

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records

**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1312th
MEETING**

Wednesday, 20 October 1965,
at 3.30 p.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 58:</i>	
<i>Draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (continued)</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolutions</i>	115

Chairman: Mr. Francisco CUEVAS CANCINO
(Mexico).

AGENDA ITEM 58

Draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (*continued*) (A/5803, chap. IX, sect. I; A/5921; E/3873, chap. II and annexes I and III; A/C.3/L.1208, L.1210, L.1211, L.1217, L.1219 to L.1223, L.1225, L.1226 and Corr.1, A/C.3/L.1228, L.1231 and Corr.1, A/C.3/L.1236, L.1237, L.1239, L.1241 to L.1244)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to consider the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Greece and Hungary (A/C.3/L.1244).
2. Mr. COMAY (Israel) said that his delegation opposed the draft resolution because it considered it essential that anti-Semitism, with which the entire history and fate of every generation of the Jewish people had been tragically bound up, should be expressly mentioned in the draft Convention.
3. The history of the Jewish people was that of a branch of the human family which had been singled out for cruel hostility and savage persecution. Anti-Semitism, which had assumed at different times religious, racial, economic and cultural aspects, was unfortunately not something which belonged to the remote past, for, after having reached its culminating horror in the twentieth century with the atrocities of the Hitler régime, the declared aim of which was to ensure the "final solution of the Jewish question" by systematically exterminating all Jews in cold blood, anti-Semitism had now become the stock-in-trade of every political group aiming to subvert democratic institutions and freedoms. It was thus precisely because anti-Semitism continued to exist in the world that it must be mentioned expressly in the Convention.
4. In any case, it was difficult to conceive how the Convention could pass over such a monstrous evil in silence when it owed its origin to the manifestations of anti-Semitism which had occurred in a number of

countries in 1959 and 1960. When the United Nations had tackled the question of manifestations of anti-Semitism and other forms of racial prejudice and religious intolerance of a similar nature the general consensus had been that anti-Semitism was not a matter of religious intolerance alone and that it was necessary to draft a separate convention dealing with the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination.

5. The Israeli delegation was well aware that a number of delegations opposed the enumeration of the evils engendered by racial prejudice, but it wished to point out that anti-Semitism would not be the only evil to be expressly mentioned in the Convention, for racial segregation and apartheid were referred to in article III, which had been unanimously approved, and there was a reference to colonialism in the preamble. There appeared to be no reason therefore why anti-Semitism should not be treated in the same way. Thus, the Tanzanian representative's arguments in favour of an express reference to nazism applied equally for anti-Semitism, for a phenomenon having such far-reaching social and political consequences surely warranted explicit attention in a convention on racial discrimination. In that connexion, his delegation naturally welcomed the Bolivian amendment (A/C.3/L.1236) which would condemn nazism in all its forms and manifestations.

6. He wished to point out that anti-Semitism had not only been a source of suffering for the Jews, but had frequently been used to distract the attention of the rest of the population from real social evils. The nazi movement, in particular, had exploited anti-Semitism as a way of sapping the resistance of the peoples which it intended to conquer and which it had eventually reduced to slavery after appalling massacres. He was happy to see, in that connexion, that a number of Governments and important Church bodies were striving to put public opinion on its guard against the evils of anti-Semitism; he had in mind particularly the statement in which the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR had called upon the population to oppose anti-Semitism and the resolution against anti-Semitism which the Ecumenical Council of the Catholic Church was in the process of adopting.

7. As far as the Soviet amendment (A/C.3/L.1231 and Corr.1) was concerned, his delegation considered it totally unacceptable that that amendment should bracket Zionism together with anti-Semitism, nazism and neo-nazism; whether that amendment had been put forward for reasons of political opportunism or in order so to complicate the work of the Committee as to achieve the elimination from the Convention of any reference to anti-Semitism, it was an affront to Israel and to the Jewish people everywhere. Zionism

was the Jewish national movement which had given birth to the State of Israel, and it was perhaps one of the oldest movements for national self-determination. It had been endorsed by the United Nations in 1947 when the General Assembly (resolution 181 (II)) had voted by an overwhelming majority for the restoration of Jewish independence. It was worth recalling that the Soviet Union had at that time fully associated itself with the majority, thus endorsing Zionism, and it was therefore difficult to understand why the Soviet delegation was now trying to have Zionism condemned in the Convention under consideration. Perhaps the Soviet delegation was trying to deflect international attention from the grave situation in the USSR, where the Jewish population was being persecuted in matters of religion, traditions, language and literature, and was in a serious plight which had distressed world public opinion, including many distinguished personalities who could not be accused of any ill-will towards the Soviet Union. While it was only fair to say that some positive gestures had been made of late, it had to be acknowledged also that the situation of the Jewish community had scarcely improved.

