

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

**THIRD COMMITTEE, 998th
 MEETING**

Friday, 21 October 1960,
 at 3.5 p.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 12:</i>	
<i>Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters V, VI and VII (section II, paragraph 645 only, and sections IV and V)) (continued)</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolutions (continued)</i>	79
<i>Organization of work</i>	83

Chairman: Mr. Eduard MEZINCESCU (Romania).

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters V, VI and VII (section II, paragraph 645 only, and sections IV and V)) (A/4415, A/C.3/L.845, A/C.3/L.847/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.848/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.850/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.851/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.852/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.858, A/C.3/L.859/Corr.1) (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (continued)

1. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) recalled that he had proposed at the 997th meeting that the last part of operative paragraph 2 of the Czechoslovak revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.848/Rev.2) and the whole of operative paragraph 3 should be deleted. He appealed to the Netherlands and Norwegian delegations not to press their amendment (A/C.3/L.858) if his own appeared to be acceptable to most delegations.
2. Mr. BEAUFORT (Netherlands) said that although the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.3/L.848/Rev.2) was acceptable in its general trend and scope, his delegation and the Norwegian delegation had felt that a resolution of that kind should be worded more carefully so as to avoid even the slightest suspicion of bias. The main differences between their amendment (A/C.3/L.858) and operative paragraph 2 of the original text were that the amendment called upon Member States and the specialized agencies—the usual formula—and asked them to co-operate in the implementation of resolution 6 (XVI) of the Commission on Human Rights, a point which the two delegations felt to be very important. They were not in favour of the reporting procedure proposed in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.
3. The two delegations were not opposed to the Saudi Arabian amendment (A/C.3/L.859/Corr.1) in principle and would withdraw their own if that amendment was adopted.
4. Mr. RUDA (Argentina) stated that he would be able to vote for the revised draft resolution on United

Nations assistance for the advancement of women in developing countries (A/C.3/L.847/Rev.1).

5. Like the delegation of Uruguay, his delegation would have preferred the draft resolution on low-cost housing and related community facilities (A/C.3/L.851/Rev.1) to cover rural as well as urban housing, but he would not press the point for the time being. He trusted, however, that when the Committee took up that item at the next session, it would bear in mind the housing needs of low-income groups in rural areas. During the debate on the Council's report at the fourteenth session, his delegation had stressed (936th meeting) the gravity of the problem of rents in nearly all countries, and particularly in Latin America. He expressed the hope that the problem would be discussed at the next session and that a comparative study would later be prepared on rents in different countries and on the methods used to deal with the problem. With those points in mind, he would vote for the draft resolution, subject to a slight drafting change in the Spanish text of operative paragraph 2: the words "públicos y de otra índole", after the word "servicios" should be deleted to bring the Spanish text into line with the English original.

6. He welcomed the revised text of the draft resolution on the teaching of United Nations subjects (A/C.3/L.850/Rev.1); the incorporation of the Bolivian suggestion had improved the original text. The Bolivian delegation had, however, originally mentioned faculties of law, which, he felt, should not be omitted. He was not sure whether they were included in the faculties of social and human sciences mentioned in operative paragraph 5.

7. He congratulated the Czechoslovak delegation on having drawn attention to a very serious problem—manifestations of racial and national hatred—by submitting its draft resolution (A/C.3/L.848/Rev.2) and on having shown a most commendable willingness to accept suggestions. He ventured to hope that it would accept one more suggestion. In the first preambular paragraph, the word "principle" should be replaced by the word "purpose", for it referred to the purposes mentioned in Article 1 of the Charter, the exact meaning of which had been clearly defined at the San Francisco Conference. The purposes were the aims of the United Nations, the principles the means by which those aims could be achieved. If the Czechoslovak delegation could accept the amendment he proposed, he would be able to vote for the draft resolution. Otherwise, he would be obliged to vote against it.

8. Lastly, he would vote for the amendment submitted by the Netherlands and Norway (A/C.3/L.858) to the Czechoslovak revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.848/Rev.2) because he felt that the text should include a reference to resolution 6 (XVI) of the Commission on Human Rights.

9. Miss HAMPTON (New Zealand), speaking as a co-sponsor of the fifteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/

L.850/Rev.1), explained, in answer to the Argentine representative's question, that the faculties of social and human sciences mentioned in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution were intended to include faculties of law.

