

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



THIRD COMMITTEE, 464th

MEETING

Wednesday, 3 December 1952, at 3 p.m.

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

Page

Human rights: Recommendations concerning international respect for the self-determination of peoples (E/2256, annex V, A/2165, A/2172, chapter V, section I, A/C.3/L.293/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.317) (*concluded*).. 279

Chairman: Mr. S. Amjad ALI (Pakistan).

Human rights: Recommendations concerning international respect for the self-determination of peoples (E/2256, annex V, A/2165, A/2172, chapter V, section I, A/C.3/L.293/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.317) (*concluded*)

[Item 30]*

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION B (E/2256, annex V) AND OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY LEBANON (A/C.3/L.293/Rev.1) (*concluded*)

1. Mr. RAJKUMAR (India) said that his delegation had reconsidered the amendment it had submitted at the 461st meeting (A/C.3/L.315). India had always advocated all possible measures, within the framework of Article 73 of the United Nations Charter, to hasten the progress of the non-self-governing peoples in all fields. His delegation had submitted its original amendment in an effort to avoid confusion and duplication of work, since a special committee already existed for the purpose of dealing with information transmitted by the administering Powers under Article 73 e of the Charter.

2. In view of the objections raised, however, and since his delegation agreed in principle with the Lebanese proposal, he withdrew his original amendment, and submitted instead a new text (A/C.3/L.315/Rev.1). He emphasized that the purpose of his amendment was not to change the Lebanese draft resolution (A/C.3/L.293/Rev.1), but merely to make it possible to place the proposal before the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories at its next session. The Committee could then consider a possible revision of the Standard Form in the light of that proposal.

3. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that in view of the Indian delegation's action, he would withdraw his amendment (A/C.3/L.316) to the original Indian amendment.

4. As regards the new text (A/C.3/L.315/Rev.1), he felt that a number of delegations would greatly prefer to vote on the Lebanese draft resolution as it stood, without additions. He himself could take a more favourable attitude towards the revised Indian amendment if it were presented in the form of a separate proposal, since inclusion of the Indian text in the text of the Lebanese draft resolution might imply doubt on the part of the Third Committee of its own competence to deal with the question.

5. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) thanked the Indian representative for the conciliatory effort he had made in submitting the new text. For his part, with a view to saving the time of the Committee, he would accept the amendment with the proviso that, in deference to the Saudi Arabian representative's suggestion, it should be voted on separately from the remainder of the draft resolution.

6. He would also accept the Haitian amendments (A/C.3/L.314) to the Lebanese draft resolution. He suggested that if any representatives objected to them, a separate vote should be taken on them.

7. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) pointed out that the undertaking accepted by the Members of the United Nations who were administering Powers was clearly set forth in Article 73 e of the Charter, which listed three types of information to be transmitted to the Secretary-General on the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Political information was not included in that list. Her Government had in the past voluntarily transmitted information on the political advancement of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories under its administration, and it would continue to do so. It was her Government's policy, however, to oppose the adoption by the United Nations of proposals recommending the transmission of such information by the administering Powers. Despite the inclusion of the word "voluntarily", the Lebanese draft resolution constituted such a recom-

* Indicates the item number on the agenda of the General Assembly.

mendation. She was not raising the question of the competence of the General Assembly to adopt such a recommendation; but she questioned whether it would be wise for the Assembly to do so. To force new obligations on the administering Powers prematurely might only oblige them to take a more categorical position on the principle involved than they would otherwise do. The United Nations might be likened to a growing plant, which had to be carefully tended and nurtured; its growth would be more healthy if it were not forced. The draft resolution adopted (460th meeting) on the basis of draft resolution A (E/2256, annex V) had recognized, if inadequately, the universality of the principle of self-determination, but draft resolution B (E/2256, annex V) and the Lebanese draft resolution (A/C.3/L.293/Rev.1) singled out the States responsible for the administration of Non-Self-Governing Territories. None of the amendments thus far proposed, including the revised Indian amendment (A/C.3/L.315/Rev.1), had removed the considerations of principle which prevented her Government from supporting those draft resolutions.

