



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
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.111) (concluded)	285
Freedom of information (continued)	
(b) Interference with radio signals: Economic and Social Council resolution 306 B (XI) (A/1397 and A/C.3/L.112) (continued)	288
(c) Question of the freedom of information and of the Press in times of emergency: Economic and Social Council resolution 306 C (XI) (A/1397)	290

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.111) (concluded)

[Item 63]*

1. The CHAIRMAN put before the Committee a consolidated text of the draft resolution on the covenant on human rights, as presented by the Officers of the Third Committee (A/C.3/L.111).

2. He paid a tribute to Mr. Schwelb, Assistant Director of the Division of Human Rights, who had been of great assistance in preparing the consolidated text.

3. Inasmuch as the Committee had approved each part of the draft resolution separately, it could discuss only the order of the paragraphs and their form, but not matters of substance. Members would have the opportunity to explain their attitude towards the resolution as a whole after a vote had been taken on the entire text.

4. Mr. LESAGE (Canada), Mr. LEQUESNE (United Kingdom) and Mr. DE LACHARRIERE (France) thought that representatives should have the opportunity to discuss the substance of the draft resolution as a whole before the vote was taken.

5. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that such a course would set a most undesirable precedent. The

Committee had already discussed and voted on every component part of the draft resolution and should not reopen the debate on substance.

6. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should confine itself to a discussion of the form and arrangement of the draft resolution and to explanations of votes.

That suggestion was adopted by 45 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

Mr. A. S. Bokhari (Pakistan) took the chair.

7. Mrs. MENON (India) suggested a rearrangement of the draft resolution, whereby those paragraphs which began with "considers"—or with "whereas", which should be changed to "considers"—would be grouped together, to be followed, first, by all the paragraphs which began with the words "calls upon" and then by the paragraphs which began with "decides" and "requests". Such an arrangement would appear more logical.

8. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the paragraphs were grouped under each of the four questions put to the Committee by the Economic and Social Council, and that the Indian representative's suggestion would destroy that sequence.

9. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) agreed with the Chairman. Furthermore, the various paragraphs which began with "considers" were followed by operative paragraphs which determined their meaning; if they were separated, there was a danger of distortion.

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

10. He suggested, however, that section B might be divided into two separate sections, the first dealing with the idea that the first eighteen articles of the draft covenant should contain a greater number of rights and the second with the idea that the wording of some of the articles should be improved.

11. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico), Rapporteur, agreed that the resolution was not stylistically perfect, but said that it would be much simpler for him to prepare a report on the item under consideration if the existing arrangement of the paragraphs were maintained.

12. Mr. CHANG (China) supported that view. The draft resolution was irregular in structure, but it served its purpose; partial improvement would do more harm than good.

13. Mrs. MENON (India) and Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) did not press their suggestions.

14. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the consolidated text of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.111) as a whole.

The draft resolution was adopted by 29 votes to 5, with 13 abstentions.

15. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) suggested that explanations of votes should be limited to three minutes.

That suggestion was adopted by 39 votes to 6, with 5 abstentions.

16. The CHAIRMAN called on representatives who wished to explain their votes to do so.

17. Mr. LESAGE (Canada) said that his country attached the greatest importance to respect for human rights within its own borders. In a spirit of collaboration the Canadian delegation had sought practical methods of producing a covenant on human rights that could be implemented. When the separate parts of the resolution had been considered, the Canadian delegation had several times cast a negative vote, as, for example, on the question of inclusion of economic, cultural and social rights, which in its opinion would make implementation of the covenant difficult, if not impossible.

18. The resolution as finally adopted was confusing, illogical, repetitive and diffuse, and the Canadian delegation had been unable to accept it. Nevertheless, in order not to make the task of the Commission on Human Rights more difficult still, it had not opposed the resolution but had merely abstained, with the reservation that it would in the future oppose the inclusion of provisions to which it had objected.

19. Mr. DAVIN (New Zealand) said that he had voted against the draft resolution because it included provisions which his delegation had consistently opposed. The Committee had been wrong to take an arbitrary decision to include economic, social and cultural rights in the covenant, since the definition of such rights involved a tremendous task and would provide a fertile field for disagreement. The result might well be to set back the adoption of the covenant for years and jeopardize the work done so far. It seemed impossible that the General Assembly should have before it at its sixth session a revised draft covenant including those rights.