10. Miss ADDISON (Ghana) expressed the hope that the draft resolution on low-cost housing and related community facilities (A/C.3/L.851/Rev.1), which her delegation had co-sponsored, would prove acceptable in its present form. She could not accept the amendment deleting the reference to the Secretary-General in operative paragraph 2. He had been asked to initiate a study on low-cost housing under General Assembly resolution 1393 (XIV) and he should be allowed to proceed with it.

11. She supported the draft resolution on United Nations assistance for the advancement of women in developing countries (A/C.3/L.847/Rev.1). The original text, which was already satisfactory, had been made still better by the incorporation of the Polish amendment (A/C.3/L.856/Rev.1). She also supported the draft resolution on the teaching of United Nations subjects (A/C.3/L.850/Rev.1), which had been made more acceptable by the incorporation of the Bolivian suggestion.

12. In connexion with the Czechoslovak revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.848/Rev.2), she said that there was no racial hatred in Ghana. However, her countrymen encountered discrimination outside their own country and they condemned it wherever it appeared. The United Nations had also condemned discrimination on many occasions; the First Committee, for instance, had strongly censured the "apartheid" policy of the Government of the Union of South Africa. Taking a similar stand, the Conference of Independent African States, which had met at Accra in 1958, had adopted a strongly worded resolution on racial discrimination and segregation,^{1/} which she read out.

13. Ghana could not but support the Czechoslovak revised draft resolution, but her delegation felt that the text should be much stronger. It called upon Governments to take all necessary measures to prevent all manifestations of racial, religious and national hatred, but she wondered how many Governments would take such action or even admit that it was necessary. She regretted that the reference to resolution 6 (XVI) of the Commission on Human Rights had been omitted from the revised text, for some action had been taken under that resolution. As it stood, the draft resolution expressed no more than a pious hope, when it should aim at consolidating any results already achieved under resolution 6 (XVI). She therefore welcomed the amendment submitted by the Netherlands and Norway (A/C.3/L.858).

14. Mr. DE VILLIERS (Union of South Africa) supported the fifteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.850/Rev.1) on the understanding that he was voting for the teaching of the purposes and principles of the United Nations as adopted at San Francisco. There had been a tendency to place new interpretations on the Charter, so that the original meaning became changed and blurred. The Charter was clearly worded and it was in the interests of the United Nations that it should not be misread.

^{1/}Conference of Independent African States, Declaration and Resolutions, 22nd April 1958 (Government Printer, Accra, Ghana), resolution IV.

15. Mr. FARHADI (Afghanistan), speaking as a co-sponsor of the fifteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.850/Rev.1), assured the representative of the Union of South Africa that the draft resolution referred precisely to the purposes and principles agreed to by the drafters of the Charter, and especially to the purpose of achieving "respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion" (Article 1, para. 3). Further, his delegation wished to associate itself with the Ghanaian representative's remarks regarding racial prejudice.

16. He suggested, as a minor drafting change affecting only the French text of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.847/Rev.1), that the words "de leur côté" in operative paragraph 1 should be replaced by "pour leur part".

17. Mr. BOUQUIN (France) said that he would vote for the revised draft resolutions on the teaching of United Nations subjects (A/C.3/L.850/Rev.1) and on low-cost housing (A/C.3/L.851/Rev.1). He also supported the draft resolution on United Nations assistance for the advancement of women in developing countries (A/C.3/L.847/Rev.1). That important proposal was fully in line with Economic and Social Council resolution 771 H (XXX), which had been adopted on 25 July 1960—only three months earlier—without a single dissenting vote. He could not agree with the representative of Ceylon that the text was repetitious. It was true that the Council resolution was mentioned both in the preamble and in the operative part, but that was logical. If either reference was to be eliminated, it should be deleted from the preamble rather than operative paragraph 1.

