

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1819th
MEETING**

Friday, 11 December 1970,
at 3.40 p.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Miss Maria GROZA (Romania).

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters VII (sections A, except paragraphs 234 to 239, and B), IX, X (section D), XI (sections A, K and M) and XIII (sections A and B)] (continued) (A/7929, A/8003 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/8174/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1769, A/C.3/L.1770, A/C.3/L.1813, A/C.3/L.1832, A/C.3/L.1835, A/C.3/L.1838, A/C.3/L.1843, A/C.3/L.1844, A/C.3/L.1846, A/C.3/L.1847)

AGENDA ITEM 58

Technical assistance in the field of narcotics: report of the Secretary-General (continued) (A/8003, chap. XI, sect. A; A/8003/Add.1, A/C.3/L.1813, A/C.3/L.1841, A/C.3/L.1842)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS
(continued)

1. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that his delegation had been surprised at the allegations made by the Iranian representative at the 1817th meeting not only because Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter of the United Nations specifically prohibited intervention in matters which were within the domestic jurisdiction of Member States but also because the source of the statement had been a State which was not particularly noted for its advocacy of human rights or personal freedoms. It was not recorded that Iran had ever raised its voice to protest against violations of human rights perpetrated under the former régime of the Sultans of Zanzibar—violations which had included slavery, racial discrimination, economic exploitation, political oppression and forced marriage of women. It could not have been expected that the overthrow of the Sultan's Government would immediately lead to the elimination of all the evils existing under the former régime, but the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania had tackled the problems arising from the contradictions between a popular revolution and the legacy of old attitudes by insisting that all marriages should be free from restrictions based on religious or racial considerations. Ways and means of ensuring a smooth and orderly transition from the traditional pattern of marriages were being discussed, but the task was not an easy one for a country which had over one hundred different tribes and communities.

2. His country had nothing to hide in the matter of the status of women or the manner in which marriages took

place. The Iranian Government had previously raised with the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania some questions concerning persons of Iranian descent who were Tanzanian nationals. In a desire to accommodate the wishes of the Iranian Government, the United Republic of Tanzania had allowed an Iranian representative to visit its territory and discuss those questions with different leaders and officials. The Iranian envoy had been given full co-operation and the necessary assurances that the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania would see that the human rights of each and every person concerned were protected. His Government found it regrettable that the representative of Iran should see fit, either in the Committee or elsewhere, to spread malicious propaganda against the United Republic of Tanzania. The statement that the practice of forced marriage had been intensified during the month of Ramadan reflected either ignorance of Tanzanian society or complete prejudice. If the Government of Iran had truly cherished the cause of Afro-Asian solidarity, it would have appreciated the extraordinary courtesy extended to its envoy and would have respected the assurances given him by Tanzanian Government leaders both on the islands and on the mainland.

3. Mr. FLORES (Argentina), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1847, said that the purpose of the first amendment was to bring the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1511 (XLVIII) up to date by referring to paragraph 79 of resolution 2626 (XXV), adopted by the General Assembly on 24 October 1970. Similarly, the aim of the second amendment was to make the wording of the fifth preambular paragraph consonant with the terminology adopted by all organs of the United Nations in connexion with the subject of general and complete disarmament. Lastly, it was not appropriate at the present time for the Committee to establish a priority by asserting that the resources released by such disarmament should be used in particular for programmes to advance the status of women. The matter required further consideration, since some felt that any resources released should be used for the economic and social progress of all peoples, and particularly of the developing countries. Accordingly, replacement of the words "and in particular" by "including" in the fifth preambular paragraph would improve the text.

4. Mrs. GONZALEZ DE CUADROS (Colombia) said that she supported the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1510 (XLVIII) despite the fact that operative paragraph 1 merely expressed "the hope" that the United Nations family of organizations would set an example in the opportunities it afforded for the employment of women at senior and other professional levels.

5. She fully shared the view that the family was the corner-stone of society and endorsed the Saudi Arabian representative's first amendment in document A/C.3/L.1838 to the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1511 (XLVIII). On the other hand, adoption of the second Saudi Arabian amendment would mean imposing a condition on the provision of information concerning family planning. Therefore, the words "provided that" in the amendment in question should be deleted and the remainder of that amendment should constitute a separate sentence. She had reservations concerning the third Saudi Arabian amendment, which she felt was discriminatory. The fact that a woman worked did not mean that she could not be a good mother. Women had a very special role to play in society and they should not be prevented from taking their part alongside men in its development. She would be unable to support the third of the amendments proposed by Argentina and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.1847), for full use should be made of possible means of advancing the status of women.

6. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) accepted the Colombian representative's suggestion concerning his second amendment.

