

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



THIRD COMMITTEE, 1352nd
MEETING

Tuesday, 23 November 1965,
at 3.15 p. m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda Item 58:</i>	
<i>Draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (continued)</i>	
<i>Articles on measures of implementation (continued)</i>	
<i>Articles VIII and VIII (bis) (continued) . . .</i>	363

Chairman: Mr. Francisco CUEVAS CANCINO
(Mexico).

AGENDA ITEM 58

Draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (continued) (A/5803, chap. IX, sect. I; A/5921; E/3873, chap. II and annexes I and III; A/C.3/L.1237, L.1239, L.1241, L.1249, L.1262, L.1272, L.1291 to L.1296)

ARTICLES ON MEASURES OF IMPLEMENTATION
(continued)

Articles VIII and VIII (bis) (continued)

1. Mr. MACDONALD (Canada) said that his delegation welcomed several features of the revised draft of article VIII submitted by Ghana, Mauritania and the Philippines (A/C.3/L.1293), including the naming of the proposed committee, the clarification of the way in which its members would be elected, and the provision for the filling of casual vacancies. There were some respects in which the text could be improved but, since the draft was the result of a compromise, his delegation would not itself propose any changes, although it would support appropriate changes if they were put to the vote; one example was the desirability of allowing states to nominate non-nationals for membership of the proposed committee. His delegation felt obliged to vote against the financing arrangements set forth in article VIII, paragraph 6, and in favour of the Tanzanian amendment (A/C.3/L.1295) to that paragraph, since it believed that the proposed committee should be tied as closely as possible to the United Nations itself and have the benefit of the prestige and impartiality which complete identification with the Organization could best provide. While recognizing the powerful arguments in favour of the existing text of paragraph 6—which represented perhaps the limit to which the consensus could extend—Canada hoped that, with the passage of time, the committee would be brought into a fuller and more mature relationship with the United Nations, and that the question of financing would at least be kept open for review at an early date following the committee's inception.

2. His delegation thought that article VIII (bis), paragraph 2, was somewhat restrictive in providing that the suggestions and recommendations of the proposed committee would have to be based on information received from States Parties to the Convention. The Third Committee should not be unduly concerned over that point at the present stage, however, and should rely on the committee itself to establish its own jurisdiction on a pragmatic basis.

3. In the view of his delegation, the "States Parties concerned", referred to at the end of paragraph 2, were any of the parties to the Convention. There was a world-wide general community interest in the subject matter of the Convention, and every State Party was therefore an interested party.

4. Mr. MOVCHAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that the revised draft of article VIII, being a compromise text, suffered from certain defects and omissions. For instance, the draft originally submitted by Ghana (A/C.3/L.1274/Rev.1) had clearly indicated that the proposed committee should submit suggestions with the States Parties concerned—a provision which was in accordance with the generally recognized principles of international law and which his delegation would have preferred to see maintained. However, since the compromise text conformed to the principles of the Charter and to those set forth in the body of the draft Convention, and since general acceptability was a prerequisite for the widest possible implementation of the instrument, his delegation was prepared to support it.

5. The CHAIRMAN invited the Secretary of the Committee, under rule 154 of the rules of procedure, to make a statement on behalf of the Secretary-General concerning the financial implications of the Tanzanian amendment (A/C.3/L.1295) to article VIII, paragraph 6.

6. Mr. DAS (Secretary of the Committee) drew attention to document A/C.3/L.1251 which contained a statement of the financial implications of the proposals on implementation originally introduced by the Philippines (A/C.3/L.1221). In paragraph 3 (a) of that document, the financial implications of defraying the costs of a committee of eleven members was given as \$20,000 for each session of four weeks' duration. If the committee was to consist of eighteen members, as proposed by Ghana, Mauritania and the Philippines, the cost would be approximately \$33,300 for each session of four weeks' duration. The total annual cost would, of course, depend upon the frequency of meetings of the committee. In addition, the cost of servicing the committee, as set out in document A/C.3/L.1251, paragraph 3 (c), would also apply.

7. Mr. EL AHMADI (Sudan) said that his delegation approved, on the whole, the clauses concerning reporting in the revised draft (A/C.3/L.1293). He drew attention, however, to the fact that, under Article 64 of the Charter, reporting was optional, and not compulsory. Since the Committee was dealing with a new field, his delegation could accept article VIII (bis), paragraph 1, up to and including the words "thereafter every two years". It would prefer to see the remainder of the paragraph deleted. He proposed that the words "suggestions and" in both the first and the second sentence of paragraph 2 of that article should be deleted, since they implied that the committee would make specific proposals. His delegation would vote in favour of the Tanzanian amendment to article VIII, paragraph 6, which would at least help to ensure the impartiality of members of the proposed committee.