8. The delegation of Israel protested in the strongest terms against the Soviet amendment, which lumped Zionism together with such evil and inhuman forces as anti-Semitism and nazism, of which Jews were the chief victims. It appealed to the Committee to give its overwhelming support to the Bolivian amendment and vote for the deletion of the word "Zionism" from the Soviet proposal. The Committee could not adopt a convention on the elimination of racial discrimination without resolving specifically that enlightened humanity must do everything in its power to eradicate that evil and banish it from its midst forever.

9. Mrs. JIMENEZ (Cuba) said that while her delegation condemned racial discrimination wherever it manifested itself, it considered that the various forms which such discrimination could assume should be combined in some general expression lest some forms be omitted. Her delegation would therefore support unreservedly the draft resolution submitted by Greece and Hungary (A/C.3/L.1244), which satisfied that requirement.

10. Mr. DARMAN (Somalia) also supported the draft resolution because it sought to make the text of the Convention of universal application and that goal might be jeopardized if particular forms of racial discrimination were expressly mentioned.

11. Mr. LAWREY (Australia) said that his delegation would oppose the draft resolution submitted by Greece and Hungary. It was moved by a strong feeling that it would be wrong to allow the vicious and irrational form of discrimination called anti-Semitism to pass without specific condemnation.

12. Anti-Semitic activity was a concrete fact of history. Through the centuries it had manifested itself in many and often terrible forms as had been recalled eloquently by the delegation of Israel. Present times had seen Hitler's attempt not merely to persecute but to exterminate Europe's Jewish communities. Unhappily anti-Semitic attitudes and practices were not absent from the world of 1965, nor were they so insignificant that they could be passed over in silence or condemned merely by implication.

13. There had been some argument about the nature of anti-Semitism. So far as the Australian delegation was concerned it knew very well what anti-Semitism was, it knew that it existed in the world today and it believed that it should be condemned and eradicated. Anti-Semitism was a form of discrimination against—at its worst persecution of—human beings, not because of their acts, but because they had been born Jews. So far as it took the form of banning or limiting the practice of the religion of Judaism it was a manifestation of religious intolerance, which Australia deplored. But anti-Semitism was more than that. It was an ever-present and particularly repugnant form of racial discrimination.

14. The Australian delegation accordingly favoured condemning anti-Semitism and of writing into the draft Convention a provision for combating it.

15. Mr. ABDEL-RAHIM (Sudan) said that he had listened with surprise to the Israel representative's remarks which depicted anti-Semitism as a universal phenomenon, for while anti-Semitism certainly existed, it could not reasonably be claimed that it was rife in all countries of the world. Racial discrimination, and especially anti-Semitism, was virtually unknown in Afro-Asian countries in general and certainly not in the Arab and Moslem countries: a fact which had traditionally been acknowledged even by Jewish historians—at any rate till the rise of Zionism and the State of Israel.

16. Since the birth of Zionism and of Israel, determined attempts had been made to depict the Arab countries as being anti-Semitic, whereas in reality those countries had always been havens for victims of persecution especially during the Middle Ages when both Jews and Muslims were subjected to various forms of persecution in different parts of Europe. Although the traditional pattern of friendship and understanding between Jews and Arabs had recently been modified in certain respects it was important to remember that the present conflict between Jews and Arabs was in no way a manifestation of anti-Semitism but was in fact a war being fought against Zionist imperialism. For the Arabs, Israel was what South Africa was to the African nationalists and Zionism was the equivalent of apartheid.

17. While it was quite true that the term anti-Semitism normally referred to Jews and not to Arabs who formed the great majority of Semites in the world it was important to remember that the term had been used and was still being used by different writers—including some who were themselves Jewish but not Zionist—in different senses and, especially, to indicate, on the one hand, the prejudices which Jews of oriental origin encountered in Israel and, on the other hand, the hostility which existed in Israel towards the Arabs. The Arabs, for their part, opposed Zionism as an ideology and Israel as a State, but they were in no way anti-Semitic.