7. Mrs. OGATA (Japan) said that, while she had no objection to the first of the Saudi Arabian amendments (A/C.3/L.1838) she considered that it would be more suitable as a preambular than an operative paragraph. On the other hand, she disagreed with the Saudi Arabian representative's basic assumption that women were, if not stupid, at least irresponsible. Many women worked because they had to and others because they had something to offer society. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that bringing up children was a task to be carried out jointly by men and women. She was therefore strongly opposed to both the second and the third amendments in document A/C.3/L.1838.

8. Begum HAMIDULLAH (Pakistan) observed that the Saudi Arabian representative had emphasized a fact of primary importance in asserting that the family was the corner-stone of society, and she therefore supported his first amendment (A/C.3/L.1838). At the same time, it should be recognized that women did not want to become men—they were merely seeking equality and full recognition of their professional qualifications. In some societies their worth and dignity were disregarded and it might be very useful to undertake an in-depth study of women's position in the contemporary world to ascertain whether economic, social and political emancipation had in fact advanced their status. She was completely unable to support the second and third amendments proposed by the Saudi Arabian representative.

9. Mrs. ASIYO (Kenya) announced that the delegations of the Ivory Coast, Madagascar, Niger, Sierra Leone and the United Republic of Tanzania had become sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1846. The sponsors considered that, since most developing countries still depended largely on an agricultural economy, it would be practical and useful to include the teaching of modern methods of farming and other aspects of agriculture to women among the general objectives listed in the annex to

the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1511 (XLVIII). She supported the ideas underlying the draft recommended in Council resolution 1510 (XLVIII) and noted with satisfaction that a similar text had been adopted by the Fifth Committee at the current session.¹ Both of the draft resolutions on the status of women now before the Committee made specific and valuable recommendations and she therefore appealed to the Saudi Arabian representative to withdraw his third amendment in document A/C.3/L.1838. In the developing countries, educated women were needed to work side by side with men in the task of nation-building. There were demands for their services in government, in private enterprise and in voluntary organizations. There was far too much *de facto* discrimination against women in many parts of the world and the text of a United Nations resolution should not contain any provision which could be used against women. Like the members of the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on the Status of Women, she welcomed the attempt to establish operational programmes directed towards fuller participation of women in all sectors in the development of their countries and towards the integration of women in the process of national development (see A/8003, para. 354). Moreover, she fully supported the idea of drafting a declaration on protection of women and children in emergency or war time.

10. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) said that in her country women were playing a more and more important role in public life. For example, there had been an increase in the number of women in the Legislative Assembly and a woman had recently been elected Governor of San José. Her delegation attached great importance to the draft resolutions recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolutions 1510 (XLVIII) and 1511 (XLVIII) and fully supported the principles they reflected and the objectives envisaged. She felt that the first and second amendments proposed by Argentina and Uruguay in document A/C.3/L.1847 would improve the draft in Council resolution 1511 (XLVIII) but, for the same reasons as those advanced by the Colombian representative, she could not endorse the third amendment. Similarly, she considered that to adopt the first and third of the amendments submitted by the Saudi Arabian representative (A/C.3/L.1838) would be a retrograde step. The family was indeed a corner-stone of society, but that fact had been no obstacle to the advancement of the status of women, who were fully aware of their obligations to the family. On the other hand, she endorsed the second Saudi Arabian amendment, for she considered that it helped to clarify the text of the draft resolution.

11. Mrs. JOKA-BANGURA (Sierra Leone), commenting on the amendments submitted by the representative of Saudi Arabia in document A/C.3/L.1838, said that while she agreed that the family was the corner-stone of society she would be opposed to the inclusion of that assertion if it was to be used solely as a pretext for discriminating against women in employment. Also, family planning was a personal matter which could be settled within the family; it was not appropriate to discuss in an international forum the type of information to be made available to married

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 82, document A/8098, para. 31.

couples. As to the third Saudi Arabian amendment, she felt that its adoption might cause persons to decide not to marry and lead to greater discrimination against married women, for the latter could lose their jobs if they had children under nine years of age. Accordingly, she appealed to the Saudi Arabian representative to withdraw his amendments.

12. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that she shared the concern voiced by previous speakers regarding the amendments proposed by the representative of Saudi Arabia. The first and third amendments, in particular, caused her delegation great difficulties and she hoped that the Saudi Arabian representative would heed the appeal to withdraw his proposals.

13. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1510 (XLVIII).

The draft resolution was adopted by 88 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

14. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1511 (XLVIII) and the amendments thereto.