8. As regards the Haitian amendment (A/C.3/L.314) to the Lebanese draft resolution, she could support the insertion of the words "and nations" in the preamble, but questioned the wisdom of including them in the operative part of the text.

9. She could support the eight-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.317) if its sponsors would accept two amendments, namely, replacement of the word "Instructs", in paragraph 1 of the operative part, by the words "Requests the Economic and Social Council to ask . . ." and the insertion, after the word "submit", in paragraph 2 of the operative part, of the words "through the Economic and Social Council".

10. Mr. BEAUFORT (Netherlands) pointed out that his Government also had in the past voluntarily transmitted political information on the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories under its administration. He opposed the adoption of either draft resolution B or the Lebanese draft resolution, however, for two reasons. First, the scope of the proposals exceeded that of the Standard Form set up for the transmission of information under Article 73 e; and, secondly, if resolutions of that kind were repeatedly adopted by the General Assembly, the transmission of information would lose much of its voluntary character.

11. His Government objected to the General Assembly's exerting what had been referred to as "moral pressure" and he could therefore not support either proposal.

12. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) had considered it important that the question of the right of self-determination of non-self-governing peoples should be discussed in the Third Committee because it could in that way be dealt with from a purely humanitarian point of view. It was equally important that any other body which might subsequently examine the Lebanese proposal should take that point of view into consideration.

13. He therefore proposed the addition, at the end of the revised Indian amendment (A/C.3/L.315/Rev.1), of the following words: "... for consideration of its provisions in the light of the discussions of the question in the Third Committee".

14. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) felt that the sub-amendment just proposed by the representative of Afghanistan would limit the scope of the Indian amendment unnecessarily. As he understood the amendment, its intention was not so much to bring about "consideration" of the Lebanese proposal by the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, as to provide practical guidance to that Committee in its consideration of the information transmitted by the administering Powers and to lead it to adapt its work to the spirit of the resolution. He would find it difficult to accept the sub-amendment and hoped that the representative of Afghanistan might be persuaded to withdraw it.

15. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), referring to the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.317), proposed the addition, at the end of paragraph 1 of the operative part, of the words "including the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories" (A/C.3/L.318).

16. Mrs. BERGER (Canada) noted that the debate on the question of self-determination had emphasized the serious conflict existing between administering and non-administering Powers as regards the obligations of the former under Article 73 e of the United Nations Charter. She had hoped that draft resolution B might be replaced by, for example, a text noting that political information was being transmitted voluntarily by certain States and encouraging other administering Powers to follow their example. The original text of the Indian amendment (A/C.3/L.315) might have enabled the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories to draft such a text. There was much to be said for the argument that the Charter of the United Nations did not require the transmission of political information or authorize intervention in the domestic affairs of States. The practical aspect of the problem had been discussed with tact and tolerance by the representative of Norway (450th meeting), who had emphasized the fact that the effectiveness of any recommendation adopted by the Third Committee would depend on the goodwill of the administering Powers.

17. For those reasons, her delegation could not support the Lebanese draft resolution as it stood.

18. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) said that she had appreciated the Indian delegation's reasons for submitting its original amendment and was particularly grateful for the conciliatory action it had taken in replacing that text with the new one. The Indian delegation had consistently made positive contributions to the cause of the non-self-governing peoples, and it had once more provided the Committee with a common ground.

19. Her delegation would support the revised Indian amendment.

20. Mr. LOOMES (Australia) said his delegation could not support either draft resolution B or the Lebanese draft resolution, for several reasons. First, being applicable only to the Non-Self-Governing Territories, they were inappropriate as a general statement of principle on the question of the right of self-determination. Secondly, while the substance of the proposals was largely covered by General Assembly resolution 327 (IV), they went further by specifically recommending the transmission of political information.

Finally, they attempted to extend the voluntary obligations of the parties to the United Nations Charter. The subject of political information had intentionally been omitted from Article 73 e of the Charter. His Government was one of those which had voluntarily submitted such information, but it had done so on the clear understanding that that action did not prejudice the interpretation of Article 73 e.

21. Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia) stated that he would vote in favour of the Lebanese draft resolution.

22. The information transmitted by the administering Powers under Article 73 e was insufficient and often distorted, as was even then being shown in the Fourth Committee in the hearings of representatives of the indigenous populations of the Territories. It was not surprising that the administering Powers made every effort to avoid transmitting political information, since they were well aware that such information would constitute a serious danger to the maintenance of the colonial system.

23. The Lebanese draft resolution, based on draft resolution B adopted by the Commission on Human Rights (E/2256, annex B), was the logical sequel to the draft resolution which the Third Committee had just adopted (460th meeting), since it concerned specific measures to implement the general principle affirmed in the previous resolution. It was in harmony with the spirit of Chapter XI of the Charter, and adoption of it would represent a further step towards the achievement of self-government for the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

24. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) considered the revised Indian amendment an improvement on the original text, which had thrown doubt on the Third Committee's competence in the matter under consideration and would have had the effect of postponing the discussion of the Lebanese draft resolution for another year. He agreed with the Canadian representative that it would have been better to adopt a recommendation which was acceptable to the administering Powers. Nevertheless, he saw no reason why the General Assembly should not suggest to the administering Powers not already voluntarily transmitting political information that they should follow the example of those who were doing so.

25. He would therefore support the Lebanese draft resolution.

26. Mr. DE MORAES (Brazil) said that he would support the Lebanese draft resolution, since it was only logical that those who had supported the substance of draft resolution A (E/2256, annex V) should also support that of draft resolution B. It was perfectly legitimate to request Members administering Non-Self-Governing Territories to provide the Secretary-General with political information about them, so long as it was clearly stated that the information should be supplied voluntarily. Although Article 73 e of the Charter did not explicitly require political information to be submitted, the word "political" appeared three times in that Article, so that the moral obligation to supply such information was clearly implicit. That, indeed, was confirmed by the fact that some administering Powers did in fact supply such information voluntarily.

27. The suggestion made by the Afghan representative (461st meeting) that the word "regularly" should be substituted for "voluntarily" in the Lebanese draft resolution was, however, unacceptable. The relevant States might, ideally, submit information regularly, but they would always do so only voluntarily.

28. His support of the Lebanese draft resolution was given on the understanding that it was not intended to exert pressure on any Member State, but should be construed merely as a request to Member States to co-operate freely and more fully with the Secretary-General in supplying him with information. A draft resolution such as that suggested by the Canadian representative might have been wiser, but the Lebanese text was the only one before the Committee and it did not violate either the spirit or the letter of the United Nations Charter.

29. He would also support the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.317), since the Commission on Human Rights should continue to deal with the problem of self-determination and that text provided for new steps to ensure that the right should be implemented.

30. Mr. KOS (Yugoslavia) supported the Lebanese draft resolution because it was consonant with the Charter of the United Nations and with the previous General Assembly resolutions on the subject. It was a practical proposal for giving effect to the right of self-determination.

31. He had been inclined to oppose the addition of the revised Indian amendment (A/C.3/L.315/Rev.1) to that draft resolution, because he had feared that the matter might be diverted to some other United Nations organ; but the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.317) would ensure the Third Committee's continuing concern with it and its ability to follow developments in a matter so closely linked with the draft covenants on human rights.

32. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) accepted the United States representative's amendments to the joint draft resolution, but could not agree with the amendment proposed by the Ukrainian representative. The latter was superfluous and gave the appearance of discrimination. The Commission on Human Rights had shown that it had borne the Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories in mind by drafting specific recommendations on them without needing instructions from the General Assembly.

33. With regard to the Lebanese draft resolution (A/C.3/L.293/Rev.1), he could not agree with the Netherlands representative that the aim had been to exert moral pressure on certain Member States. The Canadian representative had appeared critical of the way in which that supposed pressure was being exerted and had suggested that some other formulation would be more likely to obtain the support of the administering Powers. He himself had produced the best formulation he could, so that it was not his fault if it did not seem the most courteous means of exercising moral suasion, but rather the fault of those who had failed to produce an alternative draft. In fact, he had chosen the most courteous form possible. By requesting the administering Powers to supply the requisite information, the draft resolution showed clearly that the General Assembly vastly preferred to receive such information

from the governments concerned and to base its recommendations on such information rather than on information from irresponsible sources. The draft resolution was in fact a mark of consideration for the administering Powers and showed the desire of the other Member States to collaborate fully with them.

