



CONTENTS

	Page
Draft first international covenant on human rights and measures of implementation (A/1384, A/C.3/534, A/C.3/535, E/1681 and A/C.3/L.76) (continued)	215

Chairman: Mr. G. J. VAN HEUVEN GOEDHART (Netherlands).

Draft first international covenant on human rights and measures of implementation (A/1384, A/C.3/534, A/C.3/535, E/1681 and A/C.3/L.76) (continued)

[Item 63]*

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY BRAZIL, TURKEY AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (A/C.3/L.76) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the United States amendment (A/C.3/L.98) to the amendments submitted by Yugoslavia (A/C.3/L.92) and the USSR (A/C.3/L.96) to the basic text (A/C.3/L.76).
2. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) explained that the purpose of the amendment submitted by her delegation was to bring the various opinions expressed by the members of the Third Committee to the attention of the Commission on Human Rights, in order to assist the latter body in preparing and perfecting the recommendations which it would submit to the General Assembly in 1951.
3. The Yugoslav and USSR proposals were quite unrealistic. As she had already emphasized at the previous meeting, some of the rights which the Yugoslav delegation wished to include in the covenant were being studied by the International Law Commission and by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. The text proposed by the USSR, by contrast, limited free expression of opinion by the phrase "in the interests of democracy". There might be some cause for concern lest the true interpretation of that phrase might be rather, "in the interests of the Soviet Union"; such an attitude had, indeed, been indicated by Mr. Vyshinsky in his book on Soviet law.
4. The purpose of the United States amendment was to request the Commission on Human Rights to consider the Yugoslav and USSR proposals when it

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

examined the final text of the draft covenant, without obliging it to include those proposals in the text of the covenant.

5. It had been said at the preceding meeting that the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.76) issued no precise directive to the Commission on Human Rights; in reply, Mrs. Roosevelt pointed out that paragraph 2 (e) of the draft resolution not only dealt with economic and social rights, but also provided for the drawing up of additional instruments and measures relating to all human rights not included in the covenant. That was clearly a constructive approach.

6. Mr. GARCIA BAUER (Guatemala) agreed with the delegations of the United States and of Egypt that it was inadvisable to make such specific recommendations as the USSR delegation proposed. In point of fact, some of the rights mentioned in the USSR proposal were already being studied by other organs of the United Nations, and the Commission on Human Rights should wait until those organs communicated the results of their work in that regard. Furthermore, the Commission on Human Rights should be allowed more freedom of action; it should merely be instructed to consider certain general questions.

7. Mr. MOODIE (Australia) recalled that the Commission on Human Rights had not been able to finish its work nor to proceed to a thorough second reading of the first eighteen articles of the draft covenant during the course of its sixth session. Accordingly the Commission should, at its next session, make an effort to improve the draft. Some articles, especially articles 8 and 14, were not satisfactory and Australia would propose a new text for article 14 to the Commission. He had not put it to the Third Committee because the Australian delegation did not feel that texts should be discussed by the Committee at the current stage. The Yugoslav amendment (A/C.3/L.92) was too vague in its statement that the wording was "inadequate".

8. Moreover, the Committee must not overburden the Commission on Human Rights by issuing too positive

instructions regarding new articles. In that connexion, the United States amendment met the requirements of the situation exactly; it would enable the Commission on Human Rights to study the new ideas presented during the meetings of the Third Committee.

9. He could not support the Egyptian amendment (A/C.3/L.97/Rev.1) to the basic text (A/C.3/L.76), and preferred to support the United States amendment.

10. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) took issue with the United States representative's interpretation of the USSR proposal. Mrs. Roosevelt had declared that the Soviet Union was endeavouring, in its proposal, to restrict human rights. Yet a perusal of parts II and V of the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.96) showed conclusively that no restriction was intended, except as regards the dissemination of propaganda on behalf of fascist and nazi ideas or racial hatred.

