

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1083rd
MEETING**

Wednesday, 25 October 1961,
at 3.20 p.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 35:</i>	
<i>Draft International Covenants on Human Rights (continued)</i>	
<i>Article 26 of the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (continued)</i>	115

Chairman: Mr. Salvador P. LOPEZ (Philippines).

AGENDA ITEM 35

Draft International Covenants on Human Rights (E/2573, annexes I-III, A/2907 and Add.1-2, A/2910 and Add.1-6, A/2929, A/4789 and Corr.1, A/C.3/L.933) (continued)

ARTICLE 26 OF THE DRAFT COVENANT ON CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS (E/2573, ANNEX I B) (continued)

1. Daw MYA SEIN (Burma) said that it was certainly not owing to lack of interest that she had not taken part in the discussion on articles 19 and 26 she had listened attentively to the preceding speakers, and was deeply concerned in the question, but she wanted a satisfactory balance to be achieved between freedom of expression—which was recognized by the Constitution of Burma in terms very similar to those of article 19—and guarantees against any abuse of that freedom.

2. Her delegation had at first thought that article 26 was somewhat out of place in the draft Covenants. Now, however, it considered that, in view of the present situation, it was the duty of the Third Committee to contribute in some way to the maintenance of peace, for without peace, freedom would have no meaning. Her delegation had thus come to believe that article 26 was of great importance and should be maintained; moreover, the Burmese Constitution, which prohibited the use of force as a means of settling international disputes, enshrined the ideal of peace founded on justice and morality, and prohibited discrimination based on creed, race or sex, was in complete harmony with the provisions of article 26. Fear and hatred were passions which could cause both individuals and nations to lose their sense of proportion, and must therefore be eliminated.

3. Her delegation would accordingly vote in favour of the sixteen-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.933).

4. Mr. MUNGUIA NOVOA (Nicaragua) said he had no objection in principle to the sixteen-Power amendment. In the Spanish text, however, he would prefer the verb "estará" to be replaced, where it appeared in both paragraphs, by the verb "será", which would give the text the positive and affirmative character that it should have. Nor was he entirely satisfied with

the word "apologfa", but would none the less vote in favour of the text, which embodied an international principle of the utmost importance.

5. Nicaragua was firmly opposed to all propaganda for war. Such propaganda was in fact harmful to all the peoples of the world, for its victims were not only the inhabitants of the large countries from which it emanated, who were powerless to resist its hold, but equally those of the small countries, who had no means of defence against it. Furthermore, his delegation could not but approve the condemnation of national, racial and religious hatred, which was formally prohibited by the Constitution of Nicaragua.

6. Mr. BOUQUIN (France) remarked that his delegation was still perfectly willing to vote for the original text of article 26, which had been carefully drafted by qualified jurists and represented compromises which any amendment might undo.

7. It appeared to be accepted that the new article 26 proposed by the sixteen Powers would be placed immediately after article 19. His delegation, together with several other delegations, feared that the result would be to destroy the harmonious whole presented by articles 24, 25 and 26 of the draft Covenant. It was also afraid that the provisions of article 26, once it became article 20, might undermine the freedoms laid down in article 19. That was one of the reasons for which his delegation had reservations about the sixteen-Power amendment.

8. Paragraph 2 of the amendment came closest to the original article 26. He had no objection to the use of the word "appel" which had been introduced in the French text. The term "discrimination" was also acceptable, but unnecessary, since advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred could in fact be nothing else than advocacy of discrimination.

9. He was, however, surprised to note that the amendment had reversed the order of certain terms appearing in the original article, thus weakening their meaning. From national, racial or religious hostility to hatred there was a progression: the word "hatred" was stronger than the word "hostility". The sixteen-Power amendment, on the other hand, read: "Any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to . . . hostility . . .". Even if the words "incitement to hostility" had a meaning other than incitement to hostilities, in other words to war, that formula could not be justified: hatred always resulted in hostility.

10. Again, he was not satisfied with the replacement, in the French text, of the future tense "sera" by the present tense "est". If existing legislation already embodied the prohibitions contained in the original article 26, there was no need to include the article in a covenant the aim of which was precisely to have certain changes incorporated in the national legislation of Member States. Furthermore, his delegation

saw no reason for the substitution of the phrase "by law" for the phrase "by the law of the State". The reasons given by the representative of Saudi Arabia (1082nd meeting) had shed no light on the matter. What was the function of law-courts, if not to apply the law? And did not the word "law" embrace all the laws and even the constitution of a State?

