A Palestinian Arab leader living in Israel who had formerly been resident in Jordan had recently published a book in which he compared the freedom of expression in Jordan, where he had spent five years in prison, and in Israel.

10. Mr. MASRI (Jordan), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that the Committee was currently considering not freedom of expression but the right to self-determination.

11. Mrs. ESHEL-SHOHAM (Israel) said that the previous day she had listened to long tirades which had had nothing to do with the right to self-determination.

12. The Arab States themselves, therefore, had done their utmost to prevent the Palestinian people from exercising their right to self-determination. They had even gone so far as to use terror, which had reached its height the previous year in Jordan, a predominantly Palestinian State.

13. Mr. MASRI (Jordan), speaking on a point of order, said that the matters raised by the Israeli representative had no connexion with the item on the agenda. He asked the Chairman to request the delegation of Israel to refrain from interfering in the internal affairs of his country.

14. Mrs. ESHEL-SHOHAM (Israel) said that, while they might not be palatable to the Jordanian delegation, the facts she had raised were nonetheless true. The Palestinians persecuted in Jordan had fled, not to their brothers in the neighbouring Arab Countries, but to Israel.

15. Mr. MASRI (Jordan), speaking on a point of order, said that as the Israeli representative had raised the question, some clarification was in order. The unhappy events in Jordan had been possible only because the Palestinian people had no homeland. The same situation would recur wherever that people went.

16. Mrs. ESHEL-SHOHAM (Israel) said that she could only reply by repeating the words of the Jordanian former Defence Minister which she had already quoted, namely, “The Jordanians are also Palestinians”.

17. Resuming her statement, she said that the Arabs were denying the Jewish people their fundamental right to self-determination and had tried by all the means at their disposal to wipe her country off the map of the world. Her

Government nevertheless believed that there was room for all to live side by side in the Middle East. A new and sinister formula had been used of late to achieve the same end of wiping her country off the map—one involving the establishment of a secular democratic state in Palestine. The inexperienced listener might be deceived but what was not made clear was the fact that the idea was contingent upon the elimination of the Jewish State and the denial to the Jewish people of the right to self-determination. According to the Palestinian National Covenant, as amended by the fourth Palestinian Council at Cairo in July 1968, only those Jews who had been in Palestine in 1917 would be allowed to live on the ruins of the State of Israel. The aim remained the same as in the past, the destruction of a State Member of the United Nations, the elimination of the Jewish people’s rights to liberty and self-determination and the uprooting and exile of most of Israel’s Jews.

18. Israel favoured self-determination for the Arabs in their own country but did not recognize anybody’s right to decide Israel’s destiny or to advocate self-determination for a group which enjoyed that status and insisted on adding to it on the ruins of another country.

19. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he wished to correct two flagrant errors in the Israeli representative’s statement.

20. First, she had said that the Palestinian Arab population had grown as a result of the immigration of Arabs into Israel; actually, as the statistics and report of the Special Committee on Palestine had shown in 1947, the Jewish population had grown as a result of immigration but the Arab population had increased because the birth rate was higher than the mortality rate.¹

21. As to the words of the former Jordanian Defence Minister, what man had not said to his beloved: “You and I are one”? Did that mean he should lose his own identity? The words of Mr. Anwa Nusseibeh must be understood in a similar context. Palestine had not renounced either its right to self-determination or its individuality.

22. Miss DUBRA (Uruguay), speaking on a point of order, said that the general debate had been going on for a long time and the Committee had still to vote on many amendments. She therefore proposed that the debate be closed and that a vote be taken forthwith on her motion.

The motion to close the debate was adopted by 85 votes to none, with 20 abstentions.

23. Mrs. SELAMI (Algeria) pointed out a grammatical mistake in the French text of the first amendment in document A/C.3/L.1882, relating to the first preambular paragraph of the draft resolution: the word “*coloniale*” (singular) should be in the plural. She also proposed that the words “in colonial and developing countries” should be retained at the end of the third preambular paragraph.

24. Mrs. MARICO (Mali), speaking on a point of order, said that the Algerian representative’s proposal did not

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Supplement No. 11*, vol. I, chap. I, para. 16.

seem helpful and formally requested that the Malian amendment in document A/C.3/L.1882 should be retained.