11. So far from wishing to restrict human rights, his delegation took the view that the covenant should contain provisions concerning economic and social rights, as well as political rights, and that it should set forth the sum total of all the rights which all individuals should enjoy.

12. He was in no way opposed to the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.76), but considered the draft covenant inadequate.

13. As regards the procedural question of the order in which the various proposals before the Committee should be voted on, he said the USSR proposal should come first.

14. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) agreed that directives ought to be given to the Commission on Human Rights, but pointed out that the USSR and Yugoslav amendments had been submitted in the name of their respective authors and could not in any circumstances be regarded as constituting instructions from the General Assembly to the Economic and Social Council.

15. In reply to an observation by the CHAIRMAN, to the effect that the amendments submitted by the USSR (A/C.3/L.96) and Yugoslavia (A/C.3/L.92) contained far more than mere opinions, Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) explained that it was her delegation's intention, in its amendment, to refer to those documents in their complete form.

16. Mr. CABADA (Peru) said he could not accept the amendment proposed by the United States to its own text, for it would be wrong for the General Assembly to recommend the proposals of two Member States and not those of the others.

17. Paragraph 2 (b) of the basic text was entirely satisfactory in itself, and he expressed the hope that it would be voted on first.

18. AZMI Bey (Egypt) felt that his amendment (A/C.3/L.97/Rev.1) should take precedence over the other texts. That amendment had arisen from a desire to reconcile the various ideas expressed in the course of the Committee's meetings. He had revised it once more, in a further effort to provide common ground for the most divergent opinions.

19. He read his amendment, from which he dropped the phrase "and to the definition of the scope and

limitations of all rights", the delegations of Lebanon and the United Kingdom having already submitted a similar amendment.

20. The purpose of the Egyptian amendment was to add other rights to those set forth in the first eighteen articles of the draft covenant and so furnished an answer to the clear question put to the Committee. The text mentioned "other covenants" because it was possible that the first covenant might not cover all rights, or might not be completed within the time limit.

21. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) said she was prepared to withdraw her amendment in favour of the one submitted by the Egyptian delegation.

22. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) noted that the debate, which had been to the point during the consideration of the four questions raised by the Economic and Social Council, was straying from the subject, especially as regards the first question. The Committee's business was to determine, first, whether the enumeration of rights was sufficiently full; and secondly, whether the articles were well worded. For that purpose, the USSR had prepared a draft resolution in the hope of preventing the Committee from merely transmitting the views of its members *en bloc* to the Commission on Human Rights instead of replying to some precise questions. Actually, the Commission, finding itself in an impasse, had already been forced to apply to the Assembly for directives. If the Assembly simply transmitted to the Commission the opinions expressed by the various delegations, the Commission would find itself in the same position again.

23. He had no objection to sub-paragraph 2 (b) of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.76), but held the view that after that sub-paragraph the Committee should set forth particular instructions concerning the other rights clearly mentioned in the USSR proposal. Certain representatives had expressed concern lest such instructions might have the effect of delaying the work of the Commission on Human Rights. Such fears were unfounded; in his opinion, in order to work with dispatch, the Commission must have instructions.

24. Mr. VLAHOVIC (Yugoslavia) said his delegation would support paragraph 2 (b) of the basic text (A/C.3/L.76), and added that he had no objection to the Egyptian amendment.

25. In his opinion, the text of the Yugoslav amendment (A/C.3/L.92) should be inserted between paragraphs 2 (a) and 2 (b) of the basic text.

26. Mr. CASSIN (France) recalled the General Assembly's wish that the draft covenant should be referred to it for consideration within one year. In so far as the quality of the resolution was concerned, he supported the amendments of Lebanon and Yugoslavia, which were designed to secure the adoption of policy decisions. In so far as the scope of the resolution was concerned, the question was how much the Commission on Human Rights could do in a year. In making the instructions to the Commission mandatory, the Committee was proposing to give it an extremely extensive programme; unless an order of priority was established and the Commission was given an indication of which political, economic and other rights it should consider in addition to the first eighteen, it would find it impossible to carry out such a task.