20. Another reason for opposing the resolution had been that it included a paragraph relating to the right of

self-determination. The New Zealand delegation considered that to be a right of groups and therefore out of place in a covenant dealing essentially with the rights of individuals. Furthermore, there was a serious inconsistency between section B of the resolution, in which the Commission was requested to take into consideration views expressed on certain rights, and the outright decision in section E to include in the covenant rights in the same field.

21. His country would, however, continue to maintain its interest in the work of the Commission on Human Rights and in the draft covenant, and he sincerely hoped that in spite of the handicaps imposed by the draft resolution a useful covenant would be produced.

22. Mr. BEAUFORT (Netherlands) said that he had, with regret, voted against the resolution because important matters had been omitted from it while ambitious but impractical ideas had been included.

23. More important, the Committee had deliberately discarded the opportunity to produce, within a short period after the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a covenant which would become binding international law. That could have been achieved, had the covenant been limited to a number of basic human rights, namely those enumerated in the first eighteen articles, with possibly a few others.

24. The Committee had, however, decided that social, economic and cultural rights too should be formulated at the same time, as part of international law, and that the right of complaint should be granted to individuals and special groups.

25. The Committee had apparently forgotten that the preamble of the Declaration stated that the universal and effective recognition of those rights should be secured by progressive measures. It had disregarded the necessity of gradual development of concepts of positive international law, as well as the fact that those rights did not as yet form part of the legal conscience in all parts of the world. As a result, both the effectiveness of the principles of law to be formulated and the supremacy of the law itself might suffer.

26. He hoped that the honesty of his delegation's position would be appreciated; it had been unable to accept a resolution which in its opinion would seriously harm the healthy development as well as the recognition and protection of human rights.

27. Mr. RODRIGUEZ ARIAS (Argentina) said that he had abstained from voting on some parts of the resolution and had opposed others, but had voted in favour of the resolution as a whole because it constituted a step forward in the preparation of a covenant on human rights.

28. Mr. DELHAYE (Belgium) said that, while his delegation approved of many of the provisions contained in the resolution, such as the federal clause and the provisions relating to the equality of rights of men and women, collaboration of various United Nations organs and co-operation with the specialized agencies, it considered that in the first covenant only general principles applying to economic, social and cultural rights should be given, and that, in view of the international situation, the right of petition should not for the time being be granted to individuals or groups of individuals.

29. Lastly, the Committee had decided to exclude the so-called colonial clause. Belgium administered colonial territories which were not sufficiently advanced to permit immediate application of the rights contained in the covenant; and, unlike some other countries, it wished to ratify the covenant in the knowledge that it would be able to carry out the obligations it assumed.

30. As the Belgian delegation had serious objections to some parts of the resolution, while it wholeheartedly supported others, it had been forced to abstain from voting. It would, however, continue to co-operate in the elaboration of a covenant such as would truly further the progress of mankind.

31. Mr. SZYMANOWSKI (Poland) explained why he had abstained from voting on the resolution. His delegation attached the greatest importance to the earliest possible adoption by the General Assembly of a covenant guaranteeing the fundamental rights of man. Hence the Committee's decisions should provide clear and adequate recommendations for the future work of the Commission on Human Rights.

32. The resolution did include sound and correct directives for the Commission on the colonial clause and the inclusion of articles on economic, social and cultural rights. On the other hand, it was less clear in its references to the federal clause and to the necessity of the addition of political rights in the first eighteen articles; those references left room for interpretations which would be unacceptable to his delegation.

33. The most inadequate part of the resolution was that dealing with the implementation of the covenant. He believed that the Committee had made a serious mistake in rejecting (314th meeting) the USSR proposal (A/C.3/L.96) to delete articles 19 to 41, and it was to be feared that its decision would have serious repercussions on the fate of the draft covenant. The decision not to delete articles 19 to 41 had caused his delegation to abstain from voting on the resolution.

34. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) explained that she had voted for the resolution because her government thought it important that the work relating to the draft covenant on human rights should proceed as rapidly as possible and that every possible step should be taken in the General Assembly for the promotion of human rights. The Members of the United Nations must constantly keep in mind their relevant obligations under Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter.

