



UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL

A/C.3/SR.808  
14 November 1957

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Twelfth Session

THIRD COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE EIGHT HUNDRED AND EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Tuesday, 12 November 1957, at 3.15 p.m.

CONTENTS

Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees  
(A/C.3/L.639/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.641, A/C.3/L.642, A/C.3/L.643)  
(continued)

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mrs. LIONAES	Norway
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. COX	Peru

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the three working languages (English, French or Spanish), preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. Corrections should be sent in triplicate within three working days to the Chief, Meeting Services, Department of Conference Services, Room 1104, and also incorporated in mimeographed copies of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED AT 0930 HOURS ON 14 NOVEMBER 1957, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 0930 HOURS ON 19 NOVEMBER 1957.

Publication of the final printed records being subject to a rigid schedule, the co-operation of delegations in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

57-53139

/...

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES (A/C.3/L.639/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.641, A/C.3/L.642, A/C.3/L.643) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to resume its consideration of the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.643).

Mr. DELHAYE (Belgium) said there was no need to stress his country's interest in all humanitarian problems. Belgium was taking an active part in a number of international efforts in behalf of refugees and its vote in favour of the draft resolution would be an expression of its compassion for the Chinese refugees in Hong Kong. In conformity with the United States and French representatives' statements, however, his delegation's vote should not be interpreted as a financial commitment on the part of his Government, since public expenditure was subject to the approval of Parliament.

Mrs. QUART (Canada) said that her Government gave sympathetic consideration to the situation of the Chinese refugees and the efforts of the local authorities but its support of the draft resolution implied no financial commitment at the present stage. It hoped, however, that the appeal would not fall on deaf ears.

Mrs. TOLBERT (Liberia) said that her delegation appreciated the High Commissioner's work in behalf of refugees and would support any resolution that tended to alleviate their plight. She supported the Saudi Arabian representative's oral amendment to the draft resolution and endorsed the United States representative's explanation that no financial commitments were involved by voting in favour of the three-Power draft; nevertheless, every effort should be made to improve the lot of the refugees.

Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) said that his delegation's position was guided by paragraph 11 of the High Commissioner's report and paragraphs 110, 111 and 113 of the UNREF Executive Committee's report (A/2585/Rev.1). The question was a humanitarian and non-political matter and praise was due to the Hong Kong authorities in facing a situation, which had grown beyond the resources available.

/...

(Mr. Brillantes, Philippines)

The draft resolution was intended to enlist world-wide support. His delegation was glad that the Saudi Arabian oral amendment had been accepted and would vote for the draft resolution, on the understanding that it implied no financial commitments.

Mr. PYMAN (Australia) said he hoped that the Committee would adopt the draft resolution by an overwhelming majority, in order to express the United Nations' concern about the plight of the Hong Kong refugees. His delegation had had doubts, for practical reasons, about including any reference to the High Commissioner in the draft resolution, in the belief that the Hong Kong authorities and the United Kingdom would be able to deal with the situation, given increased resources. In view of the fact that Governments would not be committed to any financial obligations, however, he would be able to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. HANEKE (Norway) said that his delegation would be able to vote in favour of the three-Power draft resolution, on the understanding that no government commitments for material support were entailed.

Mr. KRAJEWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation regarded the so-called problem of the Hong Kong refugees as a phenomenon of economically-prompted migration and rapid urbanization, similar to many cases observed all over the world, in which the High Commissioner's intervention had not been sought. He could see no possibility of solving the problem without the participation of the People's Republic of China, which was the State most directly concerned. He would vote against the draft resolution.

Mr. NUR (Indonesia) said that, although his delegation was in sympathy with the underlying purposes of the draft resolution, it considered that the effect of the adoption of the draft would be to discriminate in favour of the Chinese refugees in Hong Kong, and against refugees in other parts of the world. It would be better not to single out that category, but to refer to them in the thirteen-Power draft resolution. His Government, moreover, was unable to make any material contribution, and would therefore abstain from voting on the draft resolution.

/...

Mr. COX (Peru) said he would vote for the draft resolution, as an expression of sympathy to human beings who had been forced to leave their country. Owing to its own economic commitments, Peru could not undertake any financial obligations, but would support the draft resolution in order to show that all refugees deserved the Committee's attention.

Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) said she would vote for the draft resolution, on the understanding that the Chinese refugees in Hong Kong would not be placed under the High Commissioner's mandate. She regretted that the secondary question of the heavy burden placed upon the Government of Hong Kong had been mentioned in the draft; the main point was that hundreds of thousands of human beings should receive the assistance they needed. Unfortunately, her Government was unable to pledge any material support.

Mr. AGOLLI (Albania) considered that the overwhelming majority of the Chinese in Hong Kong could not be regarded as refugees, and could not therefore be placed under the High Commissioner's mandate. The question had been raised for political reasons and had nothing to do with humanitarian refugee problems. He would vote against the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN put the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.643) to the vote.

The draft resolution was adopted by 43 votes to 10, with 14 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the thirteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.639/Rev.1) and the amendments thereto.

Mrs. ROSSEL (Sweden), observed that the Greek representative's statement at the previous meeting that paragraph 5 combined both the advisory and the executive functions of the Executive Committee was purely formal and appealed to him not to press that argument.

With regard to his assertion that the terms of reference of the UNREF Executive Committee were not taken up in the joint draft resolution, she pointed out that the earlier Committee had been set up to deal with a previously defined programme, whereas the new Committee would take action on programmes still to be planned. Nevertheless, the contingencies covered by Economic and Social Council resolution 565 (XIX) were largely reproduced in the thirteen-Power draft. Thus, the provisions of sub-paragraph A (a) of the earlier resolution were covered by sub-paragraph 5 (c), sub-Paragraph A (b) by sub-paragraph 5 (c) and 5 (f) /...

(Mrs. Rossel, Sweden)

and paragraph 8, and sub-paragraph A (c) by sub-paragraphs 5 (c) and 5 (d); sub-paragraphs A (d) and A (h) contained general provisions, which had not been restated; sub-paragraphs A (e), A (f), A (g) and A (i) were covered by paragraphs 8 and 10 of the new draft, and paragraph B by sub-paragraph 5 (b).

In the debate, some delegations had expressed the opinion that not enough attention had been paid to voluntary repatriation. The sponsors of the draft resolution had merely broadened the scope of material assistance to the High Commissioner's Office, but had not in any way revised his Statute. They had assumed that a reference to repatriation in the preamble would constitute adequate recognition of that aspect. The introduction of the five-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.641), however, had shown that concern was still shown on the subject and, in a spirit of conciliation, the sponsors had inserted a new operative paragraph 2, restating article 1 of the High Commissioner's Statute, in the hope that the five Powers would withdraw their amendment. The High Commissioner was bound under his Statute, not to "encourage" various solutions, but to "facilitate" them. "Encouragement" would involve the High Commissioner in political decisions, whereas his activities must depend on the measures taken by the countries of asylum and of immigration and, above all, on the freely expressed will of the refugees themselves. The High Commissioner could not encourage any one of the three solutions at the expense of the others.

The Syrian representative had suggested that the word "promote" could be used instead of "facilitate", but the sponsors considered that that word implied even more compulsion than "encourage". They appreciated the spirit of compromise that had prompted that suggestion, but considered it most important that the High Commissioner should not be forced to make any political decisions.

Furthermore, the five-Power amendment, through its reference to paragraph 1 of the thirteen-Power draft, applied only to the existing UNREF programme, and thus entailed the incorrect principle of relating voluntary repatriation only to the unsettled European refugees. Secondly, contributions to UNREF had already been made for a specific programme already planned by the High Commissioner, and it would be unwarranted for the General Assembly to modify that programme on an ex post facto basis.

With regard to the new paragraph 5, she said that the sponsors wanted the new Committee to have a broad international basis and to expand the scope of refugee assistance within the framework of the United Nations. That was why they proposed

/...

(Mrs. Rossel, Sweden)

that the Committee should consist of many kinds of States, not only countries in different parts of the world, but the countries most directly interested in the High Commissioner's work, such as countries of first asylum, countries of immigration and countries which, for humanitarian or religious reasons, wished to give their support or material aid. It was to be hoped that wide representation could be achieved since, if twenty-five countries were to be represented, nearly one-third of the Member States would be included. The stipulation that a certain interest should be shown in the work was necessary, for the alternative was to include countries which were not interested in helping the High Commissioner to find solutions.