18. Referring to the Czechoslovak revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.848/Rev.2), he associated himself with the comments made by the Belgian representative at the 994th meeting, and supported the Saudi Arabian amendment (A/C.3/L.859/Corr.1). If the amendment submitted by the Netherlands and Norway (A/C.3/L.858) was not withdrawn, he would vote for it. The revised text of the draft resolution was satisfactory on the whole, but it might be improved by some drafting changes. He was not satisfied with the words "orienting youth" in the fourth preambular paragraph: it was not only young people but adults that should be guided towards peace in accordance with the spirit of the Charter, and the word "orienting" was clumsy. It might be replaced by some such word as "educating", but his delegation would not insist on that point. On the other hand, the Argentine representative had rightly pointed out the difference between the purposes and the principles of the Charter. To take his point fully into account, the beginning of the first preambular paragraph should be redrafted to read "Recalling that the fundamental purposes of the United Nations are to maintain international peace and security and to develop friendly relations among nations . . .", the word "develop" in the next phrase being replaced by the word "strengthen". In the second preambular paragraph, the expression "religious and racial prejudice" was unsatisfactory, as religious prejudice was not what was meant. He therefore proposed that those words should be replaced by "religious intolerance and racial prejudice". He hoped that the sponsor of the draft resolution would be able to accept those changes.

19. Mr. DEVAKUL (Thailand) remarked that he had no objection to the draft resolution on the teaching of United Nations subjects (A/C.3/L.850/Rev.1). The draft resolution on the advancement of women (A/C.3/L.847/Rev.1) was also quite acceptable, but he felt that the Committee might give some thought to the advancement of men also. He would vote for the draft resolution on low-cost housing (A/C.3/L.851/Rev.1) with the reservation that his Government would undertake the review of its housing requirements requested in operative paragraph 1 only when time and funds permitted.

20. Mrs. LEFLEROVA (Czechoslovakia) accepted the drafting changes proposed by the French representative to her delegation's draft resolution (A/C.3/L.848/Rev.2). She was prepared to accept the Saudi Arabian representative's proposal to delete the end of operative paragraph 2 and the whole of operative paragraph 3 if the delegations of the Netherlands and Norway would withdraw their amendment (A/C.3/L.858).

21. Mr. BEAUFORT (Netherlands) stated that the co-sponsors would withdraw their amendment (A/C.3/L.858), although they were not entirely happy about the text of the draft resolution.

22. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) endorsed the emphatic condemnation of racial and national hatred expressed in the Czechoslovak revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.848/Rev.2). She recalled that resolution 6 (XVI) of the Commission on Human Rights condemning anti-Semitism and other forms of racial prejudice and religious intolerance had originated with the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.

23. She was glad to see that the debate had gone beyond the narrow confines of that resolution and had demonstrated the universality of the problem of national racial discrimination and religious intolerance. For her delegation, Nazism was in essence the denial of the equality of all peoples and races. The seed of Nazism existed wherever people believed themselves selected by history because of their race or by God because of their creed, to the exclusion of other races and creeds; from there to go on to the belief that superior races or chosen creeds had the right to subdue lesser races or lesser creeds was one easy step.

24. Viewing the United Nations efforts on the protection of minorities, she had thought of the protection of majorities. Sometimes millions of people living in their own country were discriminated against by a small foreign minority more harshly than any minority group. The Arab majority in Palestine had been discriminated against to the extent that they had been made a minority in their own country. Now that Arabs in Palestine were a minority, she hoped that they would at least be granted the protection accorded to other minorities, and that the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities would read the statements of Arab representatives in the Committee and look into that case of discrimination.

25. The fifteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.850/Rev.1), even in its revised form, did not fully dispel her doubts about its effectiveness. While her delegation would vote for it, it hoped that the basic material which UNESCO was invited to prepare would place particular emphasis on the practical action of the United Nations and its related agencies.

26. Mr. KANO (Nigeria) said that the changes that had been made in the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.3/L.848/Rev.2) had altered the very character of the text. By deleting the request for a report on manifestations of racial and national hatred, the Committee had precluded United Nations action on the matter and had virtually closed its eyes to the whole affair. As a new member of the Committee, his delegation had been deeply disappointed and hoped that something more tangible would be done at the following session.

27. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the seven-Power revised draft resolution on United Nations assistance for the advancement of women in developing countries (A/C.3/L.847/Rev.1).

28. Mrs. DEMBINSKA (Poland) asked for a separate vote on the clause in operative paragraph 1 which read: "that they will collaborate with the Secretary-General in the study which he has undertaken in compliance with resolution 771 H (XXX) of the Council".

At the request of the Greek representative, 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, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Against: Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Austria, Mali, Morocco, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Togo.