8. Mr. RIOS (Panama) stressed the importance of clarity and precision in an instrument such as the draft Convention. He did not fully understand the meaning of the phrases "in their personal capacity" and "the different forms of civilization" in paragraph 1 of the revised draft of article VIII. He found it difficult to envisage that a United Nations official would act in his personal capacity — i.e., according to his own judgement and criteria. With respect to the second point, while it might have been possible in ancient times to speak of distinct civilizations, the modern trend was for human civilization to become increasingly one. He agreed with earlier speakers that the word "experts" was unsatisfactory, unless the text expanded to indicate that the persons in question should be, say, jurists or sociologists familiar with current social problems.

9. With respect to article VIII, paragraph 6, a means should be found of ensuring that the remuneration of members of the proposed committee was paid by the United Nations, in order to ensure the greatest impartiality. As the purpose of the committee was to implement the principles and ideals of the United Nations, its members should be linked as closely as possible to the Organization.

10. Mr. K. C. PANT (India) said that he could not agree with those delegations which seemed to favour the outright rejection of the revised draft of article VIII, since it represented weeks of work and incorporated the basic ideas previously advanced for the constitution of machinery to receive and evaluate reports from States Parties to the Convention. It was inevitable that there should be some reservations concerning the details of a text which was the result of an attempt to combine two entirely different documents.

11. The question of responsibility for the expenses of members of the proposed committee was an important one, both financially and politically, because of the current situation in the United Nations. Despite the weighty arguments advanced in favour of payment of the expenses by the United Nations, his delegation found it difficult to agree that the costs of a body in which not all Member States would participate should be borne by the United Nations as a whole. There was great merit in the Italian representative's suggestion that the costs should be shared equally

by the States Parties to the Convention, which would have the effect of insulating members of the committee, to some extent, from the pressure that might be exerted on them if they were paid directly by their respective States. The Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1294), to article VIII, paragraph 6, was also very reasonable, and his delegation was inclined to support it.

12. The proposal that casual vacancies should be filled through the appointment of another expert by the State Party whose expert had ceased to function as a member of the committee (A/C.3/L.1293, article VIII, para. 5 (b)) was, apart from any other considerations, not a very practical method of dealing with the problem. It was highly probable that some members would not be able to attend every session over a period of four years, and the simplest solution would be to allow them to nominate alternates.

13. In the view of his delegation, the word "experts" required no further definition, since it could be left to the good sense of Governments to ensure that the persons they nominated were experts in the appropriate field. The fact that members of the committee would have to be elected by an absolute majority should prevent the election of unsuitable persons, which the representative of Panama appeared to fear. The definition proposed by Iraq (A/C.3/L.1294) would exclude many persons actively engaged in the struggle against racial discrimination.

14. Having participated at certain stages in the drafting of the text before the committee (A/C.3/L.1293), he wished to explain to delegations which had suggested that the committee's recommendations should be specific, rather than general, that the clause in which recommendations were mentioned (article VIII (bis), para. 2) related to the reporting machinery, and not to disputes. The "States Parties concerned" would be States which had shown support for the Convention by becoming Parties to it, and to place them in the dock because of shortcomings in implementing the Convention might not be the best approach, at least initially.

15. Some doubts had been expressed concerning the requirement of equitable geographical distribution in the composition of the proposed committee, owing to the fact that most of the States Parties might, for a time, belong to a single region. Obviously, however, geographical distribution would then be understood in the context of the membership for the time being, with the expectation of a much larger world-wide membership at a later stage. The Convention was being drafted for the future, and the vital principle of equitable geographical distribution must be retained.

16. The requirement that the committee should report annually to the General Assembly was reasonable, since the matter was of sufficient universal interest for the Assembly to be kept informed of developments. While it was logical to exclude States which were not Parties to the Convention from such activities as the election of members of the committee, there was no need to extend the principle unduly, and discussion in the Assembly would put some moral pressure on them to become Parties.

17. While he agreed with the views expressed at the preceding meeting by the representative of Saudi Arabia on the question of expenses, he had had difficulty in fully comprehending other parts of his statement. The submission of the names of candidates in alphabetical order was a natural method, and once the names of the candidates had been revealed the lobbying to which he had referred, and which was part of the democratic process, could not be avoided. Similarly, there seemed to be no better or fairer way of determining which of the members elected at the first election should retire after two years than by drawing lots.