The first amendment in document A/C.3/L.1847, affecting the fourth preambular paragraph, was adopted by 73 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

The fourth preambular paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 82 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

The second amendment in document A/C.3/L.1847, affecting the fifth preambular paragraph, was adopted by 81 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

The third amendment in document A/C.3/L.1847, affecting the fifth preambular paragraph, was adopted by 62 votes to 2, with 20 abstentions.

The fifth preambular paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 78 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

At the request of the Bulgarian representative, a separate vote was taken on the words "from dissolution which, to a large extent, is caused by accelerated progress in the industrial and technological fields" in the new operative paragraph 8 proposed in the first amendment in document A/C.3/L.1838.

The words in question were deleted by 51 votes to 3, with 27 abstentions.

The new operative paragraph 8 proposed in document A/C.3/L.1838, as amended, was adopted by 45 votes to 13, with 26 abstentions.

The new paragraph (6) of section II.B of the annex to the draft resolution, proposed in the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1846, was adopted unanimously.

The second amendment in document A/C.3/L.1838, affecting paragraph (4) of section II.C of the annex, was adopted by 39 votes to 9, with 31 abstentions.

Paragraph (4) of section II.C of the annex, as amended, was adopted by 68 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Saudi Arabia, the vote on the third amendment in document A/C.3/L.1838, affecting paragraph (1) of section II.D of the annex, was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Saudi Arabia.

Against: Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali.

Abstaining: Mongolia, Peru, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Yemen, Algeria, Cameroon, Chad, China, Haiti, Iran, Jordan, Kuwait, Laos, Libya.

The amendment was rejected by 84 votes to 1, with 14 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, separate votes were taken on operative paragraphs 2, 3, and 6 of the draft resolution.

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 86 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 85 votes to 1, with 12 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 6 was adopted by 88 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

15. Mr. EL SHEIKH (Sudan) informed the Committee that several delegations had held informal consultations and had agreed that, in order to expedite the Committee's work, further statements should be made only by sponsors of amendments; other delegations would express their positions by the way they voted. The sponsors of new draft resolutions on controversial issues would not press for a vote on them but would be satisfied if the Committee's report mentioned that the items had not been discussed because of lack of time.

16. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) endorsed the comments made by the representative of Sudan and expressed the satisfaction of her delegation at the spirit of good will and compromise that had made it possible to expedite the Committee's work. Her delegation had agreed not to press for a debate on the draft resolution in document A/C.3/L.1844 on the protection of women and children in emergency or war time, fighting for peace, national liberation and independence. However, the report of the Committee should state that the matter had not been discussed because of lack of time and would again be before the Committee at its next session.

17. Mr. BAYÜLKEN (Turkey), on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution on assistance in cases of natural disaster (A/C.3/L.1832), thanked the Chairman and the members of the Committee for making it possible to come to an agreement that should enable the Committee to adopt the draft resolution unanimously. As a result of the informal consultations that had been held, it had been decided that the first sentence of operative paragraph 4 should be amended to read:

"Invites the Secretary-General to study and include in his comprehensive report, in addition to those studies and reports he has been invited to submit by the General Assembly in resolution 2435 (XXIII) and by the Economic and Social Council in resolution 1546 (XLIX), paragraphs 10 and 11, his conclusions and recommendations on:"

18. He asked the representative of the Secretary-General to confirm the sponsors' understanding that the comprehensive report of the Secretary-General would include the study on the role within the United Nations system of the emergency fund for disasters, which had been requested in Economic and Social Council resolution 1546 (XLIX).

19. Mr. KITTANI (Deputy to the Assistant Secretary-General for Inter-Agency Affairs) confirmed that the Secretary-General's comprehensive report would include the study in question.

20. Mr. BAYÜLKEN (Turkey) said that in view of that confirmation he was pleased to announce that the sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1835 had agreed to withdraw it and to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1832. He wished to thank them for their spirit of compromise and co-operation and expressed the hope that it would now be possible for the Committee to adopt the resolution unanimously.

21. Mr. PAPADEMÁS (Cyprus) said that, with the revisions that had been introduced by the sponsors, the draft resolution was entirely acceptable to his delegation, which wished to be added to the list of sponsors.

22. Mr. ČALOVSKI (Yugoslavia) expressed the appreciation of his delegation for the spirit of co-operation that had enabled the Committee to reach agreement on the draft resolution.

23. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan) expressed the appreciation of his delegation to those of Yugoslavia, India, Peru and the United States for their readiness to reconcile their differ-

ences. Unanimity was indispensable if a resolution such as the one on assistance in cases of natural disaster was to be effective. The support of those countries which were in a position to make available the logistic support provided for in operative paragraph 2 was essential. The immediate availability of such assistance would save thousands of human lives that would otherwise be lost as a result of injuries, exposure, starvation, epidemics and other causes in the immediate aftermath of natural disasters.