25. Mrs. SELLAMI (Algeria) explained that her idea was not to delete the words "against certain independent States of Africa and Asia" as the Malian representative seemed to think, but to retain the words "in colonial and developing countries".

26. Mr. PAPADEMAS (Cyprus) proposed that the text of the second paragraph proposed by Pakistan in document A/C.3/L.1886/Rev.1 would be improved by replacing the words "established in accordance with the right of the self-determination of its peoples is incompatible with the practices and purposes of the Charter" by the words "or country or at its political independence is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter". That wording would be in tune with the text of the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, adopted at the previous session.

27. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said he wished to make it clear that that was a subamendment to his amendment and not wording to which he had agreed.

28. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the debate had been closed and that the Committee should therefore not accept any further changes to the draft resolution under consideration. She would, however, abide by the Committee's views in the matter.

29. Mr. ARIM (Turkey), supported by Miss FAROUK (Tunisia), urged that the Committee should proceed to the vote forthwith.

30. Mr. PAPADEMAS (Cyprus) said that the sole purpose of his proposal was to harmonize the text of the draft resolution and that of the Declaration. He was sure that the representatives of Turkey and Tunisia would not be opposed to a paragraph they had adopted the previous year.

31. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said that the Cypriot subamendment to the amendment in A/C.3/L.1886/Rev.1 had been introduced the previous meeting, before the debate had been closed. His request to have the amendment retained was therefore in order.

32. The CHAIRMAN observed that at the current meeting the representative of Cyprus had merely proposed the deletion of certain words; he had not proposed any new wording. Since the debate was closed and two delegations were opposed to that subamendment, the Committee could not accept it. The Cypriot representative's proposal, however, could be put to the vote separately.

33. Mr. PAPADEMAS (Cyprus) agreed that his subamendment, i.e. the deletion of the words "established in accordance with the right of the self-determination of its peoples" should be put to a separate vote.

34. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (Barbados), speaking on a point of order, said he wished to explain his delegation's

position on the subamendments orally proposed by the Moroccan representative to his delegation's subamendments in documents A/C.3/L.1888 and A/C.3/L.1889.

35. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) pointed out that the debate had been closed and said it was time to proceed to the vote. The representative of Barbados should have made his explanations before the closure of the debate.

36. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (Barbados) said that he merely wished to indicate that his delegation could not accept the Moroccan subamendments to his subamendments because they referred to the Middle East question.

37. After a procedural discussion in which Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco), Mr. MWAANGA (Zambia), Mr. RIOS (Panama) and Mr. ERMACORA (Austria) took part, the CHAIRMAN decided to give the floor to two delegations whose names were on the list of speakers for the purpose of explaining their votes.

38. Mr. WESTERMOEN (Norway), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Sweden and his own country, said that he wished to comment on certain procedural aspects of the Committee's work and in particular on the disadvantages of any duplication between its work and that of other Main Committees of the General Assembly. The Committee had before it a recommendation, in the form of a draft resolution transmitted by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1592 (L), to which a number of amendments had been proposed. The draft resolution raised important questions dealing with various aspects of the relationship between human rights and the right to self-determination. It should be noted in that connexion that a number of those questions were on the agenda of the Security Council, while some of the others were being debated in at least two other organs of the General Assembly.

39. The recommendation which had prompted the Economic and Social Council to formulate the draft resolution under consideration had originated in the Commission on Human Rights, where it had been thoroughly discussed. The recommendation had then been discussed and voted on in the Economic and Social Council. No amendment had been put forward at that stage. Yet now, the Committee had before it some 30 amendments and subamendments to the draft resolution. That being so, the delegations on behalf of which he was speaking had reached the conclusion that it would not be possible to deal adequately with all the issues raised in the draft resolution and the amendments proposed to it. They would therefore abstain in the voting on the amendments, except that the delegation of Iceland would vote on two of them.

40. Since the original recommendation of the Economic and Social Council would in all likelihood be substantially changed as a result of amendments, the Governments of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Sweden and Norway would like an opportunity to study the final text carefully in order to be able to adopt a decision when the Committee's recommendation reached the General Assembly.

