

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
 ASSEMBLY**

EIGHTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1232nd  
 MEETING**

Tuesday, 15 October 1963,  
 at 3.10 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	Page
<i>Agenda item 12:</i>	
<i>Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter IX, except section III; chapter X; and chapter XIII, section VII) . . . . .</i>	93
<i>Agenda item 43:</i>	
<i>Draft Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (continued) Article 9 (concluded). . . . .</i>	95

**Chairman: Mr. Humberto DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile).**

**AGENDA ITEM 12**

Report of the Economic and Social Council (A/5503, chapter IX, except section III; chapter X; and chapter XIII, section VII)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to hear a statement made under item 12 of the agenda of the General Assembly by Mr. B. R. Sen, Director-General of FAO. He recalled that Mr. Sen had devoted himself with admirable zeal to relieving the sufferings of the innumerable victims of malnutrition.
2. He added that he had recently attended the World Food Congress in Washington as chairman of the Chilean delegation. His distress at the thought of millions of people suffering from hunger had been a little alleviated by the hope that international co-operation, the advance of science and technology, social and cultural reforms and short- and long-term research would help to improve the lot of those unfortunate people.
3. The problems with which FAO had to deal were directly connected with problems of human rights. If the dignity of man was to be enhanced, more must be done than grant him certain rights such as freedom of association and of expression; he must also have enough to eat. Food resources must therefore be augmented and the task grew more and more pressing as the population continued to increase so rapidly.
4. Mr. SEN (Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) recalled that, fifteen years previously, the General Assembly had unanimously adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—an act of history. The Universal Declaration had been a symbol of the new age that was being born following the agonies of two world wars. The new generations demanded the end of all basic causes of war—hatred, fear, exploitation and want. For the first time, man had been willing to bind himself by an instrument of moral and legal authority, demanding the universal recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all

members of the human family as the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world.

5. It was understandable that the framers of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should have placed their primary emphasis on civil rights and personal freedoms. Although civil rights had been firmly established in several democratic societies, the two world wars had disrupted them more than any others. Many nations had yet had to attain self-government and the restrictions on the civil rights of their population had occupied their attention more than anything else.

6. But in the fifteen years since the adoption of the Universal Declaration, one-third of the human race had achieved political independence, and economic development had become the standard by which people everywhere were measuring the value of political freedom. Although man's struggle for civil and political rights had been immeasurably strengthened by the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, progress in regard to economic and social rights had been small. That was perhaps due to the absence of an urgent call to mankind, through the Universal Declaration, to regard freedom from hunger as one of man's first freedoms and to act to eliminate it. In fact, article 25 of the Universal Declaration had been couched in somewhat too general terms and the right to food was mentioned only as one of a whole complex of desirable social security targets.

7. According to FAO's Third World Food Survey<sup>1/</sup> there were in the world today nearly 500 million persons who were going hungry and over 1,000 million more who suffered from malnutrition. According to forecasts, if the world population continued to grow at its present rate, it would double within the next thirty-five years and, if food production continued to lag behind, there would at the end of the century be 3,000 million persons underfed or malnourished. History taught that the discontent of such vast masses was almost certain to break out in grave social disorders or even revolutions. It was against that background that FAO had launched the Freedom from Hunger Campaign three years previously, with a view to focusing world attention on the dimensions of the problem and to mobilizing public opinion to combat the scourge of hunger. Since then some progress had been made and world leaders had lent their support to an essentially humanitarian cause. He referred in particular to the encyclical Pacem in terris, in which Pope John XXIII had affirmed man's right to living conditions compatible with his dignity. The time had come for a vast collective movement of aid and solidarity, to help the millions unable to attain the degree of development that the progress of science ought to enable them to achieve. But that aid must be given with full respect for the liberty of the developing

<sup>1/</sup> FAO, Basic Studies supporting the Freedom from Hunger Campaign, No. 11 (Rome, 1963).

peoples. They must feel themselves principally responsible for their economic and social progress.

8. He also drew attention to the Manifesto issued on 14 March 1963 by the world-renowned statesmen who had met in the Special Assembly on Man's Right to Freedom from Hunger at FAO headquarters. They too had stressed the fact that freedom from hunger was man's fundamental right, and they had suggested national and international action for abolishing hunger and thereby improving human relations.