27. The Yugoslav amendment (A/C.3/L.92) contained features which deserved careful study, such as the right of asylum and the right to participate in public affairs. If, however, the question was to be dealt with seriously, political rights proper would have to be included in the covenant.

28. In the USSR proposal (A/C.3/L.96) three categories of rights were to be distinguished: some of them, such as freedom of the Press, had already been considered; others, such as access to public office, would be considered if there was time, or might be the subject of a separate covenant; others again were vast in scope, as for example the right of self-determination, and came within the competence of the General Assembly rather than that of the Commission on Human Rights.

29. He emphasized that his criticism was not directed at the substance of those proposals but at the length of the programme they proposed to assign to the Commission on Human Rights. He would therefore vote for the Egyptian amendment (A/C.3/L.97/Rev.1), which a number of delegations, including the United States, Brazil and Yugoslavia, appeared to have accepted, since it involved a recommendation which was not mandatory and would not impose on the Commission on Human Rights a task which it could not fulfil.

30. The CHAIRMAN read out the text of a new amendment which was based on a compromise between the different texts proposed by Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States.

31. He proposed that the meeting should be suspended for fifteen minutes so that the mimeographed text could be circulated to members.

The proposal for suspension was adopted by 29 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

The meeting was suspended at 4.30 p.m. and was resumed at 4.45 p.m.

32. The CHAIRMAN said that the text submitted by the delegations of Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States (A/C.3/L.99) could not properly be regarded as an amendment to the amendments of the USSR and Yugoslavia, since it in fact proposed a new text for paragraph 2 (b) of the basic text (A/C.3/L.76).

33. The Committee had three different texts before it: that proposed in the Yugoslav amendment (A/C.3/L.92), that appearing in the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.96) and the new amendment (A/C.3/L.99).

34. He would put the Yugoslav amendment to the vote first, since of the three texts, it was the one furthest removed from the basic text.

35. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) pointed out that the text submitted jointly by the delegations of Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States had been submitted as sub-amendment and should therefore be put to the vote before the amendments to which it related.

36. The CHAIRMAN replied that to treat the text as a sub-amendment would render the USSR and Yugoslav amendments nugatory, since, in the event of the adoption of the said text, they would simply be referred to the Commission on Human Rights without being put to the vote.

37. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) said that the attitude of his delegation in regard to the various texts which had been submitted would depend on how far those texts enabled the Third Committee to give a satisfactory reply to the questions which had been put to it: Were the first eighteen articles of the covenant adequate? Was the list of rights they defined complete and if not, how should it be supplemented? There appeared to be four different solutions open to the Committee.

38. In the first place, it could present the Commission on Human Rights with the text of articles which the Commission would merely be required to reproduce and incorporate in the covenant without discussing them or putting them to the vote. That somewhat radical solution did not figure in any of the texts which had been submitted.

39. In the second place, the Third Committee could request the Commission on Human Rights to incorporate certain specified rights in the covenant, leaving it to the Commission to find a satisfactory definition. That was the solution proposed in the Yugoslav amendment (A/C.3/L.92). If it took that course, the General Assembly would instruct the Commission on Human Rights to draft certain articles. The Commission was, however, composed of the representatives of governments which might have reasons for not approving the drafting of those articles. The Commission would thus find itself in a very difficult position, since it would be in possession of precise instructions from its superior organ, but would be prevented from carrying those instructions into effect as a result of the opposition of some of its members.

40. A third solution would be to recommend the Commission on Human Rights to take into consideration the views expressed during the discussion of the draft covenant in the General Assembly, with a view to the addition of other rights. That was the solution contained in the Egyptian amendment (A/C.3/L.97/Rev.1).