With regard to the Saudi Arabian delegation's second and third amendments (A/C.3/L.642), she pointed out that they drew no clear line of responsibility for the liquidation of UNREF between the Executive Committee and the High Commissioner's Office. There was every reason to believe that the existing close co-operation between the High Commissioner and the Executive Committee would continue, but it was essential to make it quite clear with whom the final decision would rest in the event of disagreement; the sponsors of the joint draft believed that it should be for the Executive Committee to take that decision, because its collective judgement reflected the opinion of the Organization to a large extent and because the High Commissioner should not be called upon to bear the onus of possibly contentious decisions. If the Saudi Arabian amendments were adopted, the High Commissioner might be made a scapegoat for decisions which should properly only be taken by representatives of Governments.

Mr. SAMY (Egypt) said that his Government had had to spend vast sums on Arab refugees in the Gaza Strip and had been unable to help European refugees. It was, nonetheless, sincerely concerned with the fate of all the refugee everywhere, both those who were within the High Commissioner's mandate and those who were not.

The High Commissioner and his staff had shown themselves capable of dealing efficiently with the refugee question, with the able assistance of the UNREF Executive Committee. The High Commissioner should be able to count on such assistance in the future, since it would not be suitable for him to accept great responsibility without the advice of the countries which furnished aid to the refugees and since such countries were entitled to control of the use of the moneys they had themselves contributed. He therefore supported the draft resolution. /...

Mrs. HAIKAL (Jordan) commended the High Commissioner for having approached the matter of the Hungarian refugees in a wholly humanitarian and objective manner.

Now that the reference to selection of members of the proposed Executive Committee "on the widest possible geographical basis" had been included in paragraph 5 of the thirteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.639/Rev.1), an equally objective approach to future refugee situations seemed to be guaranteed and she would therefore support the draft resolution.

With reference to the joint amendment (A/C.3/L.641) she said that it was important to incorporate in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution a reaffirmation of the basic principle of the Statute regarding permanent solutions. She fully agreed with the High Commissioner that one of his functions was to ensure the widest possible freedom of choice on the part of the refugees. However, she also agreed that the principle of voluntary repatriation should not be applied to children whose parents had remained in their country of origin. The children were too young to make a choice for themselves, and the High Commissioner should take steps to reunite them with their families.

She took exception, from a purely humanitarian point of view, to the Israel representative's recent statement that the Israel Government's main contribution had been to accept some European refugees for resettlement. The High Commissioner should in future object on moral grounds to any contribution towards the welfare of some refugees which made it impossible for other refugees ever to return to the land of their ancestors.

Mrs. SHOHAM-SHARON (Israel) remarked that, in spite of repeated protestations to the contrary, representatives of the Arab States had on several occasions seen fit to bring up the question of the Palestine refugees.

She wished to correct a misquotation of her recent statement; she had said that unfortunately her Government could not increase its contribution to UNREF because of the heavy burden it had assumed in looking after thousands of refugees who had previously been under the High Commissioner's mandate.

(Mrs. Shoham-Sharon, Israel)

The immigration policy of her country was wholly an internal matter. Furthermore, Israel was in no way responsible for the creation of the Palestine refugee problem. She pointed out that nearly 500,000 persons from Arab countries had come in the past years to Israel.

Mr. EL-FARRA (Syria) pointed out that the phrase "promotion of permanent solutions" was to be found in two earlier General Assembly resolutions on refugees, and that, moreover, the word "promote" was used repeatedly in article 8 of the Statute which set forth the specific functions of the High Commissioner. He therefore pressed his proposal that the High Commissioner should be asked to promote, rather than merely "facilitate", permanent solutions for refugees.

Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) said that the great success achieved by the High Commissioner's Office in providing permanent solutions for the Hungarian refugees made her all the more conscious that similarly swift action had not been forthcoming in the case of the earlier refugees. She was glad the draft resolution emphasized the UNREF programme for those unfortunate persons. She also supported the provision for dealing with future refugee situations as they arose.