35. She did, however, wish to point out her serious concern about the practicability of including economic and social rights in that first draft covenant. Her delegation would naturally have to reserve its position on the inclusion of such rights in the first covenant and would examine on its merits any text finally submitted, in order to determine whether or not it could support inclusion of that text in the draft covenant.

36. Mr. MOODIE (Australia) said that he had been unable to vote for the resolution although he agreed with many of its provisions. His delegation had consistently emphasized the importance of leaving it as far as possible to the Commission on Human Rights to consider all the suggestions made regarding the substance or wording of the draft covenant. It had expressed doubt about the wisdom of imposing decisions upon the Com-

mission without, however, contesting the right of Committee members to express their views.

37. The resolution contained specific directives in respect of what should be included, but was confused and repetitious in form. It would be impossible for the Commission on Human Rights to submit a draft covenant based on it to the General Assembly at its sixth session, as directed in part A.

38. In the circumstances it would have been better to reject the resolution than to adopt it, leaving it to the Commission on Human Rights to complete its work as it had originally intended to do, and to submit the text of the draft covenant as it stood to the General Assembly at its next session.

39. In spite of its misgivings about the resolution, his delegation would of course continue to co-operate wholeheartedly with the Commission on Human Rights.

40. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) stated that he had abstained from voting on the resolution. While the original text had not been specific enough in providing directives to the Commission on Human Rights, the final text contained too many directives and might produce a number of undesirable results: confusion about the work and competence of the Commission on Human Rights, delay in the preparation of the draft covenant, a reduction in the number of signatures to that instrument, and, finally, a disinclination on the part of the Economic and Social Council and the Commission to ask the General Assembly for its advice on such a matter again.

41. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) said that he had voted for the resolution because, on the whole, it gave the Commission on Human Rights an opportunity to continue its work on the basis of what the General Assembly deemed necessary at that time. He would not, however, conceal his view that the resolution was confusing in its wording, occasionally to the point of incoherency.

42. He could not agree with part C. The Sixth Committee had rejected the federal clause as early as 1948, and successive votes in the Commission on Human Rights had shown growing opposition to it. He hoped that such opposition would continue to grow.

43. Mr. LEQUESNE (United Kingdom) said that he had voted against the resolution because, although many of its provisions were acceptable, it was inadequate and possibly dangerous as a whole. The Committee had given no specific replies to the last of the four specific questions addressed to the General Assembly by the Economic and Social Council. Instead, it was merely asking the Council to request the Commission to take account of certain suggestions.

44. In part E, paragraph (a), it was decided that economic, social and cultural rights must be included in the draft covenant, while the second paragraph of part A called upon the Economic and Social Council to request the Commission to produce a revised draft of the covenant in time for the sixth session of the General Assembly. The task set forth in part E, paragraph (a), could not be accomplished in so short a time.

45. In adopting the resolution, the Committee had failed to heed the wise warning against impugning the authority of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Committee should also ponder the fact

that, while a majority of its members had insisted upon the necessity of including economic, social and cultural rights, there had been no fewer than twelve abstentions from the vote on the proposed deletion of articles 19 to 41 (314th meeting), which dealt with measures of implementation.

46. It was time that Member States asked themselves seriously whether it was possible just then to draft an effective covenant on human rights. If the honest answer to that question was "no", they should have the courage to say so.

47. Mr. PEREZ PEROZO (Venezuela) said that in voting for the resolution he kept in mind the fact that the Committee was, after all, only dealing with a draft covenant. His vote could not in any way prejudice the final attitude of his delegation towards the revised draft covenant which would ultimately be submitted by the Commission on Human Rights.

48. Mr. BOTHA (Union of South Africa) explained that his delegation had not been able to support the draft resolution, although the majority of the recommendations which it contained were acceptable to it and had, in fact, been supported by it when the various parts were voted on separately.

49. The resolution contained a number of parts which his delegation could not support. The directive which, under the resolution, the General Assembly would give to the Economic and Social Council and, through it, to the Commission on Human Rights, was impracticable in its scope and did not represent the clear directives which the Commission had requested. Moreover, the resolution contained a number of inconsistencies.