41. Mr. MWAANGA (Zambia) said that he wished to explain his delegation's vote on a number of the amend-

ments, particularly the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1882, suggesting the addition of a sixth preambular paragraph to the draft resolution under consideration. He hardly needed to recall that the Zambian Government had always supported the cause of the Palestinian people, and would always be willing to reaffirm the inalienable rights of that people, just as it had done in the past. His delegation would be glad to support an amendment designed to introduce a separate paragraph on the question of the Palestinians, but it could not support the amendment proposed because it bracketed together the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia, Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) and the Palestinian people. That decision did not in any way imply a change of policy on the part of the Zambian Government: rather it reflected its unswerving attitude in the matter, namely that the problem of the Palestinians was so important that it must be regarded as an individual and separate problem.

42. In voting on the other amendments his delegation would be prompted by the progressive policy it had always pursued, which was well known.

43. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1592 (L) and the amendments thereto.

The amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1878, as orally revised, proposing the introduction of a new preambular paragraph, was adopted by 54 votes to 5, with 52 abstentions.

The first amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1882, concerning the first preambular paragraph, was adopted by 80 votes to none, with 33 abstentions.

The first preambular paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 103 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

The first amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1881/Rev.1, concerning the third preambular paragraph, was rejected by 64 votes to 27, with 23 abstentions.

The second amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1882, as orally revised, concerning the third preambular paragraph, was adopted by 75 votes to 4, with 33 abstentions.

The third preambular paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 74 votes to 15, with 23 abstentions.

The second amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1881/Rev.1, concerning the fourth preambular paragraph, was rejected by 63 votes to 26, with 24 abstentions.

44. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) said that, in her view, the word "usurpación" in the original Spanish text of the paragraph was hardly appropriate.

The third amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1882, concerning the fifth preambular paragraph, was adopted by 105 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

The fifth preambular paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 107 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The new preambular paragraph proposed in document A/C.3/L.1880 was adopted by 89 votes to 3, with 24 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Morocco, a recorded vote was taken on the Moroccan oral amendment to document A/C.3/L.1888.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Ceylon, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Greece, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Against: Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Israel, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Swaziland, Uganda, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Dahomey, Denmark, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Laos, Madagascar, Mexico, Nepal, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Zambia.

The Moroccan oral amendment was adopted by 42 votes to 26, with 48 abstentions.

The new preambular paragraph proposed in document A/C.3/L.1888, as amended, was adopted by 48 votes to 23, with 45 abstentions.

The fourth amendment proposed in document A/C.3/L.1882, as amended, was adopted by 47 votes to 20, with 47 abstentions.

45. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. GOLOVKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mrs. GORBACHEVA (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said they felt that the Moroccan oral amendment was weaker than the fourth amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1882, and had abstained from voting on it. However, since the wording of the Moroccan amendment was the one that had finally been adopted, they would like the votes of their delegations to be recorded as votes in favour.

46. The CHAIRMAN said that, contrary to what was stated in document A/C.3/L.1893, the new paragraph proposed in the first amendment of that document had been submitted with a view to supplementing and not replacing other paragraphs.

The new paragraph proposed in document A/C.3/L.1893 was adopted by 83 votes to none, with 26 abstentions.

The first paragraph proposed in document A/C.3/L.1886/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted by 81 votes to none, with 31 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Cyprus, a separate vote was taken on the words "established in accordance with the right of the self-determination of its peoples" in the second new preambular paragraph proposed in document A/C.3/L.1886/Rev.1

The words were retained by 24 votes to 5, with 81 abstentions.

The second paragraph, as orally revised, was adopted by 68 votes to none, with 43 abstentions.

The third new preambular paragraph proposed in document A/C.3/L.1886/Rev.1 was adopted by 80 votes to none, with 31 abstentions.

The amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1879, concerning operative paragraph 1, was adopted by 82 votes to none, with 32 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Israel, a vote was taken by roll-call on the Moroccan oral amendment to document A/C.3/L.1889.

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

In favour: Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen.

Against: Portugal, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Israel, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria.