11. Referring to paragraph 1 of the sixteen-Power amendment, he affirmed that no country was more hostile than France to war propaganda. If the Committee were drafting a declaration, he would certainly not oppose that part of the amendment and he well understood the motives that had inspired its authors. A covenant, however, was quite another matter, and before including it in an expression such as "propaganda for war" it was necessary to know the precise meaning of the phrase. As several representatives had pointed out, it was vague and its definition would present serious difficulties when the time came for the practical and legal application of the article in question.

12. Recalling the discussions on the text in the Commission on Human Rights, he observed that no delegation had at that time—or at any time since then—proposed the inclusion of a reference to propaganda for war, which appeared neither in the Brazilian amendment on the subject transmitted to the Secretariat^{1/} nor in an amendment submitted by Poland to the Commission on Human Rights.^{2/} Although the USSR representative had, at the ninth session of the Commission (379th meeting) deplored the fact that, owing to the rejection of the Polish amendment, the original article 26 was incomplete, he had none the less voted for the text together with ten other delegations.^{3/}

13. The French delegation considered that article 26 as originally worded could have been adopted by a much greater majority than the sixteen-Power amendment, which it was unable to support. Regrettably, the adoption of that amendment would prevent it from voting for the original draft. He stressed that the articles of the draft Covenants should be considered dispassionately, from the standpoint of their intrinsic merits and not of the value attached to some of the words used therein. They should enshrine universal rules and not be made to fit a particular region or country. Finally, he regretted that, in references to peaceful coexistence, criticism had been levelled against countries not represented in the United Nations.

14. Mrs. TILLET (United States of America) stated that her delegation was not in a position to support the sixteen-Power amendment which was a revised version of the nine-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.930/Rev.2) rather than a compromise between the two original amendments.

15. Her delegation would have been able to accept the expression "propaganda for war" if it had remained linked, as in the four-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.932) with the precise legal concept of incitement to violence. Unfortunately this was not the

case. Moreover, that very concept had been weakened by being subdivided, in paragraph 2 of the amendment, into the three distinct concepts of incitement to discrimination, incitement to hostility and incitement to violence.

16. Although the United States delegation was strongly opposed to all propaganda inciting to violence or war, it considered that the prohibition of war propaganda, when the term was ill-defined, could lend itself to interpretations which would end up by destroying the right to hold and to express opinions laid down in article 19.

17. She wondered, for instance, whether the Press of most countries of the world, which had recently reported on the explosion of a high-power bomb—an explosion which, incidentally, did not seem to have been mentioned by the newspapers in the country concerned—could be accused of engaging in war propaganda.

18. Mr. FERREIRA ALDUNATE (Uruguay) recalled that a distinction should be made between the aims or principles that were to be expressed and the legal forms that they should assume, as well as their precise position in the relevant text.

19. No one could claim that Uruguay, a small country which had few troops and no compulsory military service, was in favour of war propaganda. Its people, whose origins were diverse, was nevertheless so united that it knew nothing of racial or national hatred and could not even understand that such a sentiment could exist. His delegation's inability to accept the sixteen-Power amendment was therefore not based on reasons of substance.

20. First, it feared that, coming immediately after article 19, the amendment might be interpreted as restricting or offsetting freedom of information. In his view, the original article 26 had been aptly placed at the end of several articles dealing with the equality of individuals before the law and with the protection of minorities.

21. The use of the word "prohibited" in connexion with war propaganda was, he considered, unsatisfactory. The very concept of propaganda could not be precisely defined. In the eyes of some representatives, it was just another phenomenon of modern life, a means of mass communication. To others, the word expressed disapproval: propaganda was an evil thing in itself. In his opinion, the simple act of transmitting information could be described as propaganda. There was no such thing as completely objective information; every person in selecting items of information, in deciding on their presentation, and, as was unavoidable, in interpreting them, was bound to use a subjective approach. At most, the word "propaganda" could be said to describe a certain breadth of dissemination of information, as distinct from communications between individuals. That being so, he felt that to insert article 26 directly after article 19 would give the impression that the latter was concerned only with individual forms of expression and not with those aimed at the masses. The Uruguayan delegation was considerably perturbed by this danger.