50. He hoped nevertheless that the Commission on Human Rights would be able to salvage whatever good features the resolution contained.

51. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) stated that he had abstained from voting on the resolution because it was characterized by incoherencies in its provisions and contradictions in its intentions. His delegation deemed itself bound by the provisions for which it had voted during the votes on the separate parts, and his abstention did not at all indicate a slackening in his country's interest in the swift conclusion of a draft covenant on human rights. It did indicate a fear that the resolution just adopted would considerably delay the attainment of that goal.

52. Nevertheless, the Greek representative in the Commission on Human Rights would do his utmost to implement the resolution to the largest possible extent.

53. Mr. DE LACHARRIERE (France) agreed with those who held that the resolution was almost incoherent. Although it contained some good provisions, it also contained many repetitions, useless assertions, and even contradictions, as well as serious gaps. The last defect was particularly notable in respect of measures of implementation, on which the resolution really had nothing to say.

54. He could not analyse all the shortcomings of the resolution within the three-minute time limit and would therefore reserve his right to comment upon it at greater length at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

Freedom of information (continued)

[Item 30]*

(b) Interference with radio signals: Economic and Social Council resolution 306 B (XI) (A/1397 and A/C.3/L.112) (continued)

55. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) said that his delegation would whole-heartedly support any resolution based upon the accepted principle of freedom of information, and condemn anything standing in the way of that principle, such as interference with radio broadcasting or other information media.

56. It seemed to him, however, that the speeches so far made in the debate had constituted attacks by speakers on one another and defence of their own position, rather than attacks against, and defence of, the Chilean draft resolution (A/C.3/L.112) under consideration.

57. The draft resolution introduced a difficulty. Only a resolution couched in general terms and not aimed at any one in particular could be regarded as being in the true interests of freedom of information; the Committee should concentrate on the rights of people and not on differences between governments. That consideration would oblige his delegation to abstain from voting on the draft resolution in its existing form and method of presentation.

58. His country had also suffered from misrepresentation and mis-statements, but he would refrain from entering into details on that subject since he considered that it was not for the Committee to consider specific instances, but to concern itself only with the maintenance of the right of all people to any kind of information and to condemn any measures likely to interfere with the right of all persons to be fully informed.

59. Mr. HOFFMEISTER (Czechoslovakia) regretted that the Committee should have to begin its deliberations on freedom of information at the most vulnerable point of that entire concept. Resolution 306 B (XI) was biased and one-sided, and in adopting it the Economic and Social Council had taken a stand against the wrong party. What was called "interference with radio signals" in the Committee's agenda should in reality be called "interference in the internal affairs of States through radio signals". Attention should have been centred not on the receiving but on the broadcasting aspect.

60. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaimed man's right "to seek, receive and impart information and ideas", but that surely did not mean imparting fascism, war-mongering, hatred and lies. No propagandist had the right to spread fear among people living and working in peace and a spirit of brotherhood.

61. At its fourth session, held in Montevideo, the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press had discussed a draft international code of ethics (E/CN.4/Sub.1/125) which branded calumny, slander, libel, unfounded accusations and plagiarism as serious professional offences and provided that rumor and unconfirmed news should be identified and treated as such. His country was identifying and treating them as such. Those who were broadcasting war propaganda and disruption based themselves on the false freedoms of mis-information, inaccuracy, irresponsibility and slander,

false freedoms which were an offence against the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Committee should call such voices of piracy and aggression to order. Their aim was to undermine the constructive efforts of socialist society and ultimately to overthrow governments in order to restore the old capitalist order.

62. Under the leadership of the "Voice of America", the broadcasts in question distorted facts, spread untruths, intentionally harmed the economic relations of his country with others, and assisted deserters, traitors and common criminals. They did not shrink from gross attacks against the head of the Czechoslovak State and members of the government, openly calling for subversive activities and high treason. While they made no impression on the people, they constituted nevertheless a very serious infraction of the provisions of the Charter.

63. Accordingly, his delegation repudiated the Economic and Social Council resolution and could not accept any proposals based upon it, such as the Chilean draft resolution.