18. With regard to the origins of the Zionist movement, of which the Israel representative had spoken, he noted that it was religious Zionism which went back to ancient times, not political Zionism, which had begun in the nineteenth century and was a reaction against anti-Semitism in Europe, which like the colour bar was a phenomenon peculiar to European

civilization, and was alien to the African and Asian civilizations. In that connexion, it was interesting to note that the Zionist movement, the object of which was to solve the problem of anti-Semitism by the establishment of a Jewish national home, had not sought to achieve that solution at the expense of the peoples who had tried to wipe the Jews off the face of the earth, but at the expense of other peoples. It was well known that the leaders of the Zionist movement considered the establishment of their proposed Jewish State in East Africa and in South America before they finally decided to focus their attention on Palestine. And when they finally settled for Palestine the Zionists treated the Palestinian Arabs as atrociously as the nazis had treated the Jews. While anti-Semitism was of course to be deplored, the fact of having been persecuted did not give the Jews the right to persecute the Palestinian Arabs or Jews of non-European origin. Israel, incidentally, had been repeatedly censured for acting in violation of United Nations resolutions, and for committing acts of violence against the Palestinian Arabs.

19. His delegation would support unreservedly the draft resolution presented by Greece and Hungary, not only because the Sudan condemned racial discrimination in all its forms, but also because it believed that a listing of the various forms of racial discrimination might weaken the Convention. Such a listing would be unwise not only because it would be difficult to draw up an exhaustive list, but also because there was no guarantee that other forms of racial discrimination might not one day emerge which would be automatically excluded from the scope of the Convention; the absence of the former from the Convention might in fact even give them a kind of implicit sanction. Moreover, as had been pointed out before, the differences of opinion to which any listing would give rise would be so great that the Committee would be unable to achieve unanimity; and unanimity was essential on a text of such importance as the Convention. In any event, in a legal document of that kind, the most important question was that of principle. And on the principle that all forms of racial discrimination must be abolished all the members of the Committee were agreed. The Convention should state unequivocally a universal principle which would apply to all forms of racial discrimination and would be equally valid for the past, the present and the future.

20. Mr. COMAY (Israel) speaking on a point of order, said that, while the conflict between Israel and the Arab countries was unfortunately an undeniable fact of contemporary history, it should not be referred to in the present debate. Hence, although he had felt obliged to explain the nature of Zionism—a question which had been brought up by delegates other than his own—he had carefully avoided any reference to that conflict.

21. Not to exacerbate the discussion, he would refrain from refuting—as he could very easily do—the arguments of the representative of the Sudan, who had hurled accusations against Israel which it was difficult not to answer.

22. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) observed that the Israel representative, who had asked for the floor on a point of order, was overstepping his rights.

23. Mr. LAMPTEY (Ghana) moved the closure of the debate under rule 118 of the rules of procedure. He believed that to be the only means of preserving the spirit of harmony which was indispensable to the work of the Committee. His delegation was animated by a sincere desire to maintain the objectivity of the debate, and was not in any way seeking to deprive the representatives of sovereign States in the Committee of the right to speak. They would be able to express their views when explaining their vote.

24. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with rule 118, he would give the floor to two speakers opposing the closure.

25. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) drew the attention of the representative of Ghana to the fact that many delegations, including his own, far from wishing to exacerbate the debate, desired only to contribute usefully to it. In fact, as representatives of equal and sovereign States, they believed themselves entitled to take part in the debate.

26. If the representative of Ghana maintained his motion, he would be obliged to vote against it.

27. Mrs. VILLGRATNER (Austria) said that she agreed with the representative of Uruguay and opposed the closure of the debate.

The motion for the closure of the debate was adopted by 57 votes to 24, with 18 abstentions.

28. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with rule 129 of the rules of procedure, representatives would have an opportunity to explain their vote before or after the vote on the draft resolution submitted by Greece and Hungary (A/C.3/L.1244). Out of consideration for the speakers who had been unable to take the floor on account of the closure of the debate, he felt that it would be preferable to decide on the latter alternative.

29. Mrs. VILLGRATNER (Austria) said that she would prefer to speak before the vote.

30. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) said that he too would prefer, as would probably many other delegations, to speak before the vote. The statement which he intended to make was directly related to the question on which the Committee was to vote.

31. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that he also would have liked to speak before the vote, but he agreed with the Chairman that it would be wiser to postpone the explanations of vote until afterwards. In that way, it would be possible to avoid the delays and last-minute attempts at persuasion, which, although understandable, were nevertheless liable to obscure the issue and delay its solution.

32. The CHAIRMAN proposed that explanations of vote should be given after the balloting.

The Chairman's proposal was adopted by 77 votes to 8, with 12 abstentions.

33. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the members of the Committee to the draft resolution submitted by Greece and Hungary. In reply to a question by Mr. RIOS (Panama), he said that, should that draft be adopted, the following proposals would become

redundant: the first Polish amendment (A/C.3/L.1210) and the oral amendment thereto proposed by Jordan at the 1301st meeting; part (b) of the second Czechoslovak amendment (A/C.3/L.1220) and the United States amendment thereto (A/C.3/L.1243); the proposal for a new article submitted by Brazil and the United States (A/C.3/L.1211), the amendment thereto by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (A/C.3/L.1231 and Corr.1) and the Bolivian sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1236).