9. Finally, he commented on the Declaration issued by the World Food Congress in June 1963.<sup>2/</sup> That Declaration stated that the persistence of hunger and malnutrition was unacceptable morally and socially, and was incompatible with the dignity of human beings; the elimination of hunger was the primary task of all men and women, and the obligation to achieve it was inherent in the pledge of the nations under the United Nations Charter to take joint and separate action to achieve higher standards of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development as indispensable elements of peace.

10. The three documents he had cited demonstrated the mounting concern of world leaders over the problem of hunger, a concern which was also reflected in the proclamation of the United Nations Development Decade. The approaching celebration of the fifteenth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the preparation of the draft International Covenants on Human Rights by the Third Committee, provided a fresh opportunity to consider the problem of hunger. In that connexion, he pointed out that man's fundamental right to freedom from hunger was in fact mentioned in the combined articles 11 and 12 of the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (see A/3525, para. 144) but it was not clearly defined, and the Covenant gave no detailed enumeration of the measures which should be taken to ensure the enjoyment of the right, although that had been done in the case of other rights. The Committee should accordingly re-examine the question so as to give that right its proper importance. He suggested that, when the Committee came to examine the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, it might consider a draft article, after the combined articles 11 and 12, reading as follows:

\*1. The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to be free from hunger. They undertake, individually and through international co-operation, to develop programmes aimed at achieving freedom from hunger within the shortest possible time.

\*2. The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize that, with a view to achieving the full realization of this right, national and international action should be geared to the realization of this right by paying particular attention to:

(a) Policies to ensure that world food supplies are shared on a rational and equitable basis;

(b) Economic, technical and other measures to increase the production of food;

(c) The adaptation of existing institutions, including systems of land tenure and land use, to the requirements of economic and social progress; and

(d) The promotion and full utilization of scientific and technical knowledge and a massive education of the population in order to improve methods of production, conservation and distribution of food.\*

11. Mr. ELUCHANS (Chile) thanked the Director-General of FAO for his statement and expressed his delegation's sincere admiration for the valuable work being done by FAO. Chile was participating as far as its resources allowed in the world-wide Freedom from Hunger Campaign.

12. Man could not attain his full development or have a sense of his own dignity if he was suffering from hunger. There was therefore a pressing need to create a world movement to mobilize all the resources and the technical equipment available to the twentieth century, in the service of the hungry.

13. While reserving his right to examine in greater detail the new article proposed by the Director-General of FAO, he could say there and then that he approved of the idea of including a special article, on the right to freedom from hunger, in the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. His delegation thought that it was absurd to accord man material and moral rights and freedoms if he was not at the same time freed from hunger and suffering.

14. Mr. BEAUFORT (Netherlands) was sure that many delegations would wish to associate themselves with him in thanking the Director-General of FAO for his address, in which he entreated the Committee to devote the utmost attention to the elimination of hunger.

15. If the struggle against racial discrimination was essentially a battle to be fought in the minds of men, the efforts to ensure every human being the right to be free from hunger required only the will and firm determination to solve a problem which, although vast and difficult, was not beyond the technical capabilities of the present age. He congratulated FAO on its efforts in that field and in particular on the coming into existence of the World Food Programme which the Netherlands delegation and Government warmly supported as a practical and realistic step towards the solution of the problem and also as a manifestation of co-operation between the United Nations and FAO.

16. Mr. RAZGAILAH (Tunisia) associated himself entirely with the gratitude that the Chairman had expressed to the Director-General of FAO whose aim was to eliminate hunger by increasing the production of food and distributing it as fairly as possible. He believed that the efforts of FAO would help to do away with that hateful aspect of under-development. The fundamental rights and the very dignity of man were at stake in that struggle.

17. Mr. MACIEL (Brazil) added his thanks to those of the other delegations. The Director-General of FAO was one of the foremost leaders in the fight against hunger. Brazil was not free from that scourge, as the population of a region in the north-west had a lower level of nutrition than was considered necessary for survival.

18. The problem of hunger affected many countries and in some of its aspects, such as malnutrition and protein deficiency, it was a matter concerning public health. The question also interested demographers, since it appeared that under-nourishment was accompanied by an increased birth-rate. The Director-

<sup>2/</sup> For the text of the Declaration, see FAO, *Freedom from Hunger Campaign News*, vol. 4, No. 25 (September, 1963).