64. Mr. PLEIC (Yugoslavia) said the first consideration was that all who sincerely desired the exchange of information contributing to the strengthening of, and respect for, the principles of the Charter must, as a matter of principle, condemn any interference with foreign radio broadcasts. They must support any positive measures taken by the United Nations to curtail such interference.

65. Under existing international treaties, States were bound to use radio facilities in a manner which would not interfere with foreign broadcasts. Interference with foreign radio signals not only was a violation of international obligations, but threatened completely to destroy the entire system of radio communications which, if properly employed, could render great services to every man, every nation and the entire international community.

66. It was particularly easy for technologically developed countries to interfere with radio signals to the detriment of economically under-developed countries, which would be the first victims. The USSR, with the aid of advanced technological means, was developing a whole system of interference with foreign radio signals. His own country was among the victims of that practice: Yugoslav broadcasts were jammed by USSR stations. That was yet another reason why his delegation supported the appeal of the United Nations to Member States against interference with radio signals, especially since the Yugoslav broadcasts were entirely devoted to the truth and to the development of friendship among peoples. The voice of his country was that of a small nation fighting for its independence and peaceful development, but smothered by a technological giant.

67. For all those reasons his delegation would, in principle, support a resolution condemning and prohibiting interference with foreign radio signals. The problem was, however, very complicated and such a resolution must be drafted with the greatest care in order to make it both objective and realistic.

68. Turning to the Chilean draft resolution (A/C.3/L.112), he suggested, without submitting any formal proposal, the deletion of the first paragraph of the preamble and of the words "the accepted principles of" from the first operative paragraph. Those deletions

would make the draft resolution less controversial and theoretical.

69. Mr. BRAÑA (Cuba) took issue with the arguments advanced by the USSR and Polish delegations to the effect that governments should be permitted to interfere with radio signals on various grounds established solely by themselves. Undoubtedly, such abuses of the freedom of information as war-mongering, distortion of the truth under pressure and the slanting of news existed, but they could eventually be remedied by the convention on freedom of information. On the other hand, to deprive the people of the opportunity of deciding between truth and falsehood for themselves was merely to combat fascist propaganda by fascist methods. The State should not be permitted to decide what its people should be told.

70. He would therefore support the Chilean draft resolution and oppose any proposal which might prevent access to any channel of information whatever.

71. Mr. CASSIMATIS (Greece) observed that, in reality, the debate hinged upon the opposition of two conflicting outlooks, which had unfortunately hardened since the foundation of the United Nations. The delegations of Chile, Cuba, the United Kingdom, the United States and Yugoslavia had, in his opinion, voiced the views of free men by their advocacy of freedom to choose between truth and falsehood. Unfortunately, truth could be distorted for ulterior motives, but all civilized people believed that it would eventually prevail, as the experience of his own country clearly showed. In Greece the most conservative governments had never interfered with the reception of radio signals, even those broadcast by persons whom they regarded as rebels. During the Second World War, before Greece was overrun, when it was repelling the fascist aggression, and even later, when it was facing the Nazi invaders, the Italian and German radio could be listened to freely and commented upon in the Greek Press.

72. The Governments of Czechoslovakia, Poland and the USSR had taken the contrary view and, perhaps from an excess of caution, permitted their people to hear only what he might call the official truth. A far simpler solution of the problem of deceitful propaganda—which all delegations deplored—would be to permit absolutely free discussion of it.

73. The United Nations might well consider the idea of setting up a commission to hear complaints against the misuse of freedom of information and fuller use might be made of the international right of correction, when the convention on that subject had come into force.

74. Mr. MARIN (France) could not agree with the Polish representative's assertion that the French radio was not independent. In his own opinion, it reflected the currents of public opinion much more fully and faithfully than did the Warsaw radio station.

75. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. KOUSSOFF (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) requested that the remainder of the debate should be deferred until the following meeting, as they were not ready to speak on the subject under discussion.

76. Mr. GREEN (United States of America) asked for an immediate vote.

77. Mr. LEQUESNE (United Kingdom) also asked for an immediate vote and proposed suspension of the application of rule 119 of the rules of procedure.

78. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) thought that such a suspension would create a dangerous precedent and noted that rule 119 was mandatory.

79. The CHAIRMAN stated that those delegations which still wished to speak on the question of interference with radio signals could do so at the following meeting.