18. Mr. LAMPTEY (Ghana) regretted the confusion which had arisen concerning the compromise text submitted by Ghana, Mauritania and the Philippines (A/C.3/L.1293). The whole concept of the Tanzanian amendments (A/C.3/L.1295) was totally at variance with the ideas underlying the compromise proposal. The sponsors of document A/C.3/L.1293 had never intended the creation of a United Nations committee because they did not expect the entire membership of the United Nations to become Parties to the Convention. The General Assembly should, however, consider that reports of the proposed committee, first, because the Convention had been negotiated under the auspices of the United Nations and, secondly, because the subject of the Convention was human dignity, the most important principle of the Charter.

19. His delegation had withdrawn its original proposal (A/C.3/L.1274/Rev.1) in deference to the wishes of the majority and had sought to find a compromise through negotiations with the sponsors of the other proposals. Naturally a compromise could never be fully satisfactory to everyone. The sponsors had carefully considered all the suggestions that had been made and had arrived at a carefully balanced text, no part of which could be changed without damaging the whole.

20. Moreover, given the highly political nature of the Convention, the sponsors had sought measures of implementation which would maximize conciliation and minimize conflict. For example, in order to take account of objections to the words "prior consultation with the States Parties concerned" in paragraph 7 of the original text of article VIII (A/C.3/L.1291), the sponsors had agreed upon the compromise formula now embodied in article VIII (bis), paragraph 2. The sponsors' proposal concerning the composition of the proposed committee represented a compromise between the views of those who wanted that committee to be a body of experts and the views of those who wanted it to be a political body.

21. The sponsors were still seeking agreement on certain other issues, such as petitions; those issues had therefore not been included in the present text.

22. His delegation strongly opposed any movement to delay the matter before the Committee by referring it to the Commission on Human Rights.

23. Mr. CAPOTORTI (Italy) observed that the amendments to article VIII, paragraph 1, submitted by Iraq (A/C.3/L.1294), the United Republic of Tanzania (A/C.3/L.1295) and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.1296) all had

in common a desire to replace the word "experts" in that paragraph by something else. He wished to point out, first, that in United Nations practice, the word "experts" meant persons who were not representatives of their States; it could be assumed that they would be qualified. Secondly, in view of the logical connexion between the title and the contents of the Convention, the word "experts" clearly meant "experts in the field of racial discrimination" and not experts in other fields. Thirdly, since the experts would be appointed by States acting in the exercise of their sovereignty, it was essential to place confidence in the States Parties and assume that they would nominate the best available candidate. For those reasons, his delegation supported the retention of the word "experts".

24. The Uruguayan and Iraqi amendments proposing certain specific qualifications for the experts might merely open the door to disputes concerning qualifications. He believed the matter should be left entirely to the States concerned. His delegation had no objection to the Tanzanian amendment to replace the word "experts" by the word "members" because the words "in their personal capacity" in article VIII, paragraph 1, of the revised text (A/C.3/L.1293) clearly implied that the persons would be experts.

25. The Third Committee could neither amend the United Nations Charter nor add any additional organs to the United Nations. The Convention would be binding only on the States Parties to it; the committee to ensure its implementation would therefore have to be a creation of the States Parties. Naturally, the United Nations had an interest in the elimination of racial discrimination because it had already approved a Declaration on the subject and had developed certain well-established principles in that regard. However, while the principles enunciated by the Organization on the question of racial discrimination concerned all States, the obligations to be imposed by the Convention would affect only the States Parties. That dilemma had, he thought, been felicitously solved by the revised proposal of three Powers that the committee should be a creation of the States Parties but should report to the General Assembly. For those reasons, he could not support the first and third Tanzanian amendments to paragraph 1 of article VIII.

26. He also opposed the Tanzanian amendment to paragraph 6 because the United Nations could not assume the expenses of a body representing merely one group of its Members, however large that group might be. Since he had himself suggested that the States Parties might jointly defray the expenses of the committee, he would support the second Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1294). The objections that had been made to that amendment had been of a purely practical nature, but the Iraqi solution would be a fairer and more practical arrangement than the one proposed by the three Powers, and the members themselves would be likely to be more impartial, although, in the final analysis, their impartiality depended upon their personal integrity and their status. For example, if a State sent an official to represent it on the proposed committee, that official could scarcely be independent of his Government. The Third Committee could merely hope, but not

require, that the persons to be designated would indeed be experts. He therefore saw no reason for changing the text of the compromise proposal other than by the adoption of the second Iraqi amendment.