General of FAO had stated that increase in food production was not keeping pace with the population increase. It was thus to be feared that the problem might grow worse in the future.

19. He, too, thought that the fight against hunger should be one of the Committee's chief subjects of concern. The solution of that problem was certainly not easy and many economic, social and political factors had to be taken into account. The Brazilian delegation would give further study to the text proposed by the Director-General of FAO when the Third Committee came to item 48 of the agenda of the General Assembly (Draft International Covenants on Human Rights), but it could without hesitation assure Mr. Sen and FAO of its entire co-operation.

20. The CHAIRMAN stated that the Third Committee would give careful consideration to the proposal made by the Director-General of FAO to insert a new article in the Draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

#### AGENDA ITEM 43

Draft Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (A/5459, A/5503, chap X, sect. II; E/3743, paras. 89-145; A/C.3/L.1067, A/C.3/L.1085, A/C.3/L.1090 and Add.1, A/C.3/L.1126/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1127-1130) (continued)

#### ARTICLE 9 (concluded)

21. Mr. SHERVANI (India) wished to reply to the objections that had been made to the sub-amendments (A/C.3/L.1127) which his own and seven other delegations had proposed to the nine-Power amendments (A/C.3/L.1090 and Add.1), for those objections seemed to him to be due to a misunderstanding.

22. The words "and other", which the Saudi Arabian representative wished to see deleted from the eight-Power text were actually intended to strengthen the article, for States must not only adopt legislative measures, but also enforce them, and for such enforcement other measures were necessary.

23. Similarly, the term "outlaw" was stronger than the words "be prohibited and disbanded", which appeared in the nine-Power text, for an organization could appeal against being prohibited but if it were outlawed, it could no longer claim the protection of the courts: the insertion, before that term, of the word "or" was explained by the fact that so drastic a measure as outlawing could not be justified in all cases, but only when court action had not had the desired results.

24. The Byelorussian sub-amendments (A/C.3/L.1128) scarcely seemed justified since the declaration as a whole was directed against racial discrimination and organizations which encouraged it, and since the words which it would introduce into the eight-Power text already occurred elsewhere in the draft; an idea was not necessarily strengthened by repetition. He hoped that the Byelorussian representative would withdraw his sub-amendments.

25. As regards the text proposed for paragraph 3 by Cameroon, Guinea and Senegal (A/C.3/L.1130), it contained the words "prohibit" and "disband", which were, as he had already explained, less strong than the term "outlaw". Furthermore, it had the disadvantage of not mentioning the legislative measures which States, that had not yet enacted any, should

adopt in order to be able to undertake effective action.

26. As regards the sub-amendment proposed by Albania (A/C.3/L.1129), racialism, which was the business of the Committee, should not be mixed up with a political problem, such as fascism. As this was a declaration on racialism, the Albanian sub-amendment seemed to him unnecessary. He appealed to all the authors of sub-amendments to the eight-Power text to withdraw them. If they were maintained, the eight sponsors might be in the embarrassing position of having to vote against those texts, for their draft represented a compromise on which a certain amount of agreement had been reached and they did not wish to depart from it. He stated that the eight-Power sub-amendments introduced by him (1231st meeting), if approved as they were, would secure for article 9 the largest measure of support and that would increase the moral force behind the declaration.

27. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) said that the Indian representative had just strengthened his own delegation's intention to support the eight-Power text, although it was not the wording it would have preferred for article 9. His delegation appreciated greatly the conciliatory efforts made by the authors of that text.

28. Despite the spirit of co-operation which the Comeroonian, Guinean and Senegalese delegation had also shown, the wording that they proposed for paragraph 3 presented the same fundamental difficulties for him as the nine-Power text. For the reasons already given by the Indian representative, he would be obliged to vote against their amendment and he hoped that those delegations would give one more proof of their willingness to compromise by not pressing for a vote.

29. He was equally unable to support the Albanian sub-amendment, for the declaration must be directed against racial discrimination in general, and not against any one of its forms. He would also vote against the Byelorussian sub-amendments, for the same reasons as the Indian representative.