34. It was true that it had been couched in the form of a recommendation, but, unlike most General Assembly recommendations, it explicitly placed emphasis on the voluntary provision of information; thus, if the information was not supplied, the Member States concerned could not be accused of failing to fulfil the moral obligation implicit in most resolutions. The administering Powers should not be able to find the least trace of hostile intention in the Lebanese draft resolution, but rather should appreciate the special way in which it had been drafted as the one most appropriate to fill a gap between the administering Powers and other Member States. It was to be hoped that the administering Powers would consider the draft resolution in the spirit in which it had been drafted and submitted.

35. Mrs. BERGER (Canada) said that no draft resolution alternative and preferable to the Lebanese had been submitted simply because the original Indian amendment (A/C.3/L.315) had proposed that the Lebanese draft resolution should be referred to one of the United Nations organs best qualified to examine it in the light of its own experience. The Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories would undoubtedly have recommended a different formulation, along the lines she had suggested. She therefore regretted the submission of the revised Indian amendment.

36. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan) said that his delegation was fully aware that the administering Powers were not obliged to supply political information under Article 73 e of the Charter; the inclusion of the word "voluntarily" in the Lebanese draft resolution was merely a recognition of the situation. If the administering Powers refused to submit such information, they could not legally be compelled to do so. While he appreciated the co-operation of those Member States which did submit political information, he hoped that the others would, without prejudice to their rights and obligations under the Charter, see fit to submit what information they could, in deference to the wishes of the majority, who were anxious to obtain a clear and accurate picture of the situation in the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

37. The Afghan representative would be well advised to withdraw his oral amendment calling for the replacement of the word "voluntarily" by the word "regularly", in order to make it easier from some administering Powers to transmit political information.

38. He would support the Lebanese draft resolution.

39. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) agreed with the Pakistani representative and appealed to the Afghan representative to withdraw his amendment, or, if he pressed it, to insert the word "regularly" and retain the word "voluntarily". The deletion of the word "voluntarily" would undoubtedly deter some delegations from voting for the Lebanese draft resolution.

40. Mr. HUNEIDI (Syria) supported the Lebanese draft resolution, since, although it was true that the

Fourth Committee had adopted a number of resolutions concerning the supplying of information on the Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories, it had not dealt with any relating to the problem of self-determination and the extent to which the administering Powers were preparing the inhabitants to exercise that right. The United Nations had a special responsibility towards such peoples, and provision should be made specifically for them, in addition to the general draft resolution covering the right of all peoples to self-determination already adopted. A request for political information was a logical consequence of that concern, since, if the administering Powers were asked to ensure the participation of the peoples they administered in self-government, it was only natural that the United Nations should wish to be kept informed of the extent of such participation.

41. He was not convinced that the provision of such information went beyond the limits of the Charter of the United Nations. There was, of course, no specific obligation to supply political information, but the principle of self-determination had been laid down as one of the basic principles of the Charter, in the same way as the fundamental human rights. The adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights had led to the study of the draft covenants on human rights; and, when those covenants were adopted, they would call for action by the United Nations. Thus, the Charter implied the need for its gradual expansion to meet changing conditions; it was a dynamic instrument. The provision of the information requested under the Lebanese draft resolution was implied in the statement of the principle of self-determination in the Charter, which justified any steps the General Assembly might deem necessary to ensure that effect was given to the right of self-determination.

42. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) said that the discussion had shown that self-determination would continue to be regarded from the humanitarian angle which had been the Third Committee's concern; he would accordingly withdraw the amendment he had proposed to the revised Indian amendment (A/C.3/L.315/Rev.1).