She had certain reservations about the High Commissioner being assisted by an Executive Committee. The Statute provided for a purely advisory committee, and she had never understood why the Economic and Social Council had seen fit to endow it also with some functions of control. Moreover, she would prefer that the General Assembly itself, rather than the Council, with its restricted and therefore not fully representative composition, should establish the number of members of the proposed Executive Committee, and she would prefer that number to be twenty-five. Accordingly, she asked that a separate vote should be taken on the words, "twenty to" in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

Since there might be new groups of refugees anywhere at any time, the proposed Executive Committee should be truly representative; she was pleased that paragraph 5 now contained a reference to the election of its members on the widest

/...

(Mrs. Afnan, Iraq)

possible geographical basis. One disadvantage of the criteria for membership set forth in that paragraph was that the countries from which the refugees came might find themselves not represented on the Committee; yet, since voluntary repatriation was one of the permanent solutions envisaged, their participation would be highly desirable.

Under the Statute, in order to qualify as a refugee a person had to have left his country for political reasons; consequently unaccompanied children could not properly be regarded as refugees and they should be sent to their parents rather than resettled in foreign countries. Their right to grow up on their own soil under the care of their own families must be safeguarded by the High Commissioner. She pointed out that resettlement was hardly ever voluntary; in practice, it was not the refugee who chose the country of resettlement; the country chose him. Those who stressed that the repatriation, even of young children, must be voluntary, should bear that consideration in mind.

Mrs. QUART (Canada), speaking as a co-sponsor of the thirteen-Power draft resolution, said that the sponsors had welcomed the Dominican amendment to sub-paragraph 1 (b), whereby the High Commissioner would appeal to States, rather than renew appeals already made and also the Venezuelan amendment for a paragraph on financial rules.

With regard to the five-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.641), the sponsors had included a new paragraph restating the terms of the High Commissioner's Statute which should be acceptable to the five Powers. It was hoped that the latter would withdraw their amendment.

The sponsors had thought that the Saudi Arabian amendments (A/C.3/L.642) had been met by the inclusion of the phrase "on the widest possible geographical basis" in paragraph 2, making it clear that geographical distribution would be taken into account, although it was imperative that the members of the Executive Committee should represent interested countries. The range of those States was not necessarily static, since new refugee problems might arise and any State might decide at any time to take more interest in refugee problems than it had previously. Accordingly, the membership of the Committee had been deliberately made flexible.

/...

(Mrs. Quart, Canada)

The thirteen Powers had, however, been unable to accept paragraph 2 (a) of the Saudi Arabian representative's amendments. The Canadian delegation considered it important for some body to be authorized by the General Assembly to give the High Commissioner directives with regard to the disposal of funds; it was logical for the new Executive Committee to take those functions over from the UNREF Executive Committee, whose arrangements had worked satisfactorily.

In conclusion, she said that her Government, which had been unable to make a specific pledge to UNREF when the opportunity had been given to delegations some time previously, was now in a position to announce that, subject to parliamentary approval, it would contribute \$200,000 to UNREF in 1958.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) proposed that, for the reasons given by the Syrian representative, the word "facilitate" in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution should be replaced by "promote". In actual practice, much more had been done to resettle refugees than to repatriate them; paragraph 2 however, laid equal stress on both solutions, and he failed to see why there should be any objection to both solutions being promoted. Certainly the repatriation of young children should be promoted, rather than merely facilitated. If the sponsors of the thirteen-Power draft resolution refused to accept that change, he would re-introduce, as his own amendment, the new paragraph contained in document A/C.3/L.639/Add.1, with the substitution of the word "promotion" for the word "facilitation".

Having heard the explanations of the Swedish and Canadian representatives on the meaning of the word "directives" as used in the draft resolution, he was prepared to withdraw points 2 and 3 of his amendment (A/C.3/L.642), provided that the words "with terms of reference as set forth below" were inserted after the words "the High Commissioner's Programme" in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution. That addition would make it clear that the Executive Committee was entitled to give directives only with regard to the matters mentioned in sub-paragraphs 5 (a) and (f).

He thanked the sponsors for accepting his suggestion that the Executive Committee should be elected with due regard to geographical distribution. The draft resolution was more free from political bias than the resolutions of previous years, and he would be glad to vote for it if his amendments were accepted.

