United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

NINTH SESSION
Official Records

THIRD COMMITTEE, 585th MEETING

Tuesday, 16 November 1954, at 3.20 p.m.

New York

CONTENTS

Chairman: **Mr. Jiří NOSEK (Czechoslovakia).**

AGENDA ITEM 58

Draft international covenants on human rights (A/2714, A/2686, chapter V, section I, E/2573, A/C.3/574, A/C.3/L.410/Rev.4 and Corr.1 and 2, A/C.3/L.412, A/C.3/L.413, A/C.3/L.414, A/C.3/L.418 and Add.1, A/C.3/L.421, A/C.3/L.422, A/C.3/L.424, A/C.3/L.427 and Add.1) (*continued*)

PROCEDURAL PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY COSTA RICA (A/C.3/L.410/REV.4 AND CORR.1 AND 2) (*continued*)

1. Mr. HOOD (Australia) said he had already given his views on the Costa Rican draft resolution (A/C.3/L.410/Rev. 4 and Corr.1 and 2) as a whole.

2. As regards the amendments to that proposal, his delegation supported the joint proposal of Egypt and Lebanon (A/C.3/L.429), which would provide a way out of certain serious difficulties.

3. It had itself submitted an amendment (A/C.3/L.423) to paragraph 2 of the operative part, the sole purpose of which was to indicate more clearly what it believed the sponsor of the draft resolution had had in mind. The word "compilation" in the text of the draft resolution seemed too vague; it was not clear whether a lengthy compendium or a summary was meant. The term "concise annotation" was more accurate, the idea being that the Secretariat would summarize the comments made on the various articles. The work could be started immediately and Governments would probably receive that useful document within a period of six months. The Haitian representative had rightly emphasized that too long a time limit should not be fixed. In that respect, the text proposed by Australia had definite advantages, particularly since its sub-paragraph (*b*) provided that the Secretariat would distribute communications to Governments as soon as they were received. Lastly, under the terms of its sub-paragraph (*c*), the General Assembly would have, by the beginning of its next session, a compilation of all the amendments and proposed new articles which had been submitted in the course of the year. Those measures would save time and would make it possible to organize future work on a systematic basis. He would like to know the financial implications of his proposal, a question which the Peruvian representative had, incidentally, raised at a previous meeting. He hoped that the Costa Rican representative would find it possible to accept his amendment.

4. Mr. HUMPHREY (Secretariat) said in reply to the Peruvian and Australian representatives that no budgetary difficulties would be entailed by the adoption of either the Costa Rican draft resolution or the Australian amendment. The expenditure incurred could be met within regular appropriations; before an exact estimate of the expenditure could be given, it would be necessary to have some idea of the volume of the documentation to be furnished by Governments. In any event, however, additional appropriations would not be required.

5. Mr. MENDEZ (Philippines) regretted that all reference to the peoples had been eliminated from the revised text of the draft resolution and accordingly supported the Greek amendment (A/C.3/L.430 and Corr. 1), which reintroduced that idea. He would, however, suggest the insertion of the words "of the world" after the words "the peoples" and the replacement of the phrase "human beings" by the phrase "the human person".

6. Furthermore, as the final form to be taken by the covenants was still unknown it would be preferable to make no affirmations in advance and to delete the words "which will effectively safeguard the rights of the human person" from the third paragraph of the preamble to the Costa Rican draft resolution.

7. His delegation would vote for the amendments proposed by Australia (A/C.3/L.423) and by Guatemala (A/C.3/L.425).

8. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) thought that the changes suggested by the Philippine delegation would improve the text of the Greek amendment. There was another important point. The term "instruments" did not merely connote covenants, nor was any indication given of their number. The draft resolution should specifically mention the covenants which the Committee was engaged in drafting. If the Greek representative would agree to amend her proposal along those lines, the Afghan delegation would withdraw the amendment to the third paragraph of the preamble to the draft resolution it had proposed orally at a previous meeting (582nd meeting). It would otherwise be unable to vote for the Greek proposal and would maintain its amendment, which it hoped would be acceptable to the Costa Rican representative.

9. Mr. ROY (Haiti) said that, if the Australian proposal (A/C.3/L.423) was adopted, he would refrain from submitting a formal amendment in regard to the time limit since that proposal fully met his point. While his delegation would vote for the Australian amendment, it would be glad if the words "as early as possible" could be inserted immediately after the words "distribute to Governments" in sub-paragraph (*a*).

10. Mr. HOOD (Australia) accepted the Haitian representative's suggestion.

11. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) agreed with the Afghan representative that the term "instruments" used in the Greek amendment (A/C.3/L.430 and Corr.1) was unduly vague.