27. The question raised by the Indian representative concerning alternates for the members of the committee could be discussed in connexion with article IX, which related to the committee's procedures.

28. Mr. AL-RAWI (Iraq) said that his delegation had submitted the second of its amendments (A/C.3/L.1294) in the belief that it was only logical that the States Parties to the Convention should defray the expenses of the proposed committee because the Convention would not be signed by all States Members of the United Nations. It had submitted its first amendment because the word "experts" used in the revised text (A/C.3/L.1293) was unclear and might give rise to complications.

29. Mrs. BANGOURA (Guinea) said that her delegation strongly condemned all forms of racial discrimination and could not, therefore, support any weak measures of implementation. For that reason, her delegation would have preferred the original proposal submitted by the Ghanaian delegation (A/C.3/L.1274/Rev.1), which was closer to its aims and objectives. Although her delegation would support the compromise text (A/C.3/L.1293), it was not entirely satisfied with it and would therefore support any amendment which tended to strengthen it.

30. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation would support the Tanzanian amendments (A/C.3/L.1295). The task of implementing the Convention should, in its view, remain within the United Nations and the Organization should therefore logically defray the expenses of the proposed committee. The objection had been raised that the United Nations could not defray the expenses of an organ which was not representative of its total membership. However, the United Nations would be paying approximately two thirds of the cost of implementing the Convention and, under the compromise proposal, the States Parties whose nationals were serving on the committee would pay the other third. His delegation could see no reason why the United Nations should not pay the total cost. That arrangement would help to ensure the impartiality of the members of the committee.

31. Mr. COMBAL (France) expressed his delegation's regret that the Committee was about to settle by a vote a problem arising from two entirely different concepts of what the proposed committee should be. Some members, including the French delegation, considered that the Committee should be representative of the States Parties to the Convention; others wanted the committee to be an organ of the United Nations. Whatever the result of the vote on that fundamental issue might be, there would be a considerable number of delegations taking the minority position and that might jeopardize the Committee's objective, which was to ensure that the Convention would be ratified by as many States as possible.

32. Mr. KEITA (Mali) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the first Iraqi amendment but against the second. Because it felt that the expenses

of the proposed committee should be borne by the United Nations regular budget, it would support the Tanzanian amendment to paragraph 6.

33. Mr. COCHAUX (Belgium) agreed with the French delegation that it was regrettable that the Committee should settle by vote an issue so fundamental as the nature of the proposed committee. In his delegation's view, the committee should be composed of independent persons, and he regretted that no amendment contained a satisfactory definition of the term "experts". His delegation would therefore reserve its position on the matter.

34. His delegation would simply abstain on certain parts of the compromise proposal because, while it had misgivings concerning some legal points, it realized the necessity for adoption of the Convention.

35. Mr. ABDEL-HAMID (United Arab Republic) said that, since he had not had sufficient time to communicate the final text of the compromise proposal (A/C.3/L.1293) to his Government, he would have to abstain in the vote. He could, however, support the principle that reports on the implementation of the Convention should be submitted to the General Assembly. He requested a separate vote on the words "The States Parties to this Convention... thereafter every two years" in article VIII (bis), paragraph 1. of the revised text.

36. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking in explanation of his delegation's vote, said that he had hoped that more time would be allowed before a vote was taken on a question of such importance.

37. He requested a roll-call vote on his delegation's amendment (A/C.3/L.1295) to article VIII, paragraph 6, since the question of expenses was of fundamental importance to the developing countries. It was not in the interest of those countries, even less of the Convention itself, for the States Parties to share the costs of the proposed committee. If all Members of the United Nations shared the expenses of the committee equally, the cost per Member would be minimal, while if the States Parties were to bear the cost, a relatively small number of States, including many developing countries, might be unduly burdened.

38. He could not agree with the Italian representative's comments concerning the name of the proposed committee. The name proposed by his delegation was appropriate and reflected the importance of the committee. Many bodies had already been established with similar titles.

39. His delegation would support the Iraqi and Uruguayan amendments to article VIII, paragraph 1, as they were not inconsistent with its own amendment to that paragraph. However, it would not support any proposal that the States Parties should elect the members of the Committee.

40. He proposed the deletion of the word "general" in both sentences of article VIII (bis), paragraph 2.

41. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait) said that the revised text of article VIII was acceptable to his delegation

since it achieved a fair balance between both political and juridical principles.