22. He had not been convinced by the arguments of the representative of Saudi Arabia in favour of the words "by law". There seemed to be an almost mystical respect for the word "law"; such a respect was unjustified, especially when the law was not enacted by a Parliament elected by the people. In reality, a

^{1/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Tenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 28 (Part I), document A/C.3/L.460, Part III, article 26.

^{2/} See Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Sixteenth Session, Supplement No. 8, annex III, para. 36.

^{3/} Ibid., para. 38.

law, irrespective of its origin, was merely a juridical instrument and there was nothing in article 26 to suggest that the law in question would necessarily be interpreted by the courts.

23. His delegation wondered, moreover, whether it was not altogether too ambitious to attempt to prohibit by means of a legal instrument ills which were inherent in human nature. If the intention was to forbid war, war propaganda and hatred, why then not prohibit evil itself? No one was in favour of evil, yet it existed, and so did the war propaganda that was being carried on by many States under the pretense of serving peaceful aims. War propaganda was often understood to mean whatever ran counter to the views of a particular Government on international affairs.

24. The important thing was not so much to prohibit propaganda as to guarantee freedom of expression and the free dissemination of opinions of all kinds. It mattered little if the various sources of information contradicted one another, as the Venezuelan representative had pointed out (1082nd meeting), provided it was possible to draw on all of them in order to discover the truth, which human intelligence would always ferret out, despite all attempts to hide or distort it.

25. Although his delegation was deeply opposed to evil in all its forms, it would nevertheless vote against the present wording of the sixteen-Power amendment.

26. Mrs. CISELET (Belgium) said that she had already stressed the importance her country attached to freedom of opinion and expression in its widest sense and would hate to see restrictions placed upon a right it regarded as fundamental. That was why she had preferred not to take part in the general debate on article 26; however, she felt she should explain her position on the sixteen-Power amendment.

27. The Belgian delegation had not been in favour of inserting the original article 26 in the draft Covenant and the amendment before the Committee only accentuated the defects of the original text. Like every other country, Belgium supported the moral and social principles which inspired the sixteen-Power amendment, the more so since Belgium had served as a battlefield for Europe and its people was strongly opposed to war and war propaganda, as well as to all racial, national or religious discrimination. But that was not the problem. It was not the Committee's task to draw up a list of social or moral principles, but to draft an international legal instrument. At the moment, it was a question of guaranteeing freedom of expression and opinion, while at the same time forestalling possible abuses. But the wording of the sixteen-Power text contained serious faults: it lent itself to a far-reaching and arbitrary interpretation and, if adopted, it might well lead to a negation of the freedoms set forth in article 19. Her delegation could not therefore vote for that text.

28. In conclusion, she associated herself with the French representative in making the strongest reservations regarding the insertion of article 26 immediately after article 19.

29. Miss KUBOTA (Japan) agreed with the representatives of Chile and Saudi Arabia that all war propaganda should be prohibited, for war propaganda and appeals to national, racial or religious hostility were the basis of psychological warfare, as serious a matter as war proper. She recalled that in her

previous statement (1082nd meeting) she had drawn attention to the constructive character of article 26 and stressed the importance of completely eradicating war propaganda and all appeals to public opinion likely to be prejudicial to the maintenance of peace. The Japanese Constitution which, by the terms of its preamble, rested on the principle of peace and international co-operation, forbade recourse to war as a means of settling international disputes and Japan, which had suffered greatly as a result of war, was firmly convinced that war propaganda should be prohibited.

30. Her delegation was unable to vote for the article under discussion solely because its wording remained vague and imprecise and because it could be invoked to suppress freedom of information.

31. Mr. ALBUQUERQUE MELLO (Brazil), replying to the remarks made by the French representative regarding Brazil's position on the draft of the Commission on Human Rights, said that many years had passed since the text under discussion had been drawn up. After the war, Brazil had adopted a new constitution, containing a prohibition of war propaganda. He regretted that the representative of a country which had shown so much flexibility in the course of its history did not seem to understand that it was impossible to stand still in a constantly changing world.

32. Mr. KASLIWAL (India) remarked, for the benefit of the representatives of France and Uruguay, that it was a little late to raise objections to article 26 immediately following article 19, since the Committee had already taken a decision to that effect, and that without opposition.