30. Mrs. ARIBOT (Guinea) emphasized that, in proposing their amendment to the eight-Power text, the Cameroonian, Senegalese and her own delegations had not intended to reject the text as a whole, but simply to improve paragraph 3. It had often been said in the course of the discussion that the declaration must be drawn up in simple and precise terms and it was to achieve such simplicity that they proposed the deletion of the opening phrase. Where her delegation was concerned, the three-Power amendment reflected a clear political and social position and if the authors of the eight-Power text could not accept it as a compromise, she would be obliged to maintain it.

31. The CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to vote.

#### Paragraph 1

*The eight-Power text (A/C.3/L.1127) was adopted by 87 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.*

32. Mr. TEKLE (Ethiopia) remarked that, as the eight-Power text constituted sub-amendments to the nine-Power amendments, the Committee should vote separately on each of the sub-amendments listed in document A/C.3/L.1127.

33. The CHAIRMAN stated that the first three of those sub-amendments had been expressly incorporated in the eight-Power text of article 9, paragraph 1, and that the Committee had therefore adopted them in adopting that paragraph.

*Paragraph 2*

34. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote point 1 of the Byelorussian sub-amendments (A/C.3/L.1129).

*Point 1 of the Byelorussian sub-amendments (A/C.3/L.1128) was rejected by 37 votes to 25, with 30 abstentions.*

35. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the eight-Power text of paragraph 2 of article 9 (A/C.3/L.1127).

*The eight-Power text of paragraph 2 (A/C.3/L.1127) was adopted by 80 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 3*

*A vote was taken by roll-call on the three-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.1130).*

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

*In favour:* Poland, Romania, Senegal, Tanganyika, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Mali, Mongolia.

*Against:* Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yemen, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Guatemala, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal.

*Abstaining:* Niger, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Afghanistan, Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cyprus, Ethiopia, Gabon, Iran, Israel, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritania, Morocco.

*The three-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.1130) was rejected by 47 votes to 29, with 27 abstentions.*

36. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Saudi Arabian representative had asked for a separate vote on the words "and other" between the words "legislative" and "measures" in paragraph 3 of the eight-Power text of article 9 (A/C.3/L.1127).

37. Miss WACHUKU (Nigeria) objected to the request for a separate vote: the deletion of those words might well destroy the delicate balance of the text.

38. The CHAIRMAN remarked that, under rule 130 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Saudi Arabian representative's motion for division would have to be put to the vote.

39. Mr. IVANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), supported by Mr. DEIGADO (Senegal), asked for a separate vote on the word "or" in the same text (A/C.3/L.1127).

40. Miss WACHUKU (Nigeria) objected to that separate vote also.

41. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) interpreted the Nigerian representative's objection as applying to any separate vote on the proposed text of paragraph 3, and he unreservedly supported that position.

42. The CHAIRMAN stated that the question of the separate vote requested by the Saudi Arabian representative would have to be settled first.

43. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that, to facilitate proceedings, he was ready to withdraw his motion for a vote by division and propose the outright deletion of the words "and other".

44. Mr. SHERVANI (India) felt that the proposal was not in order, since it constituted a sub-amendment and, in accordance with the decision taken by the Committee that very morning (1231st meeting), should have been submitted before noon.

45. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) asked the Chairman to rule on the matter. If the proposal to delete the words "and other" was ruled out of order, he would maintain his request for a separate vote.

46. The CHAIRMAN stated that, under rule 131, the Saudi Arabian representative's proposal was certainly an amendment and that the Saudi Arabian representative should therefore revert to his motion for division, to which the Nigerian representative had objected. He would allow two speakers in favour of the motion and two speakers against it.

47. Mr. YAPOU (Israel) pointed out that the eight-Power proposals constituted sub-amendments to the nine-Power amendments, which should be regarded as the basic text. It was therefore entirely logical to take a separate vote on words which did not occur in the last mentioned text.

48. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta) supported the motion for division, as the words "and other" seemed superfluous in a text which already mentioned "positive measures including legislative ... measures".

49. Mr. SHERVANI (India) was opposed to a separate vote on the words "and other". He had already explained the reasons why they had been included in the proposed text and he feared that if they were deleted some countries might adopt legislation without taking the necessary measures to put it into effect.

50. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Saudi Arabian representative's motion for division.

*The motion was adopted by 43 votes to 25, with 28 abstentions.*

*The words "and other" were adopted by 58 votes to 18, with 20 abstentions.*

51. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Albanian sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1129).