12. Where the reference to the "peoples" was concerned, he feared that the Philippine representative was labouring under a misapprehension. It was not the right of self-determination which was at issue, but the rights of the human person. The text of the Greek proposal would have the effect of weakening a principle, to which several delegations attached importance.

13. On the other hand, the amendment submitted jointly by Egypt and Lebanon (A/C.3/L.429) respected all the essential principles and its adoption should not give rise to any difficulty.

14. Referring to the comments made by the Afghan representative at the preceding meeting, he said that he wished to make the intentions of his delegation clear. If the majority of the Committee favoured the adoption of a paragraph inviting non-governmental organizations with consultative status to stimulate public interest in the covenants, Lebanon would readily vote for such a provision, provided that the Non-Self-Governing Territories and the Trust Territories were expressly mentioned. No such text had, however, as yet been submitted. His delegation had already emphasized the practical difficulties to which an invitation addressed indiscriminately to all non-governmental organizations would give rise; such an invitation might also provide the pretext for activities which some Governments regarded as dangerous to their security. The deletion of paragraph 1 (*c*) would remove that pretext. The principles were not affected. The important thing was to stimulate public interest by every possible means and action by non-governmental organizations was only one such means. The proposal of Egypt and Lebanon left all those possibilities open, since the suggested new paragraph provided that the Secretary-General should give the draft covenants "the widest possible publicity". The objections raised by the Afghan delegation did not therefore apply to that text. The order of points 2 and 3 of the joint amendments (A/C.3/L.429) should be reversed, since the proposal for a new paragraph should logically precede the proposal for the deletion of paragraph 1 (*c*) of the operative part. Some delegations might wish to retain both texts and should be given an opportunity of doing so. The existing point 2 would thus become point 3 and the existing point 3 would become point 2; that change would give the Committee every opportunity of expressing its preferences.

15. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) would vote for point 1 of the Egyptian and Lebanese amendments and for what had become point 2. On the other hand she could not agree to the deletion of operative paragraph 1 (*c*) of the draft resolution. The publicity in question had to be given in the non-independent territories as well as in the others, and that fact should be stated. Her delegation would vote for both the new paragraph and the retention of sub-paragraph (*c*).

16. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) saw great merit in the Greek amendment (A/C.3/L.430 and Corr.1), and believed that the Costa Rican representative might accept it in part in order that the third paragraph of the preamble might reflect the principles that a number of delegations had defended during the discussion. However, the word "instruments" should not be used; the word "covenants" would be more appropriate. The Philippine representative's suggestion might make the text repetitious; it would no doubt suffice to say "all peoples".

17. The Australian amendment (A/C.3/L.423) would clarify the text of paragraph 2 of the operative part, which warranted certain reservations as it stood; in addition, it would give the Secretary-General a more limited task and might enable him to accomplish it in good time. His delegation regretted that it had had to withdraw its amendment (A/C.3/L.420) because of the lack of enthusiasm shown by other delegations. A sub-committee composed of representatives of the Member States could have worked more effectively than the Secretariat; that was why fault might be found with operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. He was inclined to favour the Australian amendment, but there were two essential points to be kept in mind: first, the General Assembly should not cease to concern itself with the drafting of the covenants; secondly, a precisely formulated text had to be available at the tenth session of the General Assembly for immediate consideration by the Third Committee.

18. Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) said that when he had mentioned at a previous meeting (583rd meeting) that the Uruguayan delegation had taken up an idea suggested by a non-governmental organization he had not intended that statement as a criticism; he had merely wished to illustrate the fact that the non-governmental organizations in consultative status rendered valuable assistance to the United Nations. He did not attach great importance to the expression "a desperate appeal"; he could just as easily have said "an open letter". The important thing was not to include inadmissible and useless details in a text of universal scope, by expressly mentioning the non-independent territories. There was no need to repeat the arguments that had already been advanced on that subject. With regard to the third paragraph of the preamble, he found the debate on the Greek (A/C.3/L.430 and Corr.1) and the joint Egyptian and Lebanese (A/C.3/L.429) proposals most surprising. Some delegations apparently wished to refer at one and the same time to the final covenants and to the current drafts, which would certainly be amended. It was not possible to adopt such a method. What was called for was clear and unequivocal language; the joint amendments (A/C.3/L.429) met that requirement. Moreover, some members of the Third Committee apparently thought that the draft resolution would deal with the questions of self-determination and the number of covenants. Such decisions could not be taken in that way. The General Assembly would not be bound in that respect by the provisions of the preamble. The text should merely note that the Committee had considered two draft covenants; that wording would not favour any particular view. In that respect, moreover, the Greek draft would have the same drawbacks as the Costa Rican draft resolution, which was an additional reason for adopting the joint Egyptian and Lebanese proposal. Furthermore, the new paragraph submitted by Egypt and Lebanon (A/C.3/L.429) expressed in acceptable terms the idea of giving publicity to the draft covenants. Consequently, the Egyptian and Lebanese amendments appeared likely to remove all the difficulties. He had already explained (583rd meeting) why he opposed the retention of operative paragraph 1 (*c*) of the draft resolution and there was no need for him to enlarge on that point.