41. Lastly, the Committee could also follow the slightly different course of simply transmitting those views without taking any policy decision in favour of any of them. That solution, which was proposed in the draft resolution submitted by Brazil, Turkey and the United States (A/C.3/L.76) appeared to have been abandoned in favour of the solution previously outlined.

42. As regards the text of the joint amendment of Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States (A/C.3/L.99), he pointed out that some members might wish certain articles to be embodied in the first covenant, whereas others might wish to have them embodied in other instruments; in order to give those members an opportunity of expressing their respective preferences, he suggested that the words "or in other covenants" should be put to the vote separately.

43. The Committee was thus faced with the following choice: either to transmit to the Commission on Human Rights the views expressed during the discussion — no one appeared to be in favour of that course — or to recommend the Commission to enunciate either in the covenant or in another instrument rights recognized as important by members during the discussion of the draft covenant.

44. For its part, the Lebanese delegation regarded the text submitted by Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States (A/C.3/L.99) as satisfactory, provided that the words "or in other covenants" were put to the vote separately.

45. Mr. PLEIC (Yugoslavia) pointed out that the statement made by the representative of Lebanon might give the impression that the powers of the Commission on Human Rights were superior to those of the General Assembly. He challenged that interpretation; the General Assembly had complete authority and the Commission on Human Rights must comply with its recommendations.

46. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) said, in reply to the representative of Yugoslavia, that it had never occurred to him to question the General Assembly's authority over the Commission on Human Rights. He had merely wished to point out that no decision by the General Assembly could limit the freedom of action of the governments represented on the Commission on Human Rights or oblige them to vote for certain texts, which, for some reason, they did not see fit to accept.

47. The delegation of Lebanon would vote against the Yugoslav amendment in order to avoid placing the Commission on Human Rights, which was composed of representatives of Member States, in a difficult position.

48. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) pointed out that if the Third Committee concurred in the view expressed by the representative of Lebanon, it would be accepting the theory that the eighteen members of the Commission on Human Rights were not required to comply with a majority decision taken by the sixty members of the General Assembly, which was entirely unacceptable. She was surprised to hear such an interpretation, which would result in delaying the work on the covenant on human rights, since it was necessary to bear in mind that it would be for the General Assembly to give final approval to the draft covenant and, at that stage, the views of the majority would be likely to prevail over those of the minority.

49. She personally hoped that the Committee would have an opportunity of expressing its views on the text submitted by Yugoslavia. She formally requested that it should be voted on in parts.

50. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the Chairman's decision to put the Yugoslav amendment to the vote before the joint amendment of Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States.

51. The USSR amendment and the Yugoslav amendment were, in a sense, parallel; both texts enumerated the rights which should be included in the covenant. The Yugoslav amendment, however, set forth those rights in a general way, while the USSR amendment itemized them.

52. Therefore he felt that, logically, his delegation's amendment should be voted on first.

53. Mr. KAYALI (Syria) recalled that his delegation had often stated that it considered the draft covenant, as it stood, to be an incomplete and defective instrument. Many delegations agreed that the existing text gave only an incomplete list of fundamental rights and did not guarantee their effective protection.

54. At the preceding meeting the representative of France had pointed out that the Commission on Human Rights was faced with the following choice: either to draw up immediately a covenant of limited scope, and then study the question of other supplementary instruments; or to endeavour to draw up a complete covenant covering all categories of human rights and ensuring their effective protection.

55. His delegation was in favour of the second method. The second solution would remain fruitless and the Economic and Social Council's request that the Third Committee should give directives to the Commission on Human Rights for the drafting of the covenant would not be met unless the Committee refrained from referring the draft covenant back to the Commission accompanied by a vague resolution which presented no new ideas.

56. If the Third Committee adopted the joint amendment of Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States (A/C.3/L.99), the Commission on Human Rights would find itself in exactly the same position as before. Moreover, that amendment prejudged, to a certain extent, the decision to be taken by the Commission as regards the inclusion of economic and social rights in the draft covenant. If the amendment was to be acceptable, the words "or in other covenants" must be deleted from the text.