24. At the 1817th meeting the representative of India had made certain remarks which had shown his understanding of the problems cyclones brought to the countries they struck. The Bay of Bengal, where such fearsome phenomena often originated, washed the shores of both India and East Pakistan, and the West Bengal province of India could be as much affected by their ravages as East Pakistan. The Indian representative had mentioned that his Government had granted permission for Pakistan planes to overfly Indian territory within minutes after the request had been made. That was not the occasion for engaging in exchanges, but rather the occasion for demonstrating human solidarity. In a wider context, the point in his statement at the 1816th meeting had been that, in cases of natural disaster, vehicles for the delivery of relief supplies should have standing permission to overfly and/or land in the territory of other countries. They should not have to wait for permission, the granting of which might depend on the political expediencies of the moment.

25. The draft resolution before the Committee was not confined to principles, guidelines and the submission of studies by the Secretary-General; it was also a call to action. Operative paragraph 2 held out the hope that it might be possible to mobilize the international community to deliver emergency relief to tens of thousands of stricken men, women and children within twenty-four to forty-eight hours after earthquakes, cyclones, floods and other natural disasters had struck. When a catastrophe of the magnitude of the one that had recently struck Pakistan befell any country other than the most developed, it was simply beyond its means to relieve the agony of the countless thousands of human beings affected. It was in such emergencies that the rich and powerful nations were called upon to translate their humanitarian sentiments into timely action to save human lives.

26. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America) expressed his delegation's appreciation of the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1835, which made it possible for it to vote for the draft resolution. At the tenth session of the Governing Council of UNDP his delegation had had difficulties with a similar resolution. It still had difficulty with operative paragraphs 8 and 9 of the draft resolution before the Committee, on which it requested a separate vote.

27. Mr. SATHE (India), supported by Mr. GUZMAN (Peru), noted with satisfaction that unanimity had been achieved on the substance of the draft resolution and expressed his delegation's hope that it would be adopted by acclamation. At that stage there should not be any differences of opinion, no matter how minor, that would make it necessary to ask for separate votes. He therefore appealed to the United States representative not to press his request.

28. Mr. FRANCIS (Jamaica) asked the United States representative whether it might not be possible for him to withdraw his request for separate votes on the understanding that the Rapporteur's report would reflect his delegation's position.

29. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America) said he appreciated the viewpoint of the delegations that had asked him to withdraw his request for separate votes. However, he was not in a position to do so and would explain his delegation's position after the vote. His Government's request for separate votes would in no way affect the spirit, intent or substance of the draft resolution.

Operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1832 was adopted by 92 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution was adopted by 93 votes to 1.

Draft resolution A/C.3/L.1832 as a whole, as orally revised, was adopted unanimously.

30. Mr. EVDOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in view of the principle of the universality of the United Nations and since the Committee had had before it a draft resolution reflecting a humanitarian concern shared by all, he regretted that the sponsors had not been able to accept a number of the amendments proposed by his delegation. He requested that that fact should be reflected in the Committee's report and said that if a vote had been taken on the draft resolution, his delegation would have had to abstain.

31. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America), explaining the views of his Government, said that his country considered the Pakistan disaster to be perhaps the worst of its kind in the twentieth century and it had furnished 46 per cent of all the foreign assistance which had so far been made available to that country. There should accordingly be no doubt about the goodwill with which his Government responded when such disasters struck. However, UNDP already had a serious deficit and his delegation feared that operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution that had just been adopted might create additional work for the Governing Council at a time when it was attempting to improve UNDP's delivery capacity. Because of his Government's position concerning the World Bank, it had also found it necessary to vote against operative paragraph 9.

32. Mr. EVDOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the suggestion made by the Sudanese representative and said that his delegation would not press its draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1843) provided the Committee mentioned in its report that it had not had enough time to give it serious consideration.

33. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) thanked the USSR representative for not insisting that draft resolution A/C.3/L.1843 should be put to the vote, since that draft dealt with substantive issues which the Committee had not had time to consider in detail. His delegation strongly opposed the views set forth in that text and requested that that fact should be reflected in the records of the Committee's proceedings.

34. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) thanked the USSR representative for not pressing draft resolution A/C.3/L.1843 and said that her delegation too would have opposed it.

35. Mrs. DAES (Greece) informed the Committee that Liberia had decided to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1841.

Draft resolution A/C.3/L.1841 was adopted by 84 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

36. Mr. VAN WALSUM (Netherlands) said that his delegation had some difficulty with the words "maximum penalties" in the operative paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1842, since in many countries that phrase could be construed as meaning the death penalty. He hoped that that was not what was meant in the draft resolution.

37. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that as long as the words "severe punishment" were retained he would agree to delete "maximum penalties".

38. Mr. REBAGLIATI (Argentina) felt that the text would not be improved if that change were made, since the expression "severe punishment" by itself could suggest corporal punishment. He thought that the expression "severe penalties" would be more appropriate in a legal context.

39. Mr. GANDA (Sierra Leone) said he was surprised that no representative had drawn attention to the fact that the Committee was adopting two draft resolutions on a non-controversial item. In any case since there were only minor differences in the two draft resolutions he felt that they could have been combined.

40. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) informed the Committee that he wished to make some drafting changes in the text he had proposed. To bring it into line with the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, he wished to replace the word "narcotics" throughout the text by the words "narcotic drugs". The words "the possibility of" should be inserted between "consider" and "enacting" in the operative paragraph of the draft resolution. He also wished to insert the following additional preambular paragraph between the third and fourth preambular paragraphs:

"Noting that the term 'narcotic drugs' has been defined in paragraph 20 of the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs on its second special session."

As defined by the Commission, "narcotic drugs" included not only organic materials such as opium, hashish and marijuana but also dangerous synthetic drugs such as LSD.

41. Mr. RIOS (Panama) felt that, since the draft resolution dealt with one of the most serious problems facing the world, its urgency should be stressed and maximum penalties should be used to combat it. He therefore proposed the wording "the most severe punishment and penalties", which would be in keeping with the spirit of the draft resolution and would provide for a very strong sanction against illicit trafficking in narcotic drugs.

42. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) thanked the representative of Panama and said that he thought the wording he had suggested improved the text.

43. Mr. PARDO (Malta) said that while he would not oppose draft resolution A/C.3/L.1842 he felt that it dealt with only a small aspect of the problem. It should also have called for greater co-operation between Governments and should have urged Governments to rectify social conditions which lay at the root of many instances of drug abuse.

44. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) said that he would support the draft resolution but suggested that the words "the most severe" should be replaced by the words "very severe" so that it would not appear that the death penalty was implied.

45. Mr. RYBAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, since the new preambular paragraph had been inserted only at the present meeting, his delegation had not had time to ascertain what the position of the USSR had been with regard to the definition in question. He would, however, vote in favour of the draft resolution, on the understanding that the position which the USSR had taken at the second special session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs would remain unchanged.

46. Mrs. DAES (Greece) supported the proposal of the French representative. She requested the representative of Saudi Arabia to include in his text the words "if necessary" after the word "enacting" in the operative paragraph, since many countries already had legislation providing for serious penalties in that regard.

47. Mr. SATHE (India) said that his delegation too would support the draft resolution on the understanding that the position taken by India at the second special session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs on the definition of narcotic drugs, which it had not had time to study, would not be affected by its vote in the Committee.

48. He felt that the wish of the French representative could be met by deleting the words "the most" from the wording suggested by the representative of Panama.

49. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) supported the formula proposed by the Indian representative and hoped it would meet with the approval of the representatives of Panama and France.

50. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) suggested that the words "severe penalties", as proposed by the Argentine represen-

tative, would be preferable since "penalties" was more appropriate in a legal context than "punishment".

51. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) accepted the suggestion of the French representative.

Draft resolution A/C.3/L.1842, as orally revised, was adopted unanimously.

*Personal tributes to Mr. Martin Hill and
to Mr. Ismat Kittani*

52. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan) paid a tribute to the ability, integrity and dedication of Mr. Martin Hill, the retiring Assistant Secretary-General for Inter-Agency Affairs. The wisdom, experience and compassion he had shown in co-ordinating assistance to Pakistan after the recent disaster were deeply appreciated by his country.

53. He also congratulated Mr. Ismat Kittani on his appointment as Mr. Hill's successor. Mr. Kittani's great political experience, knowledge of administrative and budgetary questions and familiarity with the work of the specialized agencies eminently qualified him for the high post he was to occupy.

54. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that Mr. Martin Hill had ably performed the many tasks entrusted to him by the United Nations.

55. Mr. Kittani had shown rare objectivity in dealing with controversial subjects and he was fully deserving of his new position.

56. Mr. KITTANI (Deputy to the Assistant Secretary-General for Inter-Agency Affairs) said he would inform Mr. Martin Hill of the tributes paid to him by the representatives of Pakistan and Saudi Arabia.

57. He thanked those two representatives for their generous words about himself and expressed the hope that their confidence and the confidence of the Secretary-General would not prove to have been misplaced.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.