19. Mr. DUNLOP (New Zealand), speaking on a point of order, moved the closure of the debate under

rule 118 of the rules of procedure. He considered that the original text of the Costa Rican draft resolution (A/C.3/L.410) was better than the latest version (A/C.3/L.410/Rev.4 and Corr.1 and 2), and that the situation was becoming more and more confused. Furthermore, the draft had originally been concerned only with a procedural matter, being designed merely to guide the Committee in its work. He paid a tribute to the devoted work of the Costa Rican representative and to the spirit of co-operation shown by those representatives who had submitted constructive amendments.

20. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) opposed the closure of the debate. The Costa Rican representative and the sponsors of various amendments had been asked a number of questions. If those questions remained unanswered, the situation would be confused when the vote was taken. It was also possible that the sponsor of the draft resolution would accept certain amendments, thereby obviating the need to vote on them. The Costa Rican representative and the sponsors of amendments should be heard before the vote was taken.

21. Mr. ROY (Haiti) shared that opinion, although he did not formally oppose the New Zealand proposal.

The proposal was rejected by 16 votes to 13, with 23 abstentions.

22. Mrs. TSALDARIS (Greece) said she was sorry that the Lebanese and Afghan representatives had misinterpreted her amendment. Her delegation's views were definite and had been clearly explained on several occasions. She drew the Afghan representative's attention to the fact that the peoples could not be provided with "draft covenants", which was why she had suggested the word "instruments" in her amendment (A/C.3/L.430 and Corr.1); they would be definitive instruments, that is definitive covenants, and not drafts. Her amendment had been conceived in the general spirit, with a view to providing the peoples with the definitive instruments which would safeguard their rights, since the right of self-determination of peoples had been inserted in the covenants as the right of most importance to individual liberty.

23. With regard to the suggestions made by the Philippine and the Uruguayan representatives, she thought that the words "the peoples should be provided . . ." should be acceptable to those representatives.

24. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) said that there had been a misunderstanding. He would have preferred to see the words "precisely formulated instruments" in the Greek amendment replaced by the words "covenants on human rights". It was only in the third paragraph of the preamble as it appeared in the latest version of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.410/Rev.4 and Corr.1 and 2) that he wished the word "draft" to be inserted before the words "international covenants".

25. Replying to a question by Mr. NUÑEZ (Costa Rica), Mrs. TSALDARIS (Greece) said that she would agree to replace the words "the peoples" by the words "all peoples" in her amendment (A/C.3/L.430 and Corr.1).

26. Mr. NUÑEZ (Costa Rica) said that in that case his delegation would accept the Greek amendment.

27. He accepted, in part, the amendment submitted orally by the Cuban representative at the preceding meeting. Accordingly, the words "should express itself fully and freely" in the last paragraph of the preamble would be replaced by the words "should continue to express itself freely".

28. He accepted the Afghan amendment (A/C.3/L.431) calling for the addition of the words "in their respective countries" at the end of paragraph 1 (*c*) of the operative part.

29. He accepted the Australian amendment (A/C.3/L.423), as amended by the Haitian representative, who had suggested the insertion of the words "as early as possible" in sub-paragraph (*a*), after the words "distribute to Governments".

30. He accepted the Guatemalan amendment (A/C.3/L.425), on the understanding that the words "preference to the discussion, article by article" in that text would be replaced by the words, "devote itself mainly to the discussion, article by article, in an agreed order".

31. Of the joint amendments submitted by Egypt and Lebanon (A/C.3/L.429), he accepted only the new point 2.

32. Mrs. TSALDARIS (Greece) accepted the Afghan representative's suggestion that the words "precisely formulated instruments" (A/C.3/L.430 and Corr.1) should be replaced by "the covenants on human rights". She also inserted the words "as soon as possible" between the words "provided" and "with the covenants on human rights".