52. Mr. DAS (Secretary of the Committee) pointed out that a correction to the French translation of the eight-Power sub-amendments had been issued in document A/C.3/L.1127/Corr.2 and that the French version of the Albanian sub-amendment to paragraph 3 of the eight-Power text should be altered accordingly. He further drew attention to the fact that the English version of the Albanian sub-amendment had a different presentation from the French version. The Albanian sub-amendment actually fell into two parts, the first

calling for the deletion of the word "or" in the English text—translated into French by "le cas échéant" and into Spanish by "llegado el caso", and the second for the addition of the words "all racist and fascist organizations and".

53. Mr. DELGADO (Senegal) recalled that the USSR delegation had asked for a separate vote on the word "or"; he had intended to do so himself, but now realized that such a request would have the same effect as the first Albanian amendment.

54. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the word "or".

*The word "or" was adopted by 61 votes to 20, with 17 abstentions.*

55. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that he had intended to ask for a separate vote on the words "and/or outlaw" in the eight-Power sub-amendments. However, in deference to the Albanian representative and in view of the fact that it might be difficult to decide whether his request on part (b) of the Albanian sub-amendment was further removed from the original text—the eight-Power sub-amendments—he would await the result of the vote on part (b) of the Albanian sub-amendment to see whether or not a request for a separate vote on the words "and/or outlaw" was justified.

*A vote was taken by roll-call on part (b) of the Albanian sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1129).*

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

*In favour:* Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Israel, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania.

*Against:* Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

*Abstaining:* Algeria, Burma, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Dahomey, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Tanganyika, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Yemen, Afghanistan.

*Part (b) of the Albanian sub-amendment was rejected by 50 votes to 13, with 41 abstentions.*

56. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that he would not press for a separate vote on the words "and/or outlaw".

57. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on point 2 of the Byelorussian sub-amendments (A/C.3/L.1126).

*Point 2 of the Byelorussian sub-amendments was adopted by 44 votes to 31, with 21 abstentions.*

58. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the eight-Power text proposed for paragraph 3, as amended.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Trinidad and Tobago, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Syria, Tanganyika, Thailand, Togo,

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yemen, Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Mongolia, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sweden.

*The eight-Power text of paragraph 3, as amended, was adopted by 64 votes to none, with 39 abstentions.*

59. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on article 9 as a whole, as amended.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Sierra Leone, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Burma, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Sweden, Tanganyika, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Romania.

*Article 9 as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 69 votes to none, with 33 abstentions.*

60. Mr. DELGADO (Senegal) proposed that the Committee should vote immediately on the draft resolution as a whole.

61. Mr. IVANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he wished to explain his vote on article 9. The Soviet Union delegation had not objected to the text which had just been adopted, for it improved certain points of the text prepared by the Commission on Human Rights. His delegation would, however, have preferred the nine-Power amendments (A/C.3/L.1090 and Add.1), which were drafted in clearer and stronger terms enjoining action to prevent the operation of racist and fascist organizations which advocated racial hatred and constituted a danger to peace and security. The USSR, which had fought with all its strength against fascism and the revival of fascism, would spare no effort to ensure that the convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, which was to be drafted by the Third Committee, provided for positive measures against racism and fascism. He proposed that the Committee should decide to draft the convention not later than at its nineteenth session. Since some of the ideas expressed in the text which his delegation had proposed for inclusion after article 9 had been introduced in the text just adopted, his delegation would not press its own text.

62. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, before voting on the draft as a whole, the Committee had still to

decide on a proposal to change the order of certain articles.

63. Mr. FINGER (United States of America), supported by Miss ADDISON (Ghana), thought it would be desirable for the Committee to vote, first on the remaining amendments and then on the draft as a whole, before hearing explanations of vote, which would consequently deal not only with article 9, but also with the draft Declaration as a whole.

64. Mr. KORVAID (Norway), supported by Mrs. MANTZOULINOS (Greece) and Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), said that, since the representative of the Soviet Union had explained his vote on article 9 immediately, all delegations should be given the same opportunity, especially in view of the importance of the article.

65. Mr. GOODHART (United Kingdom) shared the opinion of the representative of Norway; he suggested that the Committee should hear explanations of vote on article 9 at the beginning of the 1233rd meeting.

66. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the United Kingdom representative's proposal should be adopted.

*It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.