(c) Question of the freedom of information and of the Press in times of emergency: Economic and Social Council resolution 306 C (XI) (A/1397)

80. At the suggestion of Mr. LEQUESNE (United Kingdom), the CHAIRMAN stated that the draft resolution recommended for adoption in Economic and Social Council resolution 306 C (XI), which was reproduced in the note by the Secretary-General (A/1397), would be taken as the basic text for the Committee's consideration.

81. AZMI Bey (Egypt) agreed with that decision, but thought that freedom of information and of the Press was a fundamental freedom rather than a fundamental human right. The purpose of the resolution was to compel governments which had, for example, declared a state of siege and announced certain restrictions on that freedom to remain strictly within the limitations which they themselves had imposed.

82. He therefore proposed that the words "one of the fundamental freedoms" should be substituted for the words "a fundamental human right" in the first paragraph of the preamble and the word "freedom" for the word "right" in the second paragraph of the preamble.

83. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) suggested that it might be preferable to reproduce the wording of the last phrase of article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the first paragraph of the preamble.

84. He would, however, accept the Egyptian amendment.

85. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) supported the substance of the draft resolution, but thought that, if the preamble contained a reference to human rights, the operative part, embodying as it did a reference to a particular situation, might appear somewhat incongruous. Due importance, too, should be given to the phrase "on the pretext of emergencies".

86. He would, however, accept the Egyptian amendment.

87. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any objection, the Committee would take the text as amended by the Egyptian representative as a basis for the discussion.

88. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) proposed that a separate vote should be taken on the words "in all circumstances" in the first paragraph of the preamble.

89. Freedom of information and of the Press could not always be fully enjoyed, because it might be abused by the dissemination, for example, of seditious or blasphemous libels.

90. Mr. CASSIMATIS (Greece) could not agree with the Saudi Arabian representative. Freedom of the Press should be safeguarded in all circumstances. The General Assembly should recommend to Member States that they should avoid imposing restrictions even in emergencies. It was hard to see who would decide what an emergency was or what measures should be taken if such emergencies occurred.

91. Mr. TEIXEIRA SOARES (Brazil) said that unless it was stated that freedom of information should be safeguarded in all circumstances, the reference to its limitation could not be understood.

92. Mr. MONTERREY (Nicaragua) said that governments ought to be permitted to impose restrictions on freedom of the Press when necessary, since abuse of that freedom might cause them serious difficulties.

93. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) proposed the deletion of the second paragraph of the preamble. It was not clearly stated by whom or in what circumstances limitations had been placed upon freedom of information. It would be extremely hard to define emergencies and even harder to define such a phrase as "the pretext of emergencies".

94. Mr. MENDEZ (Philippines) thought that the objection raised by the representative of Afghanistan would be met if the words "may be placed" were substituted for the words "have been placed".

95. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) proposed that the amendment should read "might be placed", in order to meet objections that the word "may" could be interpreted as being permissive or hypothetical.

96. Mr. MENDEZ (Philippines) accepted that proposal.

97. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) withdrew his proposal for deletion, in favour of the amended Philippine amendment.

98. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed the adjournment of the debate, under rule 115 of the rules of procedure.

99. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland) moved the adjournment of the meeting, under rule 117 of the rules of procedure.

That motion was rejected by 25 votes to 11, with 9 abstentions.

100. Mr. MENDEZ (Philippines) opposed the USSR representative's motion for the adjournment of the debate, since the Committee had almost reached agreement on the amended text of the draft resolution.

101. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) supported the USSR representative's motion. The amendments, even if apparently trifling, might well change the substance of the draft resolution and so needed more consideration.

The motion for the adjournment of the debate was rejected by 23 votes to 7, with 15 abstentions.

102. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Saudi Arabian amendment to the amended text calling for the deletion of the words "in all circumstances" from the first paragraph of the preamble.

That amendment was adopted by 17 votes to 16, with 11 abstentions.

103. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Philippine and Saudi Arabian amendment to the effect that the words "might be placed" should be substituted for "have been placed" in the second paragraph of the preamble.

That amendment was adopted by 23 votes to 12, with 11 abstentions.

104. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution proposed by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 306 C (XI), as amended, as a whole.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 38 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.