The clause was adopted by 64 votes to 11, with 6 abstentions.

29. Mrs. DEMBINSKA (Poland) asked for a separate vote on operative paragraph 1.

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

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

In favour: Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation

of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary.

Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 70 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted unanimously.

30. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Czechoslovak revised draft resolution on manifestations of racial and national hatred, as amended (A/C.3/L.848/Rev.2).

31. Miss ADDISON (Ghana) asked for a separate vote on operative paragraph 2, as amended.

The preamble and operative paragraph 1, as amended, were adopted by 78 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

At the request of the Moroccan representative, the vote on operative paragraph 2, as amended, was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Libya, Mali.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Nigeria, Union of South Africa, China, Ghana, Liberia.

Operative paragraph 2, as amended, was adopted by 76 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

At the request of the Moroccan representative, the vote on the draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Spain, Sudan,

Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Against: None.

Abstaining: China, Ethiopia, Union of South Africa.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 78 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

32. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the fifteen-Power draft resolution on the teaching of the purposes and principles, the structure and activities of the United Nations and its related agencies (A/C.3/L.850/Rev.1).

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

33. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the ten-Power draft resolution on low-cost housing and related community facilities (A/C.3/L.851/Rev.1).

34. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on the preamble and on each of the operative paragraphs.

The preamble was adopted unanimously.

Operative paragraph 1 was adopted unanimously.

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 69 votes to 9, with 1 abstention.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted unanimously.

Operative paragraph 4 was adopted unanimously.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 71 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

35. Mrs. STEEN (Canada) said that her delegation had voted for the draft resolution on low-cost housing (A/C.3/L.851/Rev.1) because it believed that such programmes deserved very special attention from the United Nations. International action should, however, be complementary to national efforts in the matter. The amended draft resolution reflected the need for the Economic and Social Council to investigate the availability of financial resources in the countries concerned and also from existing international sources. Some technical assistance through United Nations programmes might also be required to ensure that outside capital was used to full effect. Her country had long experience of housing projects in hitherto uninhabited territory and would be glad to show visitors to Canada how its national and regional housing schemes worked. Even if countries had their own building materials, success in housing projects depended on technical skills and equipment. Canada would be willing to make available its skills to countries requiring advice or assistance.

36. Her delegation was gratified by the support given to the resolution on the teaching of United Nations subjects (A/C.3/L.850/Rev.1), which it had co-sponsored, and by the general spirit of compromise which had prevailed with regard to all the resolutions adopted.

Mr. Farhádi (Afghanistan), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

37. Mrs. ESHEL (Israel) regretted that no mention had been made in the fifteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.850/Rev.1) of the report prepared jointly every four years by the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Director-General of UNESCO, and hoped that the Committee's appreciation of that document could be mentioned in its report to the General Assembly. Her delegation had voted in favour of the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.3/L.848/Rev.2), but with some reservations, since the text had lost in revision some of its original forcefulness and honesty. She particularly regretted the failure to mention specifically resolution 6 (XVI) of the Commission on Human Rights and the elimination of the original fourth paragraph of the preamble, pointing to a very real danger in the education of youth in schools which an agency like UNESCO might have done much to combat. She strongly repudiated the accusation of discrimination against the Arab minority in Israel made earlier in the meeting by the representative of Iraq. Visitors to Israel were perfectly free to ascertain the facts for themselves and would find that Arabs enjoyed equal rights in Israel.

38. Mr. PEAL (Liberia) said that he had found the many changes, deletions and withdrawals of amendments to the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.3/

L.848/Rev.2) very confusing. While he was prepared to respect the Committee's desire for unanimity and speedy progress, he would like to leave on record the strong feelings of his delegation against discrimination from all sources, one of which the Czechoslovak resolution had courageously sought to specify. His delegation would maintain that position consistently in future.

Organization of work

39. The CHAIRMAN said that the next item on the agenda included the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (A/4378/Rev.1 and Add.1) and the report of the Secretary-General on the World Refugee Year (A/4546). He asked whether the Committee would prefer to consider those two matters separately.

40. After some discussion, Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia), supported by Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) and Begum Aziz AHMED (Pakistan), proposed that the Committee should first discuss the report of the High Commissioner and devote the remainder of the meetings allocated for the item to the study of the Secretary-General's report.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.