57. The delegations of India and China had expressed the same concern as the Syrian delegation; and the Yugoslav amendment (A/C.3/L.92), inspired by the same feeling, would indicate to the Commission on Human Rights the principles on which the Assembly desired it to base its work.

58. Accordingly, his delegation would vote in favour of that amendment, and supported the suggestion of the representative of Iraq that it should be voted on paragraph by paragraph.

59. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) stated that she could not agree to the deletion proposed by the representative of Syria, for its effect might well be to force the Commission on Human Rights to include in the draft covenant provisions which study would lead it to regard as unsuitable.

60. As regards the nature of the joint text proposed by Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States, she pointed out that if the text was treated as an amendment and was adopted, the USSR and Yugoslav amendments could not be voted on in the Third Committee, but could, nevertheless, be submitted to the Commission on Human Rights for study.

61. She did not wish to challenge the Chairman's ruling, but urged the Committee to consider whether, in place of giving rigid and categorical instructions to the Commission on Human Rights, it would not be preferable simply to invite that Commission to take into consideration the opinions expressed in the course of the debate on the draft covenant at the current session of the General Assembly. Such a procedure would not *a priori* exclude any human right from the draft covenant, but would leave the Commission on Human Rights entirely free to take whatever decisions it deemed desirable.

62. She suggested that the Committee should settle by a vote whether the joint amendment (A/C.3/L.99)

should be treated as an amendment to the USSR and Yugoslav amendments, or as a separate proposal.

63. Mr. CHANG (China) said the question was a difficult one to decide. In his opinion, the first part of the text of the joint amendment (A/C.3/L.99) was indeed an amendment to paragraph 2 (b) of the basic text (A/C.3/L.76); but the last part (beginning with the words "including those relating to articles 13...") could only be considered a procedural proposal dealing with the procedure to be followed in connexion with the two proposals before the Committee. That regrettable confusion placed the Committee in a difficult position as regards the vote.

64. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) supported the Chairman's proposal to treat the joint amendment of Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States (A/C.3/L.99) as a new proposal.

65. Otherwise, the Committee would be dealing with an amendment the effect of which would be to alter the substance of two previous proposals and to prevent their being voted on by the Committee. Such a procedure would be unjust and irregular.

66. His delegation could not agree to the establishment of such a precedent in the United Nations, lest it should itself one day find its proposals transformed into mere suggestions through the effect of some later amendment whereby they ceased to be proposals requiring a formal vote.

67. Lord MACDONALD (United Kingdom) also supported the Chairman's ruling.

68. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan) agreed that no amendment should be allowed to have the effect of changing the essential nature of a previous proposal, to the point of transforming it into a mere suggestion.

69. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) yielded to the Chairman's ruling, which her delegation had never intended to challenge.

70. Mr. CABADA (Peru) also said he had no wish to challenge the Chairman's ruling. Nevertheless, in his opinion, it was for the Committee itself to decide in which order it would vote on the different texts submitted to it.

71. The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee accepted his ruling that the Yugoslav amendment should be voted on first.

It was decided, by 22 votes to 15, with 10 abstentions, to vote first on the Yugoslav amendment (A/C.3/L.92).

72. Mr. PLEIC (Yugoslavia) requested that the text submitted by his delegation should be voted on in parts.

73. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) explained that his delegation would vote against the Yugoslav amendment and, since it had been requested that the vote should be taken by parts, he would vote against each of its subparagraphs, not because it objected to the rights which they enunciated — Greece could not but be in favour of liberty of suffrage and the right of every person to participate in the government of his country — but because it wished to indicate its preference for the joint amendment of Egypt, the United Kingdom and the United States (A/C.3/L.99).

74. Mrs. SINCLAIR (Canada), in explaining the position of her delegation with reference to the Yugoslav

amendment, recalled that, as previously stated, it regarded the first eighteen articles of the draft covenant as adequate although it considered that they could with advantage be more precisely defined.