/...

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

He asked the Secretariat by what procedure the Economic and Social Council would elect the members of the proposed Executive Committee.

Mr. VAKIL (Secretary of the Committee) replied that the Council would elect the members of the Committee by secret ballot.

Mrs. ELLIOTT (United Kingdom) thanked the Saudi Arabian representative for his readiness to make concessions, but pointed out that the sponsors of the draft resolution had also done their best to meet his views. On their behalf, she accepted the insertion he had suggested in paragraph 5, so that the only point of disagreement was the use of the word "facilitate" in paragraph 2. That word was to be found in article 1 of the High Commissioner's Statute, and she hoped that it would therefore be generally acceptable and that the resolution would receive virtually unanimous support.

Mr. AGOLLI (Albania) said that the word "promote" was obviously preferable to the word "facilitate". Although the latter was to be found in article 1 of the High Commissioner's Statute, the word "promote" was used in article 8 (c), which laid upon the High Commissioner the obligation of "assisting governmental and private efforts to promote voluntary repatriation or assimilation within new national communities."

Mr. ROSSIDES (Greece) thanked the Swedish representative for her explanation concerning operative paragraph 5. Although it might have been more advisable to establish a clear demarcation between the executive and advisory functions of the new Committee, he would not press the point, as the sponsors obviously wished it to have much the same powers as the present UNREF Executive Committee.

There was, however, some confusion with regard to the functions of the new Committee. As the Swedish representative had explained, the power to give directives to the High Commissioner, specified in sub-paragraph A (a) of Council resolution 565 (XIX), was partly covered by sub-paragraph 5 (a) but mainly by sub-paragraph 5 (c) of the thirteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.639/Rev.1); but in the latter case, the power was advisory and not executive, as it had been in the Council resolution. In that case, the High Commissioner himself, and not the committee, would be responsible for decisions to suspend or cancel programmes, which would be most undesirable, firstly, because it would be an undemocratic procedure and, secondly, because it might place the High Commissioner in a difficult position with regard to the countries concerned.

/...

(Mr. Rossides, Greece)

The responsibility for such decisions should be taken by an international body, but under paragraph 5 (c), the new Committee would be empowered only to advise the High Commissioner. The Greek delegation therefore proposed that the words "To advise", at the beginning of sub-paragraph 5 (c), should be replaced by the words "To give directives to".

There was another disturbing point. In response to a request from the General Assembly (resolution 832 (IX)), the Economic and Social Council had established the UNREF Executive Committee, which was "responsible for giving directives to the High Commissioner and for exercising the necessary control in the use of funds". The Council had been left free to define the powers of the Executive Committee, which it had done in resolution 565 (XIX). In the case of the new Committee, however, the Council's hands would be tied by the draft resolution, in which the Committee's powers were defined. He wondered whether it would not be wiser to leave the decision on the Committee's powers to the discretion of the Council, but he would not press the point.

It could not be maintained that the power to exercise the necessary controls in the use of funds, defined in sub-paragraph A (e) of Council resolution 565 (XIX), was covered by the reference, in operative paragraph 8 of the thirteen-Power draft resolution, to the Financial Regulations of the United Nations. The draft resolution was therefore defective in that respect.

Miss MacENTEE (Ireland) said that, if she had understood the intentions of the sponsors, the Council was to decide upon a membership of between twenty and twenty-five for the new Committee, in the light of the circumstances existing at the time. If that was so, the second sentence of operative paragraph 5 should be amended slightly to read "This Committee shall consist of the representatives of from twenty to twenty-five of the States Members...".

The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would make the necessary changes.

Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) said that the Third Committee should state its wishes with regard to membership of the new Committee clearly, so that the Council would have no difficulty in interpreting them. Furthermore, it was obviously desirable for the membership to be as wide as possible, so as to ensure, not only geographical representation, but the co-operation of as many

/...

(Miss Bernardino, Dominican Republic)

countries as possible. She urged the sponsors of the draft resolution to specify twenty-five members in operative paragraph 5, in which case there would be no necessity for a separate vote on the words "twenty to", proposed by the Iraqi representative.