34. Mrs. SECONINOVA (Czechoslovakia) observed that her delegation's amendment was sufficiently broad in scope to be maintained even in the event of the adoption of the draft resolution A/C.3/L.1244.

35. The CHAIRMAN said that the Czechoslovak delegation itself would have to decide, after the vote on the draft resolution, whether to maintain its amendment in its existing form, or in an amended form.

At the request of the representative of Togo, the vote on the draft resolution of Greece and Hungary (A/C.3/L.1244) was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of the), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina.

Against: Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Austria.

Abstaining: China, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Haiti, Italy, Ivory Coast, Mexico, Venezuela.

The draft resolution of Greece and Hungary (A/C.3/L.1244) was adopted by 82 votes to 12, with 10 abstentions.

36. Mr. CHKHIKVADZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished first to thank the African and Asian countries for their tireless efforts to achieve the unanimous adoption of the draft Convention. Indeed, the great majority of the Committee, guided by the Chairman's example, had worked to that end in a remarkably co-operative spirit.

37. He regretted that the Israel representative, untouched by that evident spirit of goodwill, had

tried, in the statement he had just made, to impede the adoption of the Convention, although that should represent the crowning of the Committee's work.

38. The Israel delegation had decided to raise once again the question of anti-Semitism, as it, and the delegations which were in league with it, had so often done for various motives during the last fifteen years. In doing so, and, more specifically, in accusing the Soviet Union of anti-Semitism, the Israel representative had had four aims in mind. He had wished, if possible, to distract the Third Committee's attention from its essential aim, which was the adoption of the draft Convention—a task in which his efforts had been facilitated by the attitude of certain Governments which, while giving lip service to the condemnation of discrimination, were not ready to legislate accordingly.

39. Failing that, his intention had been to make the adoption of the Convention more difficult by dividing the Committee. Moreover, by accusing the Soviet Union of anti-Semitism, the Israel representative had hoped to distract the Committee's attention from the acts of racial discrimination committed by certain imperialist and colonialist countries, in particular the United States of America. Finally, the manoeuvre had been aimed at helping the monopolies which were now preparing elections.

40. Needless to say, the Soviet Union vigorously condemned those cold-war tactics, which were indulged in not only by the Israel delegation but by all those which supported it. It would be better if those delegations had the courage of their convictions and came out clearly in favour of discrimination instead of resorting to such undermining activities.

41. He vigorously rejected the Israel representative's accusations. The Soviet Union, in its relations with its constituent peoples, based its policy on the ideology of Lenin. In Lenin's view, the Jewish workers were the brothers of all the other inhabitants of the Soviet Union in the struggle against their common enemy, capitalism. The Soviet Union did indeed make a distinction between those brothers in arms and the Zionists, but the Soviet Jews had a place of honour in the great family of peoples of the USSR.

42. Mr. USHER (Ivory Coast) said that he wished to explain his abstention during the three successive votes. He had been unable to support the motion for closing the debate because he had wished to take part in the substantive discussion; out of a spirit of solidarity he had not, however, cast a negative vote. In spite of his wish to express his point of view before the voting, he had found it difficult to vote against the Chairman's proposal and had, for that reason, again abstained. He had abstained from the third vote because he could not approve the political turn which the discussion had taken.

43. He regretted that nazism, which had been the cause of the last world conflagration, was only referred to in circumlocutions, in particular in the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft Convention. As its doctrines still had followers and were still openly based on the same ideologies, there should be no fear of calling things by their proper names.