33. Mr. NUÑEZ (Costa Rica) accepted the Greek representative's new amendments to her amendment.

34. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) remarked that points 2 and 3 of the joint amendments (A/C.3/L.429) were closely connected. He did not see how the Costa Rican representative could accept one and not the other.

35. Mr. NUÑEZ (Costa Rica) said that in that case he would accept none of the amendments proposed by Egypt and Lebanon (A/C.3/L.429).

36. Replying to a question by Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom), Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) explained that the first paragraph of the draft resolution referred to the "draft" covenants prepared by the Commission on Human Rights (E/2573, Annex I), which would be called "covenants" after their adoption. He wished to include in the Greek amendment the words "the covenants on human rights" and not "the draft covenants on human rights", as the peoples could not be provided with "draft" covenants; and it was clear that the reference in the third paragraph of the preamble, as contained in the Greek amendment (A/C.3/L.430 and Corr.1), was to the adopted texts.

37. The CHAIRMAN stated that, since the Costa Rican representative had accepted the Greek amendment, the Syrian amendment (A/C.3/L.428) was no longer before the Committee.

38. Mr. JUVIGNY (France) said that in the French text of the Guatemalan amendment (A/C.3/L.425) the words *"article par article"* should be replaced by *"par articles"*, to bring the translation into line with the Spanish original.

39. Mr. NUÑEZ (Costa Rica) again drew attention to the difference between the two expressions and said that he would prefer the phrase *"article par article"*.

40. Mr. ROY (Haiti) also saw a slight difference in meaning; the words *"par articles"* implied that several articles could be examined together, whereas *"article par article"* would seem to preclude that possibility. The Guatemalan representative had no doubt wished to provide for the possibility of examining several articles at once and for that reason had suggested that the Com-

mittee should add after those words the phrase "in an agreed order".

41. Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) pointed out that there was a similar difference in meaning between the two expressions in English.

42. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) recalled that he had proposed the words "article by article" and that his proposal had been accepted by the Costa Rican representative and by the working group. If it was decided to change that expression, he would move the restoration of the former text.

43. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) said that it was precisely the phrase *"article par article"* which appeared in the Guatemalan amendment (A/C.3/L.425) accepted by the Costa Rican representative. If the Guatemalan representative wanted the text to read *"par articles"*, an amendment to that effect would have to be submitted and put to the vote.

44. Mr. KING (Liberia) and Mr. ROY (Haiti) asked that the Spanish, English and French texts should be brought into concordance, as the same distinction existed in the three languages.

45. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) pointed out that the expression "article by article" was not in the least rigid, inasmuch as it was followed by the words "in an agreed order". That order was not given, but would be decided by the Committee at the proper time.

46. Mrs. TSALDARIS (Greece) did not think that the phrase *"selon un ordre approprié"* was an exact translation of the words "in an agreed order".

47. Mrs. QUAN (Guatemala) accepted the replacement in the Spanish text of the words *"por articulos"* by the words *"artículo por artículo"*, on the understanding that they would be followed by the phrase *"en un orden apropiado"*.

48. Mr. FOMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the Committee should proceed to vote on the Costa Rican draft resolution. The amended paragraphs could be put to the vote separately.

49. Mr. MENDEZ (Philippines) asked that all the paragraphs of the draft resolution, whether amended or not, should be voted on separately.

It was so decided.

50. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first paragraph of the preamble to the revised draft resolution submitted by Costa Rica (A/C.3/L.410/Rev.4 and Corr.1 and 2).

The paragraph was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

51. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the Afghan amendment to the second paragraph of the preamble (A/C.3/L.431, point 1).

52. Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom), speaking on a point of order, asked the Afghan representative what the purpose of his amendment was.

53. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) replied that he wished to make it clear that the reference was to the two draft covenants submitted to the Third Committee (E/2573, Annex I).

The amendment was rejected by 7 votes to 5, with 34 abstentions.

54. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second paragraph of the preamble.

The paragraph was adopted by 50 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

55. The CHAIRMAN recalled that there had been two amendments to the third paragraph of the preamble; the amendment submitted by Greece (A/C.3/L.430 and Corr.1), which had been accepted by the author of the draft resolution, and the amendment proposed by the delegations of Egypt and Lebanon (A/C.3/L.429, point 1).

56. He put to the vote the amendment submitted by Egypt and Lebanon (A/C.3/L.429, point 1).

The amendment was adopted by 31 votes to 7, with 12 abstentions.

57. The CHAIRMAN stated that the new text would consequently replace the third paragraph of the preamble to the draft resolution.

58. He put to the vote the fourth paragraph of the preamble.

The paragraph was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

59. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the fifth paragraph of the preamble.