43. In order to maintain the spirit of co-operation which had characterized the discussion at the current meeting, he would not press his proposal for the substitution of the word "regularly" for the word "voluntarily" in the Lebanese draft resolution. He could not, however, agree that that amendment went beyond the limits of the Charter. It was a matter of interpretation. He had not wished to attack any Member State, but merely to express his view on the proper interpretation of the relevant provisions of the Charter. He had not intended to try to impose that view on any Member State, since he was well aware that no sovereign State could impose any view upon another sovereign State. But any delegation was entitled to express its wishes in the form of a recommendation, which other Member States might accept or reject. It was regrettable that his amendments had not found wider agreement.

44. Mr. NAJAR (Israel) supported the Lebanese draft resolution, since it was a logical complement to the draft resolution on self-determination already adopted

by the Committee (460th meeting). The word "voluntarily" met all the legal difficulties.

45. The work of the Third and Fourth Committees on that subject should be co-ordinated. The Afghan amendment to the amendment originally submitted by the Indian delegation had caused him some misgivings, but they had been allayed by the Lebanese representative's acceptance of the Indian amendment in its revised form.

46. He could also support the amendments originally proposed by the Haitian delegation and accepted by the Lebanese representative.

47. Mr. HESSEL (France) said that his delegation had already explained (445th meeting) why it opposed draft resolution B and, even more strongly, the Lebanese draft resolution. It also opposed the joint draft resolution.

48. Its main objection was that the Commission on Human Rights always found great difficulty in drafting texts relating to self-determination and that their recommendations gave rise to even greater difficulties. Accordingly, it seemed that that Commission should not deal with a principle which could more properly and effectively be dealt with by other organs. It was the more to be regretted that he could not support the joint draft resolution since he agreed with the principle underlying it, namely that the subject required much more exhaustive consideration. If that draft resolution had been submitted earlier, so that it could have been amended, the French delegation would certainly have undertaken to amend it.

49. He drew attention to a discrepancy between the French and English texts of the second paragraph of the preamble of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.317) concerning the use of the words "*le respect de ce droit*" and "such respect". The English text seemed less explicit, if the right to self-determination was meant.

50. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq), Mr. YOACHAM (Chile), Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan), Mr. CAMPOS CATELIN (Argentina), Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan) and Mr. VILLAMAR CONTRERAS (Guatemala), sponsors of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.317), accepted the United States representative's oral amendments.

51. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) accepted the Ukrainian amendment (A/C.3/L.318) to the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.317).

52. Mr. YOACHAM (Chile) could not accept the Ukrainian amendment because it destroyed the universal character of the draft resolution by laying the emphasis on one class of dependent peoples, whereas the right of self-determination was common to all peoples.

53. Mr. NAJAR (Israel) thought the Ukrainian amendment superfluous, as the original text was very broad in scope. It was gratifying to find that the Ukrainian delegation believed that the right of self-determination should apply to all peoples, not only to those in the Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories but he could not vote for the amendment.

54. Mr. VILLAMAR CONTRERAS (Guatemala) and Mr. KOS (Yugoslavia) agreed with the Israel representative.

55. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) remarked that the discrepancy between the French and English texts noted by the French representative existed in the Charter of the United Nations. The French text of the joint draft resolution was the original; any changes to be made in the English translation should be left to the Secretariat.

56. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that, as the joint draft resolution instructed the Commission on Human Rights to submit certain recommendations, the instruction should be worded as clearly and definitely as possible. That was precisely the purpose of the Ukrainian amendment (A/C.3/L.318). He could not agree with the Chilean representative's remark that the amendment would impair the principle of universality underlying the draft resolution; it would merely make the general directive more detailed.

57. If, as the Lebanese representative had said, the resolution already covered the idea that the Commission on Human Rights should also bear in mind the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories, he could see no objection to spelling out that concept. He urged all those representatives who were sincerely concerned with helping the peoples of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories to exercise the right of self-determination to remember that, unless the explicit mention proposed by his delegation was included in the draft resolution, some delegations might raise, in the Commission, the question of its competence to deal with the subject. The French representative had already indicated that the Commission was not competent. The Ukrainian amendment, if adopted, would make such assertions untenable.