Abstaining: Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela, Zambia, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Ghana, Guyana, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Laos, Madagascar, Mexico, Nepal, Norway, Panama.

The Moroccan oral amendment was adopted by 47 votes to 26, with 41 abstentions.

47. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (Barbados) observed that the effect of the Moroccan oral amendment was to make the text of operative paragraph 1 practically identical to that of the first amendment proposed by Iraq in document A/C.3/L.1877/Rev.1. He requested a roll-call vote on that amendment so that he could express his opposition to the inclusion of the words "as also of the Palestinian people".

At the request of the representative of Barbados, a vote was taken by roll-call on the first amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1877/Rev.1, as amended.

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

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Against: Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Israel, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Portugal, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Dahomey, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Ghana, Guyana, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Laos, Madagascar, Mexico, Nepal, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela, Zambia.

The amendment, as amended, was adopted by 47 votes to 26, with 40 abstentions.

The third amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1881/Rev.1, relating to operative paragraph 1, was adopted by 53 votes to 34, with 24 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 1, as amended, was adopted by 57 votes to 13, with 40 abstentions.

At the request of the Tunisian representative, a recorded vote was taken on the second amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1877/Rev.1, proposing the insertion of a new paragraph after operative paragraph 2.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guinea,

Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Ireland, Italy, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Sweden, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

The amendment was adopted by 82 votes to 4, with 28 abstentions.

The fourth amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1881/Rev.1, concerning operative paragraph 3, was rejected by 68 votes to 22, with 24 abstentions.

The words "particularly Portugal and South Africa" in the fifth amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1882 were adopted by 78 votes to 2, with 30 abstentions.

The words "independent African States and" in the fifth amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1882 were adopted by 84 votes to 1, with 27 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 3, as amended, was adopted by 79 votes to 1, with 29 abstentions.

The fifth amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1881/Rev.1, concerning operative paragraph 4, was rejected by 70 votes to 20, with 24 abstentions.

The third amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1877/Rev.1 was adopted by 61 votes to 6, with 45 abstentions.

The fourth amendment proposed in document A/C.3/L.1877/Rev.1 was adopted by 78 votes to 1, with 30 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 4, as amended, was adopted by 70 votes to 1, with 37 abstentions.

The sixth amendment proposed in document A/C.3/L.1881/Rev.1, concerning operative paragraph 5, was rejected by 65 votes to 21, with 27 abstentions.

The sixth amendment proposed in document A/C.3/L.1882, as orally revised, was adopted by 72 votes to 18, with 21 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 5, as amended, was adopted by 74 votes to 13, with 23 abstentions.

48. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the representative of Jamaica had requested the insertion of the words "as well as States Members of the United Nations or members of specialized agencies" after the words "Security Council" in the seventh amendment submitted in document A/C.3/L.1882.

49. Mr. EL SHEIKH (Sudan) pointed out that, as worded, the Jamaican amendment would have the effect of inviting States to report to the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session.

50. Mr. BOOTHE (Jamaica) said he saw no reason why States Members of the United Nations should not report individually to the General Assembly.

The Jamaican oral amendment was adopted by 43 votes to none, with 68 abstentions.

The seventh amendment proposed in document A/C.3/L.1882, as amended, was adopted by 82 votes to 5, with 26 abstentions.

51. The CHAIRMAN recalled that Pakistan had withdrawn the operative paragraph 9 which he had proposed in document A/C.3/L.1886/Rev.1, so that only operative paragraph 10 remained.

52. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) drew attention to a slight error in the English text, where the word "principle" should be in the plural.

The new operative paragraph 10 proposed in document A/C.3/L.1886/Rev.1 was adopted by 95 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as a whole, as amended.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, France, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Barbados, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Laos, Lesotho,

Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Norway, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Sweden, Uruguay, Venezuela.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 74 votes to 12, with 27 abstentions.

53. Mr. TRESSELT (Norway), supported by Mr. TORRES (Philippines), requested the Secretary of the Committee to

have the text of the draft resolution distributed as early as possible, without waiting for the report of the Committee to the General Assembly.²

The meeting rose at 2.25 p.m.

² The text of the draft resolution adopted by the Committee was subsequently distributed as document A/C.3/L.1901.