75. Her delegation had no objection to the rights enunciated in the Yugoslav amendment; it would in fact be absurd to object to rights which were already in force in Canada. It was, however, opposed to their inclusion in the draft first covenant, and would oppose the USSR proposals (A/C.3/L.96) on the same grounds.

76. The Commission on Human Rights certainly had a heavy task to fulfil and, in opposing the proposal that it should be called upon to study additional articles, the Canadian delegation was merely acting in conformity with its previous decision to oppose, for the time being, the inclusion of economic, social and cultural rights in the draft covenant.

77. Mr. PRATT DE MARIA (Uruguay) said he would vote against the Yugoslav amendment for the reasons given by the representative of Greece.

78. His delegation was strongly opposed to paragraph 1 (c) of the Yugoslav text, relating to "the right of every member of a minority to make use of its national language and develop its culture". Uruguay was a country which had opened and was continuing to open its doors wide to foreign immigration and could not but view such a provision and its possible effect on the national culture with concern.

79. Mr. CANAS FLORES (Chile) supported the remarks of the representative of Uruguay concerning paragraph 1 (c) of the Yugoslav text. That clause might be gravely prejudicial to those countries which had not hitherto hesitated, for humanitarian reasons, to receive European refugees. Its inclusion in the draft covenant of human rights might even lead those countries to impose restrictions on immigration, which would be regrettable from every point of view.

80. Mr. ZELLEKE (Ethiopia) said that for the reasons stated by the representative of Greece, his delegation would abstain from voting on the Yugoslav amendment.

81. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon), seconded by Sayed Ahmad ZEBARA (Yemen), requested a separate vote on the opening passage of the operative part of the Yugoslav text: "Decides that the following rights should be added to the list of rights to be defined in the covenant:"

82. That would give delegations which so wished an opportunity of expressing their opposition to the mandatory nature of the directives which Yugoslavia was proposing to give the Commission on Human Rights.

83. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the introductory phrase of the operative part of the text proposed by Yugoslavia (A/C.3/L.92).

The phrase was rejected by 24 votes to 18, with 5 abstentions.

84. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that as a result of the vote it was unnecessary to put the remainder of the Yugoslav amendment to the vote. He invited the Committee to vote on the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.96).

85. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) also requested a separate vote on the introductory phrase of the operative part of the text proposed by the USSR in part II of its amendment: "In drafting the covenant, to have in mind the inclusion therein of the following provisions:"

86. Mr. ROSHCIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) protested against such a division, which he regarded as tantamount to asking the Committee not to vote separately on each part of the USSR amendment but to reject that amendment as a whole.

87. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) explained that the sole purpose of his proposal was to enable delegations which were opposed to the inclusion of additional articles in the draft covenant to defend their point of view. If the majority voted in favour of the inclusion of additional articles, or, in other words, if they voted in favour of the introductory phrase of the operative part of the USSR amendment, the Committee would examine the proposed rights one by one and could take a separate vote on each.

88. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to decide whether it wished to vote separately on the introduction to the operative part of the amendment proposed by the USSR, that is, on the words, "In drafting the covenant, to have in mind the inclusion therein of the following provisions".

It was decided, by 20 votes to 18, that that part of the USSR amendment should be put to the vote separately.

89. Mr. ALTMAN (Poland) requested that the vote should be taken by roll-call.

90. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the introduction to the operative part of the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.96, part II).

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: India, Indonesia, Iraq, Mexico, Pakistan, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Czechoslovakia.

Against: Lebanon, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala.

Abstaining: Iran, Liberia, Yemen, Ecuador.

The introduction to the operative part of the USSR amendment was rejected by 28 votes to 17, with 4 abstentions, 11 delegations not being represented at the time of the vote.

91. The CHAIRMAN said that the result of the vote made it unnecessary to put the remaining paragraphs of the USSR amendment to the vote.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.