58. Mr. GOROSTIZA (Mexico) said that he would vote for the Lebanese draft resolution (A/C.3/L.293/Rev.1) in the conviction that it was useful, as it asked for information which the General Assembly needed in order to see the problems connected with self-determination in their proper perspective; that it was not contrary to either the letter or the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations; and that it contained no trace of hostility towards the administering Powers.

59. He gladly accepted the United States representative's oral amendments to the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.317), but could not accept the Ukrainian amendment (A/C.3/L.318) because it was unnecessary. The wording of the joint draft resolution repeated the wording of the earlier General Assembly resolution (545 (VI)) asking the Commission on Human Rights for recommendations on the same subject, and as everyone was aware, in complying with that request the Commission had not ignored the Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories.

60. Mr. DUNLOP (New Zealand) observed that his delegation was unable to support a resolution implementing the right of peoples to self-determination in any way so long as the scope and limitations of that right had not been settled. Although his Government had sent and would continue to send information on political progress in the Non-Self-Governing Territories under its administration, it did so of its own accord and recognized no obligation to do so. He would therefore vote against the Lebanese draft resolution.

61. While he appreciated the reasons for the Indian amendment to that draft resolution, being unable to support the resolution itself he was not in favour of referring it to yet another committee.

62. In view of its belief that recommendations on the right of self-determination were premature until the right had been precisely defined and of the position it had taken on the recommendations of the Commission on Human Rights, his delegation could hardly support the joint draft resolution. Its vote on that text should not, however, be interpreted as indicating any deviation from its constant and full support of the principle of self-determination as enunciated in the Charter.

63. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation had indicated during the general debate that it would support draft resolution B. It was therefore prepared to vote for the Lebanese draft resolution, which was largely based on draft resolution B.

64. It would also vote for the addition proposed by the Indian delegation, understanding it to mean that upon receiving the resolution in question the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories would be expected to take practical measures to give it effect.

65. He fully supported the Ukrainian amendment. It was neither superfluous nor too late to emphasize the need for recommendations with regard to the peoples of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories, towards which the United Nations had a special responsibility under the Charter.

66. Mr. KHALATBARY (Iran) inquired whether the Ukrainian amendment also included the peoples of protectorates; if it did, he would vote for it.

67. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) replied that it did.

68. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Lebanese draft resolution (A/C.3/L.293/Rev.1), the text of which included the amendments proposed by Haiti (A/C.3/L.314) and India (A/C.3/L.315/Rev.1), which had been accepted by the Lebanese representative.

69. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) asked for a separate vote on the final paragraph of the draft resolution, which had been the Indian amendment (A/C.3/L.315/Rev.1).

70. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the last paragraph of the Lebanese draft resolution, which had been the Indian amendment (A/C.3/L.315/Rev.1).

The paragraph was adopted by 30 votes to 8, with 12 abstentions.

71. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the draft resolution submitted by Lebanon (A/C.3/L.293/Rev.1), as a whole.

72. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) requested that the vote be taken by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland.

Against: Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway.

Abstaining: Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Denmark.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 38 votes to 10, with 4 abstentions.

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY AFGHANISTAN, ARGENTINA, CHILE, GUATEMALA, IRAQ, LEBANON, MEXICO AND PAKISTAN (A/C.3/L.317)

73. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to vote on the draft resolution submitted jointly by Afghanistan, Argentina, Chile, Guatemala, Iraq, Lebanon, Mexico and Pakistan (A/C.3/L.317), which included the amendments proposed orally by the United States representative and accepted by the sponsors, and on the amendment submitted by the Ukrainian SSR (A/C.3/L.318).

74. He put to the vote the amendment submitted by the Ukrainian SSR (A/C.3/L.318) to the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.317).

The amendment was rejected by 22 votes to 16, with 14 abstentions.

75. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.317).

76. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) asked that the vote be taken by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, United States of America, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Chile, China.

Against: France, Netherlands, New Zealand, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Belgium.

Abstaining: Czechoslovakia, Peru, Poland, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada.

The draft resolution was adopted by 38 votes to 7, with 8 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.