42. His delegation would support the first Tanzanian amendment (A/C.3/L.1295) to article VIII, paragraph 2. It felt that the word "experts" in article VIII, paragraph 1, was quite adequate and it was therefore unable to support the first Iraqi amendment. It was also unable to support the second Iraqi amendment, as it considered that the States Parties should be responsible also for the travel and related expenses of members of the committee.

43. Mr. COMBAL (France) asked whether there were any precedents for the establishment of United Nations bodies in the context of international conventions. If such a precedent could be cited, his delegation might well have to reconsider its position. The bodies to which the Tanzanian representative had referred had been established directly by the General Assembly and by the Economic and Social Council and it was therefore natural that they should be financed under regular budget.

44. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) supported the French representative's request for information.

45. His delegation requested that the Committee should vote on the revised text of article VIII and article VIII (bis) paragraph by paragraph, and that separate votes should be taken on sub-paragraph 5 (a) and 5 (b) of article VIII.

46. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on article VIII (A/C.3/L.1293) and the amendments thereto.

The first Tanzanian amendment to paragraph 1 (A/C.3/L.1295) was rejected by 55 votes to 22, with 17 abstentions.

The Venezuelan oral amendment to place the words "Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination" in paragraph 1 between quotation marks was rejected by 19 votes to 10, with 62 abstentions.

The Iraqi amendment to paragraph 1 (A/C.3/L.1294) was rejected by 31 votes to 17, with 43 abstentions.

The second Tanzanian amendment to paragraph 1 (A/C.3/L.1295) was rejected by 35 votes to 32 with 23 abstentions.

The Uruguayan amendment to paragraph 1 (A/C.3/L.1296) was rejected by 16 votes to 13, with 62 abstentions.

The third Tanzanian amendment to paragraph 1 (A/C.3/L.1295) was rejected by 60 votes to 7, with 23 abstentions.

The Venezuelan oral amendment to delete in paragraph 1 the words "from among their nationals" was rejected by 69 votes to 11, with 9 abstentions.

Paragraph 1 as a whole was adopted by 83 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

The first Tanzanian amendment to paragraph 2 (A/C.3/L.1295) was adopted by 55 votes to 2, with 33 abstentions.

The second Tanzanian amendment to paragraph 2 (A/C.3/L.1295) was rejected by 33 votes to 9, with 46 abstentions.

47. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) withdrew his oral amendments to paragraph 2.

Paragraph 2 as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 87 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 90 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 90 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Paragraph 5, sub-paragraph (a), was adopted by 90 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 5, sub-paragraph (b), was adopted by 83 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.

At the request of the Tanzanian representative, the vote on the Tanzanian amendment to paragraph 6 (A/C.3/L.1295) was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Mali, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Austria, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, Guinea, Haiti, Iceland, Madagascar, Malawi.

Against: Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, Ghana, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia.

Abstaining: Nigeria, Peru, Sierra Leone, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bolivia, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Ethiopia, Gabon, Guatemala, India, Israel, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Liberia, Libya.

The Tanzanian amendment to paragraph 6 was rejected by 39 votes to 32, with 22 abstentions.

The Iraqi amendment to paragraph 6 (A/C.3/L.1294) was adopted by 26 votes to 22, with 44 abstentions.

Article VIII as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 85 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

48. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on article VIII (bis) (A/C.3/L.1293) and the amendments thereto.

At the request of the United Arab Republic representative, a separate vote on the words "The States Parties to this Convention... every two years" in paragraph 1 was taken by roll-call.

The Maldives Islands, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone,

Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Saudi Arabia, Gabon.

The words "The States Parties to this Convention . . . every two years" were adopted by 89 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The words "and whenever the Committee so requests" in paragraph 1 were adopted by 79 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions.

The final sentence of paragraph 1 was adopted by 85 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

The Sudanese oral amendment to delete the words "suggestions and" in both sentences of paragraph 2 was rejected by 68 votes to 2, with 19 abstentions.

The Tanzanian oral amendment to delete the word "general" in both sentences of paragraph 2 was rejected by 58 votes to 4, with 27 abstentions.

The United Kingdom oral amendment to delete the words "the" and "concerned" from the last phrase of the final sentence of paragraph 2 was adopted by 25 votes to 18, with 44 abstentions.

49. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) said that it had been his understanding in voting on the United Kingdom amendment that only the word "concerned" would be deleted from the text, and that the word "the" was to be retained.

50. Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom) observed that he had made it quite clear at the previous meeting that his delegation's amendment included the deletion of the word "the".

51. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) suggested that the question might be referred to the language and legal services of the Secretariat.

Article VIII (bis) as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 87 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.