33. With regard to war propaganda, he recalled that he had suggested, in connexion with article 19, the formula "incitement to war"; but a large number of delegations had expressed fear that such a term would unduly restrict freedom of information. It was therefore rather discouraging to find that the words "propaganda for war" were now being criticized on the grounds that they were too vague. Referring to his delegation's position in the Commission on Human Rights, he unreservedly endorsed the Brazilian representative's remarks. He also drew the Committee's attention to the numerous General Assembly resolutions condemning war propaganda.

34. Furthermore he emphasized, in reply to the United States representative, that the sixteen-Power amendment was not imprecise. The goal aimed at was clear, and it was that which counted. It was not for the Committee to interpret the text; that would be the task of national courts.

35. Lastly, he regretted that the words "the law of the State" no longer appeared at the end of the sixteen-Power text, since it was for each State to prohibit war propaganda in its legislation.

36. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that in modern times propaganda represented a weapon in the service of State policy in nearly all the industrialized countries of the world, and that it must not be confused with freedom of information. The representative of Uruguay was fortunate to live in a country enjoying peaceful and friendly relations with its neighbours and knowing nothing of the problems encountered by so many other States. However, his confidence in human intelligence was perhaps a little excessive. In the present day, the masses were too

beset by daily economic cares to be capable of arriving at a genuinely informed opinion; they were conditioned by the big press agencies which told them what to think; only the privileged class engaged in non-manual professions was able to resist such propaganda. Since the adoption of article 26 by the Commission on Human Rights, the situation had greatly changed and mankind could not afford to postpone the issue any longer. War propaganda was extremely well organized today and delegations must not persist in a position taken up ten years earlier. If the traditions and the sense of self discipline of thirty-years before still prevailed, such an article would not be necessary; but such was unfortunately not the case. Those were the reflections which the Saudi Arabian delegation wished to bring to the attention of the French representative, who had expressed his point of view less clearly and lucidly than was his wont.

37. The CHAIRMAN asked the Saudi Arabian representative to be kind enough not to make personal remarks about his colleagues.

38. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia) said that he was entitled to express his opinion freely as he had always done over the whole of the sixteen years during which he had been representing his country in the United Nations.

39. He felt that it was very unfair to say that the sixteen-Power amendment—which had been arrived at as a result of a sustained effort by many delegations—was merely a variation on the nine-Power amendment. As a matter of fact, the sponsors of the four-Power amendment had merely agreed to the words "discrimination" and "hostility" being added to their text. For his part, he felt that the ideas contained in those two words were implicit in the word "hatred", but he realized that it might be advisable to mention discrimination explicitly because of the serious problems it was giving rise to in many parts of the world. In any event, delegations were perfectly free to ask for a separate vote on the words in question.

40. As to the position of article 26 in the draft Covenant, he had no fixed views, for, to his mind, the article could stand on its own feet. However, if the French and other delegations so wished, it could be inserted elsewhere. For the time being, the Committee was concerned with substance. It might, since some delegations had linked articles 19 and 26 together, decide on the position of those articles at a later time unless, of course, a formal decision had already been taken on that point.

41. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had decided that article 26 would follow immediately after article 19 and would be renumbered article 20. He drew attention in this connexion to rule 124 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

42. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela), replying to the representative of Uruguay, explained that his delegation was concerned not so much about the contradictions between the different items of information supplied to the public as the fact that some people were powerless to make their views known. Any country, however small and weak, should be able to make its voice heard on an equal footing with the most powerful interest groups.

43. Mr. SITA (Congo, Leopoldville) said that he could not but admit that the discussion of article 26 and the proposed amendments had created a certain

uneasiness in the Committee. He pointed out, as an example, the great variety of objections to those texts in connexion with the words to be retained, the tense of the verb that should be employed and even the position of the article in the Covenant.

44. The most wide-spread objection was to the vagueness of the sixteen-Power amendment, but he wondered whether the original text was really any clearer. What was more, the criticisms that had been made would seem to justify delegations in abstaining rather than in casting a negative vote. In any event, it was not at all surprising that the text of the amendment should contain certain things which did not appear in the original. The world situation had changed considerably since 1953; in particular, many new countries had been able to make themselves heard in the United Nations.