44. He was convinced that the Convention should have condemned not only the doctrine but also the generally rejected practices of nazism, and regretted that considerations of expediency had prevented all delegations from adopting the same attitude. Some delegations had, indeed, referred to the difficulties that their parliaments would have in ratifying a convention containing the terms nazism and anti-Semitism. Although it wished to support the Afro-Asian countries, his delegation could not act in a way that was contrary to its deep convictions.
45. Mr. ROGERS (United States of America) had voted against the Greek-Hungarian draft resolution because his delegation was firmly convinced that anti-Semitism, which constituted a particularly dangerous form of racial discrimination, deserved special mention just as apartheid did. Thus, in conjunction with Brazil, his delegation had submitted an amendment to include in the Convention an article condemning anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism was one of the gravest and most persistent problems facing humanity, dating back over 2,000 years. Historically, it had been a barometer of the political health of States: where Jews had been unsafe, other minorities also soon found themselves in danger. That was what had happened in 1939. As a result of the explosion of anti-Semitism which the world had witnessed in 1959, the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had called the General Assembly's attention to the need for action. The Assembly had decided to prepare a declaration and a convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination.
46. During the last few months, there had been a degree of relaxation in some of the restrictions previously placed on Jewish life and Jewish worship. However, to suggest that those relaxations were as yet sufficient would be to ignore the fact that one country was still trying to stifle its Jewish population by preventing Jews from living according to their customs, depriving them of their schools, restricting their freedom of expression, forbidding Yiddish and Hebrew, and denying them their right to a nationality. Leading Jewish figures were not allowed to go abroad to take part in international meetings and ordinary Jewish citizens were denied their right to travel and settle in other lands.
47. It was to be hoped that after the stirring message of His Holiness Pope Paul VI, and the recent decision of the Ecumenical Council on the subject of the Jews, the situation of Jews throughout the world would continue to improve. In view of His Holiness's message and the decision of the Ecumenical Council, he regretted that the Committee had failed to take the opportunity offered it to condemn anti-Semitism by an overwhelming majority. However, it was clear that there was a general feeling condemning anti-Semitism and that anti-Semitism was covered by the terms of the Convention. The United States delegation remained attached to the principles of the Convention and would express its views on the plague of anti-Semitism in other United Nations organs.
48. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) had voted in favour of closing the discussion, not because he wished to prevent some delegations from expressing their point of view, but in a spirit of conciliation. He wished to exercise his right of reply and at the same time to make clear the meaning of his vote.
49. The term anti-Semitism was a specifically European one and he did not see why Europe should impose its way of thinking on the rest of the world. In Saudi Arabia Jews and Arabs were brothers and had the same customs and the same dietary habits. Africa and Asia had never known pogroms or ghettos: it was thus Europe which was hostile to the Jews. Nor must race be confused with religion: one should speak not of anti-Semitism but of anti-Judaism. Catholicism was also a Semitic religion, just as Islam was, so that anti-Semitism could be understood to mean any hostility to a black Mohammedan or a Scandinavian Christian.
50. Moreover, many Jews were loyal to the countries of which they were nationals and identified themselves not with Israel but with the countries in which they had always lived, just as the 20 million Negroes in the United States of America considered themselves to be Americans and not Africans.
51. He regretted that during the debate problems of a religious nature had served as a pretext for a renewal of the cold war, and considered that the United States had wished to exert pressure on the Soviet Union to allow Jews to leave its territory, when perhaps they did not even wish to do so.
52. He did not see by what right Israel claimed to represent the Jews of the whole world. There was no State which could set itself up as a spokesman for Islam either, as Islam was a religion and not a nationality and each sovereign State spoke in its own name.
53. After reviewing the evolution of the Palestine question during the First World War, he recalled the creation of a Jewish national home and the British Mandate, and described how the United Nations had been seized of the question, how, in the name of the Charter, it had recognized the right of the Jewish people to self-determination, and the circumstances in which it had decided upon the partition of Palestine, a decision which had been taken by a very narrow majority, thanks to the change of attitude of the Philippines and Liberia and, in his opinion, to the influence of certain pressure groups.
54. All States were free to condemn anti-Semitism and to adopt appropriate legislation if they so desired, but that was not the role of an international organization. He regretted that old wounds had been reopened and warned the Committee of the risk of rekindling passions which might again expose Jews who were loyal to their country of origin to becoming victims of racial hatred.
55. Mr. MOMMERSTEEG (Netherlands) had voted against the Greek-Hungarian draft resolution because, although he would have preferred that no form of racial discrimination should be mentioned in the text of the Convention, once article III, which expressly condemned apartheid, had been unanimously adopted, he saw no reason for not making a similar allusion to anti-Semitism. In memory of the 100,000 Netherlanders of Jewish descent who had perished

during the war, he had considered it his duty to take a firm stand in favour of an explicit condemnation of anti-Semitism. He respected the point of view of those delegations which thought otherwise, but failed to understand why the withdrawal of all the amendments had been linked to the withdrawal of the amendment condemning anti-Semitism and anti-Semitism alone. A vote in favour of the Greek-Hungarian draft resolution might have been interpreted as a refusal to condemn anti-Semitism, or at least as a mark of indifference and therefore, because it did not wish to minimize the magnitude of

that scourge, the Netherlands delegation had cast a negative vote.

56. The Netherlands delegation deplored the fact that the substantive debate had been prematurely closed and would at least have liked, like the Uruguayan and Austrian delegations, to have been able to speak before the vote.

57. Mr. ROGERS (United States of America) reserved his right to reply at a later date.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.