The paragraph was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

60. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the sixth and last paragraph of the preamble, as amended.

The paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 50 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

61. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on paragraph 1 (*a*) of the operative part.

62. Mr. FOMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said he wished to make certain that paragraph 1 (*a*) would in no way preclude Governments from proposing new amendments or additions to the draft covenants at the tenth session of the General Assembly. His delegation could vote for the paragraph on that understanding only.

63. The CHAIRMAN replied that the USSR representative had correctly interpreted the sub-paragraph.

The sub-paragraph was adopted by 50 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

64. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 1 (*b*).

The sub-paragraph was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

65. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon), speaking on a point of order, asked that the new point 2 of the joint Egyptian and Lebanese amendments (A/C.3/L.429) should be put to the vote before the new point 3 and before paragraph 1 (*c*) of the Costa Rican draft resolution. The order of points 2 and 3, which were closely related, had been inverted by mistake. The authors of the amendments could agree to the deletion of paragraph 1 (*c*) only if the new paragraph they proposed was adopted instead. They would therefore prefer not to vote on the deletion of that sub-paragraph until they knew the decision with regard to the paragraph they proposed. Lastly, the decision taken on the new point 2 might perhaps affect the Committee's decision on paragraph 1 (*c*) of the Costa Rican draft resolution.

66. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) felt that it would be contrary to the rules of procedure to vote on the new paragraph proposed by Egypt and Lebanon before voting on paragraph 1 (*c*). Moreover, the Lebanese representative's position was contradictory in certain respects. Furthermore, it was impossible to vote on the conditional deletion of a text. He therefore maintained that the Committee should follow the order of the sub-

paragraphs and paragraphs as they appeared in the draft resolution.

67. Mr. ROY (Haiti) proposed a compromise solution. If the authors of the joint amendments agreed to replace in the new point 2 the words "between paragraphs 2 and 3 of the operative part" by the words "between sub-paragraphs (*b*) and (*c*) of paragraph 1 of the operative part", the Committee could vote on that paragraph at once.

68. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) was prepared to accept the Haitian representative's proposal.

69. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) noted that the time limit for the submission of amendments had expired and that if the new amendment proposed by the Haitian representative was accepted, he would reserve the right also to submit new amendments.

70. Mr. MENDEZ (Philippines), speaking on a point of order, observed that in any case the Committee could not vote at that stage on a new paragraph to be inserted between paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Costa Rican draft resolution inasmuch as it did not yet know whether those two paragraphs would be adopted.

71. Mr. ZUAZO CUENCA (Bolivia), speaking on a point of order, agreed with the Afghan representative on the question of procedure; it was impossible to make the deletion of a given text conditional on the adoption of another text.

72. Mr. MATTHEW (India), speaking on a point of order, said that like the Afghan representative he considered the Committee could not at that stage accept any new amendment.

73. Mr. ROY (Haiti) withdrew his proposal.

74. Mr. KING (Liberia) did not think that the Lebanese representative's argument that the text of the joint Egyptian and Lebanese amendments had been wrongly presented was valid. The Committee could proceed only on the basis of the texts submitted to it, and it could not agree to transpose the order of points 2 and 3 of the joint amendments (A/C.3/L.429).

75. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to decide on the procedure to be followed.

76. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon), in agreement with the Egyptian representative, withdrew point 2 of the joint amendments as contained in document A/C.3/L.429.

77. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Swedish representative had asked (582nd meeting) that a part of paragraph 1 (c) should be put to the vote separately. He put to the vote the phrase "with the promotion of human rights, including those in the Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories".

At the request of the representative of Afghanistan, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

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

Against: Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, China, France, Iceland, Luxembourg.

Abstaining: Canada, Denmark, Israel.

The phrase was adopted by 36 votes to 14, with 3 abstentions.

78. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 1 (*c*) as a whole, as amended.

At the request of the representative of Afghanistan, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Mexico, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, France, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Abstaining: China, Denmark, Egypt, Israel, United States of America.

The sub-paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 35 votes to 13, with 5 abstentions.

79. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 2 of the operative part, as amended.

The paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 48 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

80. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the new paragraph proposed by Egypt and Lebanon (A/C.3/L.429) for insertion between paragraphs 2 and 3 of the draft resolution.

The paragraph was adopted by 46 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

81. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 3 of the operative part, as amended.

The paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 51 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

82. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.410/Rev.4 and Corr.1 and 2) as a whole, as amended.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 42 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

Printed in U.S.A. S—42051—December 1954—1,850