Mr. MEANY (United States of America) said that the Irish representative's interpretation was correct. The aim had been a certain elasticity and no definite number of members had been specified, the Council thus being left free to make whatever decision seemed appropriate in the circumstances. He could not accept the Dominican representative's suggestion that the text should specify a membership of twenty-five.

Replying to the Greek representative, he said that sub-paragraph 5 (c) should be read in conjunction with sub-paragraphs 5 (d) and (e). It would then be seen that executive functions, namely those of authorizing the High Commissioner to make appeals for funds and of approving projects for assistance to refugees coming within the scope of paragraph (c), were combined with the advisory function referred to in sub-paragraph (c). It was obvious that the Committee would not exercise its powers under sub-paragraphs (d) and (e) if it had not, under sub-paragraph (c), advised the High Commissioner that international assistance should be provided by his Office.

Referring to the Saudi Arabian representative's suggestions concerning operative paragraph 2, he regretted that he was unable to accept either of them. It was preferable to retain the present wording, with the quotation from article 1 of the Statute of the High Commissioner, as operative paragraph 2 began with the word "Reaffirms". It was true that the word "promote" was stronger than the word "facilitate", but it was precisely for that reason that the sponsors had rejected it. They had felt that no pressure must be brought to bear on the High Commissioner to adopt one solution rather than another, as that might place him in a difficult position.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Greece) said that the United States representative's explanation that sub-paragraph 5 (c) of the draft resolution should be read in conjunction with sub-paragraphs (d) and (e) applied only in the case of a decision to continue programmes of assistance. If the programmes were not continued, no action could be taken under sub-paragraphs (d) and (e).

/...

Mr. MEANY (United States of America) said that he recognized the cogency of the Greek representative's argument and was ready to accept his amendment to sub-paragraph 5 (c).

Mr. ROSSIDES (Greece) said that if his amendment was accepted, he would vote for the draft resolution.

Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) opposed the Greek amendment. Her delegation could not agree to the new Committee's giving directives for any other purpose than the one specified in sub-paragraph 5 (a).

Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) also opposed the Greek amendment. It was inappropriate to use the word "directives" when the decision involved a choice between two courses, namely to provide international assistance for refugees or not.

Mrs. ELLIOTT (United Kingdom) felt that the original text of sub-paragraph 5 (c) was preferable to the Greek amendment. As the sponsors had not been able to agree on its acceptance, the amendment should be put to the vote.

Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) regretted that the United States representative had been unable to accept her suggestion with regard to the membership of the new Committee. Her purpose in making it had been to prevent difficulties and long discussion in the Council. Furthermore, it had been amply proved in the case of the UNICEF Executive Board that an expansion of membership had resulted in increased effectiveness and support. She was convinced that the membership of the new Committee should be as large as possible, but in view of the lack of support for her suggestion, she withdrew it.

Mr. ROJAS (Venezuela) said that the decision should be left to the Council, which would elect the number of members it decided.

Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) supported the Dominican representative. Twenty-five was an appropriate membership for the new Committee. It was for that reason she had asked for a separate vote on the words "twenty to". Those who wished to leave the Council latitude to decide the point should vote for the retention of those words. She would vote for their deletion.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.639/Rev.1) and the amendments to it. She pointed out that the joint amendment (A/C.3/L.641) had been withdrawn and replaced by the Saudi Arabian oral amendment to operative paragraph 2 and that the original Saudi Arabian amendments (A/C.3/L.642) no longer stood. She put to the vote the Saudi Arabian oral amendment to replace operative paragraph 2 by the text contained in document A/C.3/L.639/Add.1, the word "facilitation" being replaced by the word "promotion".

The Saudi Arabian oral amendment to operative paragraph 2 was rejected by 33 votes to 25, with 15 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the words "twenty to", in operative paragraph 5.

The Committee decided to retain those words by 38 votes to 11, with 23 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Greek amendment to replace the words "To advise", in operative paragraph 5 (c), by the words "To give directives to".

The Greek amendment to operative paragraph 5 (c) was rejected by 49 votes to 2, with 22 abstentions.

The draft resolution (A/C.3/L.639/Rev.1) as a whole was adopted by 59 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.