45. The fear expressed by several delegations that excessive restrictions might be placed on freedom of expression was a most praiseworthy expression of concern, but it had not been supported by conclusive arguments. He did not, moreover, think that that fear was justified, for it was quite as logical to restrict freedom of expression by prohibiting war propaganda as to restrict individual liberty by prohibiting murder and theft.

46. In general, the Congolese delegation deplored the negative attitude of the delegations that were opposed to the insertion of the article in the Covenant or to the wording of the amendment. While they had, it was true, stated that they were not opposed to the principles laid down in the amendment, they had not advanced any specific arguments to prove the existence of the dangers they perceived in the use of certain words, they had not submitted any amendments, and they had not even participated in the consultations from which the sixteen-Power amendment had emerged. They had, in the end, done nothing more than to express their opposition in belated statements. He expressed regret that those delegations had not participated more constructively in the discussions.

47. The Congolese delegation would vote for the sixteen-Power amendment because of its positive elements and the fact that it seemed much more effective than the original text.

48. Mrs. ROUSSEAU (Mali), speaking on a point of order, proposed that the Committee should proceed immediately to a vote; delegations that wished to do so could explain their votes after the voting.

49. The CHAIRMAN said that he was willing to adopt that procedure if there was no objection from the delegations that had asked to explain their votes before the voting.

50. Mr. SAPOZHNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) strongly supported the Chairman. He himself had already explained the USSR position and did not wish to exercise his right of reply even though some delegations that were opposed to article 26 had made provocative statements regarding the USSR.

51. He asked, moreover, for a roll-call vote on the sixteen-Power amendment, even if a separate vote was taken on the two paragraphs, for the debate had shown that, in the last analysis, it was a question of choosing between freedom to spread war propaganda and the prohibition of it, between freedom to spread racial hatred and the prohibition of it. Every delegation must therefore take its stand publicly.

52. Miss WARREN (Australia) feared that, if the Committee adopted the proposal put forward by the representative of Mali, some delegations, which had placed their names on the list of speakers in order to explain their votes before the voting, would be at a disadvantage compared with those that had already been able to explain their votes.

53. Mr. BAHNEV (Bulgaria) asked the Chairman to give a ruling under rule 114 of the rules of procedure. He added that under rule 129, the Chairman could permit members to explain their votes either before or after the voting.

54. The CHAIRMAN, invoking rule 118 of the rules of procedure, invited the Committee to vote on the Malian proposal, stating that in any event the delegations that wished to do so could explain their votes after the voting.

The proposal was adopted by 44 votes to 19, with 10 abstentions.

55. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the two paragraphs of the sixteen-Power amendment to article 26 (A/C.3/L.933). He first put to the vote paragraph 1 of this amendment.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Congo (Brazzaville), (Congo, Leopoldville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Venezuela.

Against: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Austria, China, Colombia, Cyprus, Greece, Iran, Panama, Portugal, South Africa.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 53 votes to 21, with 9 abstentions.

56. The CHAIRMAN, before putting paragraph 2 of the amendment to the vote, drew the Committee's attention to the difference of opinion that had arisen between the Spanish-speaking delegations in respect of the translation of the English word "advocacy", which had been rendered in French by the word "appel". While some of those delegations had accepted the word "apología", others preferred the word "provocación" or "excitación", and still others the word "llamamiento". If the Spanish-speaking delegations were unable to reach an immediate agreement on one of those terms, they could vote on the original English or French texts and leave it to the Secretariat to select the appropriate term after consultation, if necessary, with the delegations concerned.

57. In accordance with the request of the representative of Chile, he invited the Committee to vote first on the phrase "to discrimination, hostility or".

At the request of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Togo, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia.

Against: Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Lebanon, Norway, Peru, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark.

Abstaining: Iran, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Tunisia, Argentina, Australia, Austria, China, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador.

The phrase was adopted by 43 votes to 21, with 19 abstentions.

58. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 2 as a whole.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan.

Against: Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Chile, China, Cyprus, France, Greece, Iran, Italy, Panama, Peru, Portugal, South Africa, Spain.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 50 votes to 18, with 15 abstentions.

59. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote article 26 as a whole, in the version proposed by the sixteen Powers (A/C.3/L.933).

At the request of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia.

Against: Denmark, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Belgium, Canada.

Abstaining: France, Greece, Iran, Panama, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Argentina, Austria, China, Colombia, Cyprus.

Article 26 was adopted by 52 votes to 19, with 12 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.